

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Thank you for bringing this to our attention.
		<b>New This Week:</b>
354		Q. Would a scientific research and development project performed by an offeror that is entered into using an "Other Transactions Agreement (OTA)" authorized by 10 USC 2371, be considered a Federal Government Project or a Non-Federal Government Project?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> A Federal project.
355	M.5: L.5.5.6 Page 95	If only a portion of the bidder's organization is ISO 9001 certified, will the points be awarded?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are looking into this now.
356	Section L	Section L does not describe the composition of the Total Evaluated Price used for award purposes. Can the Government please clarify the composition of Total Evaluated Price?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We will be very clear on this in the final solicitation.
357	B.2.5.1. Ceiling Rates for T&M and L-H Task Orders	Will the Ceiling Rates established in Attachment J.8 also be used for price analysis of Firm Fixed Price build-ups? How will risk be evaluated at the Task Order level?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. The ceiling rates have absolutely nothing to do with Firm Fixed Price Task Orders.
358	M.5. SCORING SYSTEM, page 94	The last round of QandA was a bit non-committal on creating new scales for section M, but it seems that the decrease in the dollar threshold for "past performance" necessitates an adjustment of points so that the proportional relationship between the minimum requirement and receiving full points for exceeding the minimum amount by a certain amount (or percentage) remains intact.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are assessing all potential edits and reviewing various scoring scenarios prior to issuing an updated scoring table. Once we are done with the Industry Day and One on One process, we will update the solicitations.
359	April 26, 2013 Questions and Answers; Question 300	In response to Question 300, you state that Option period exercise requirements are being edited. Could you please tell us something about how those requirements are being changed?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are changing the language to indicate that all factors will be considered in the determination to exercise an option. The language currently seems to make vendors fearful that a single compliance failure will result in an option not being exercised.
360	K.1.2 Annual Representations and Certifications; p.65	Annual Representations and Certifications -- does this heading imply that size representations must be made on an annual basis? We're assuming that an annual size re-representation would have no impact on small business status within OASIS SB unless, unless one of the three trigger events mentioned in G.3.11 occurred.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Certifications and representations need be updated annually, but not for the purposes of OASIS. Please see other related questions about recertification.
361	H.4.2 Predominant Task Order NAICS Determination; p.40	Please explain the meaning of the 2nd sentence in the first paragraph: "NAICS codes <u>only</u> define the <u>business size standard</u> for an individual task order solicitation. As stated, this sentence leads us to believe that the OCO need not consider any other criteria (such as substantive content of the task order) in selecting a NAICS code; that the OCO need consider only size standard.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is an incorrect interpretation. The OCO will select a NAICS code based on the substantive content of the task order. That NAICS code has a size standard associated with it. Each OASIS Pool has its own unique size standard that corresponds to the various NAICS codes that can be performed under OASIS. Every single NAICS code assigned to a Pool has the exact same size standard.
362	F.3 Period of Performance and H.11.On-Ramping; p.23 and 53	What accommodations would be made for ramped-on contractors who don't have a full base period in which to win the three task orders, a criteria for being awarded the option period? We request that the government define the term, "coterminous" to mean that on-ramped OASIS SB contracts would each have a full base period of five years and an opportunity to be awarded the full five-year option period.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Being on-ramped will be taken into consideration. An on-ramped Contractor would not be held to the same expectations in this regard.
363	K.1.2, P. 65	Please confirm that size determination will be made on the basis of the representations and certifications submitted by the contractor at the time of OASIS SB proposal submission.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct.
364		2. What minimum contract size per past performance do you want to see per single contract? Will you accept multiple contracts to the same customer to meet the \$2Million? Would you reconsider a minimum of \$1M/contract/year?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see the changes and previous responses to similar questions.
365		3. Given the likelihood of a large amount of proposals, what is the projected timeframe for award once the RFP is released?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We plan to have awards announced sometime prior to the end of the calendar year.
366	L.5.3.1 (Page 80)	Please clarify, would individual Task Orders (each with distinct scope, tasks, deliverables and periods of performance) awarded under a BPA qualify as distinct projects?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.

367	L.5.3.1 (Page 80)	As a Small Business, a number of our Past Performances were performed as a sub-contractor under a large Prime contractor for delivery to the Government. Each of these instances have a Teaming Agreement in place between our Small Business and the Prime. If we are to submit the Past Performance for our Small Business entity and specify the work that our team performed and the revenue our team received on that work, would we receive full credit for the Past Performance submission as a Federal Government Past Performance?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
368	(H.7.4; pg. 49)	Question: <u>Small Business</u> Will GSA provide some guidance on the data/information required in the marketing brochure? Or is this entirely up to the contractor? Will the marketing brochure require approval or review by the CO/COTR/or other OASIS Official?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We will be deleting the marketing brochure requirement.
369	(H.4.2.1; pg. 41)	Question: In the <u>Unrestricted</u> RFI , are large businesses constrained by the size standards associated with the various pools? For a proposal to the Unrestricted RFP, are large businesses simply constrained to the NAICS codes associated with the various pools?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The unrestricted contract is for Full and Open Competition, within each Pool. Large businesses are only restrained to competing on requirements issued with the corresponding NAICS codes selected as representative of the task order requirement.
370		Question: In the <u>Small Business</u> RFI...For the Purpose of bidding for an IDIQ award is there any evaluation advantage to having a team formed and in place?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
371	(L.5.5.11.1; pg 85)	Question: <u>Small Business</u> The COPM requires a Masters in Program/Project Management OR in one of the 6 core Disciplines. Does a Master's of Science in Computer Science satisfy this requirement in the Scientific or Engineering discipline?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes, this is a science degree.
372	(L.5.5.11.2; pg 86)	Question: <u>Small Business</u> For the COCM, will a certificate in Procurement and Contract Management from University of Virginia be an allowable substitute for a NCMA certification?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are taking a look at Key Personnel certificates and education substitutions right now. Answer pending.
373	L.3	As a small business, we feel it is best to present a composite capability and depth for the scope of work by teaming with one or more companies as is usual and customary. Would the Government permit bids from a prime that is teamed with subcontractors? If yes, would the Government permit subcontractors to submit one or more of the Past Performance references?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
374	GSA Interact OASIS Blog	The Blog indicates a change is being made for the requirement for a government agency audited and certified accounting system, but only states this applies to OASIS SB. In addition in an industry forum, GSA stated it may relax the requirement to allow for an independent, third party commercial audit of the bidder's accounting system. Will this change also apply to OASIS Unrestricted?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
375	Q&A Question 59, 99 and 110	If the Pools only reflect size standards and nothing more, why are they being used for OASIS Unrestricted? The answer provided in Q&A #99 is still unclear. If size standards are not being applied to OASIS Unrestricted, that is, there will be no awards set aside for companies in that size standard, why use the NAICS codes at all? GSA states the COO will select the NAICS code that best represents the task order to be competed, but that the CO has no authority to select any size standard. This says, in essence, the NAICS for Unrestricted do, in fact, refer to the type of work to be competed. Why not just have one pool for Unrestricted, or alternatively, six pools for the six core disciplines?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
376	Section L.2.3, Page 74	This section only addresses the number of awards the Government intends make in each of the six SB pools. How many awards does the Government intend to make in the Unrestricted category?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> There is no unrestricted category. The Government intends to make 40 awards in each Pool of each contract.
377	Section M.3, Page 95	This section states that the OASIS evaluation team will verify the Top 40 Offerors in each OASIS Pool has successfully passed all of the Acceptability Review requirements in Section M.4. Does this mean there will be a pool of 40 Offerors in the Unrestricted Category?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
378	L.5.4.2, Page 87	Is the Government certain that past performance references should return their completed Attachment (6) directly to the Offeror? Typical, such past performance references are sent directly to the Contracting Officer.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes. Just like CPARS information, the Offeror should know exactly what the rating is.

379	L.6, Page 92	The draft solicitation states "The Offeror shall propose ceiling rates for T&M/L-H task orders by completing Columns H through V of the Cost/Price Template. These ceiling rates are to be based upon the highest qualified employee within a given labor category or group, working in the highest paid area within CONUS, on a highly complex requirement, excluding Secret/Top Secret/SCI.". Will the Government accept direct labor rates based upon salary survey data for similarly qualified labor categories?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We will consider it. We may not approve it, but it seems to be a reasonable basis as a matter of discussion.
380	L.6.1, Page 93	Are the "National Minimum" direct labor rates provided in Attachment (2) the 50th percentile estimates from the BLS? Likewise, are the "High State Maximum" direct labor rates the BLS 90th percentile estimates for the high state? Finally, would the Government provide offerors with a link to the BLS labor statistics cited in this section?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> All rates provided in Attachment J.2 represent BLS information. The category depends upon the level of employee. The link for the BLS information is: <a href="http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_nat.htm#17-0000">http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_nat.htm#17-0000</a>
381	C.2.1.4 (18), Page 19	Does the Government consider a prototype, pre-production, or low-rate initial production weapon system or major system to be an "existing" system with respect to Operatoin and Maintenance or Direct Support?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> This would have to be examined on an case by case basis.
382	G.2.6, Page 29	Does the Government envision the COPM and COCM as direct positions or indirect positions?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> If you mean from a billing perspective, indirect. Otherwise, we don't understand the question.
383	H.7.5, Page 50	Is there a minimum number of task awards on which an offeror must bid in order to prevent dormancy or ramp-off, or is it solely based on winning at minimum of five task order awards?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are only concerned with winning.
384	L.5.1.6.2, Page 83	If a SB concern meets more than one socioeconomic category (e.g., Company A is a WOSB, SDVOSB, and a HubZone SB), would providing that company with \$50,000 meet the requirements for all three socioeconomic categories in the example?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We do not understand the question. Please clarify.
385	L.5.4 - Past Performance (82)	From the perspective of a small business, with less than 500 employees, we find the requirement for final CPARS assessment may limit our ability to participate in this procurement as a prime contractor. Although several agencies have begun inputting past performance information relevant to our performance in CPARS, we have limited abilities to influence agency representatives to input past performance information into CPARS for all of our relevant contracts. Is there a reasonable method by which this requirement can be revised to allow for greater inclusion in the competitive procurement process for small businesses in a similar position as our firm?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions. CPARS is not required.
386	Section A, Page 8, Last Paragraph	Will the government provide all submitted questions and answers received from all offerors to all offerors?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> For the final solicitation, we will post all questions and answers to FedBizOpps.
387	Section B.2.1, Page 11, Next to Last Paragraph	States "This information will be provided to OCOs and Contractors as a hyperlink on the official GSA OASIS webpage at <a href="http://www.gsa.gov/oasis">www.gsa.gov/oasis</a> ." Offeror was unable to find this link. Please provide location of the BLS estimate information.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> It does not exist yet. We said it will be provided. We did not say it is currently provided. This is in development now.
388	B.3.6, Page 15	Can offerors apply indirect costs to Materials and Equipment in accordance with their usual accounting practices?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
389	C.2.1.3, Page 18	Would the Government clarify the difference between "Engineering Sciences" as used in this section and "Engineering Services" as used in C.2.1.4?
		<b>RESPONSE: Answer pending.</b>
390	L.5.1.7. Existing Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA) - Page Number: 79	Under Section L.5.1.7, it appears that GSA will not allow newly formed joint ventures without relevant experience, past performance, and systems, certifications, and resources, to compete for this small business set aside solicitation.  <i>What is the agency's rationale and legal basis for this restriction?</i>
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
391		Are joint ventures between an 8(a) small business and large company under the SBA Mentor Protégé Program allowed to compete for this small business set aside RFP?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
392		Post-award Teaming: Highly successful contracts like Alliant and Seaport-e make the process of adding team members (subcontractors) to the Prime's team fast and easy. In order to make OASIS attractive to potential clients in that they can get critical capabilities when needed, and to achieve the objective of Primes adding work to the OASIS contract, how will the OASIS contract simplify and streamline the process by which Primes can add team members?

		<b>RESPONSE:</b> OASIS Primes can team with whomever they want at the task order level. Please advise if you can recommend a more simplistic or streamlined approach.
393	H.3 page 39	Task Order Proposals: Highly successful contract vehicles like Alliant make the process for SOO preparation by government clients and subsequent proposal response requirements by offerors very efficient and streamlined. In order to make OASIS attractive to potential clients and to achieve the objectives of improved contracting efficiencies and responsiveness, how will the OASIS contract simplify and streamline the processes for task order submissions (such as a short response time, minimal proposal size, and minimal paperwork) and for source selection/award (such as awarding within a specified minimal time)?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We plan on providing in-depth training for OCOs as well as providing a host of templates, best practices, and other supporting products for use much like Alliant does.
394	H.6.10 page 46	Classified Task Order Proposals: Clients that want to bring classified work to a contract value a simplified DD254 process to help get their work on contract more efficiently. How will OASIS streamline the DD254 process?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are open to suggestion. Please advise.
395	L.5.3.1, page 85	This section requires offerors to provide "five distinct projects, each as a prime contractor, that have a total award value of \$5 million per year." Is this \$5 million per contract or \$5 million for the five distinct projects added together? If it is the former, this seems unduly restrictive on a multiple award task order contract, especially for the small business offerors. How many of the task orders are expected to exceed \$5 million per year? The scoring criteria in section M.5 appears to give no credit for projects that meet the \$5 million standard, only to projects that exceed \$10 million. We strongly encourage the Government to review and revise this standard, especially for the small business RFP.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
396	G.3.3.1, Page 34	ISR Reporting. "OCONUS subcontracting is not counted on ISRs." Please define OCONUS subcontracting. Does that mean a foreign subcontractor? Does the definition also include U.S. based subcontractors that would be performing OCONUS?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
397	L.5.1.6, page 80	This section discusses the requirement for the subcontracting plan. Should goals be segregated by the pools that the offeror wishes to be considered for? If an offeror is a large business in some pools and a small business in others, is the offeror allowed to specify that the goals do not apply to the pools in which the offeror is a small business?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> OASIS and OASIS SB are two separate contracts. Subcontracting plans only apply to "Other than Small" businesses on the OASIS contract.
398	A.1.2., page 9; M.2., page 95	Section A.1.2 says, in part, "The General Services Administration (GSA) is committed to assuring that maximum practicable opportunity is provided to small, HUBZone small, small disadvantaged, women-owned, veteran-owned, and service-disabled veteran owned small business concerns to participate in the performance of this contract consistent with its efficient performance."
		Section M.2 says, in part, "OASIS will consist of 6 Pools based upon size standards as identified in Section H.4.2.1. Multiple awards in each Pool will be made from the selection of the highest technically rated Offerors that have a price that has been determined fair and reasonable to the Government. The Government intends to make 40 awards in each OASIS Pool resulting from this solicitation. In the event of a tie at the position of number 40, all Offerors tied for this position shall receive a contract award. A Contractor may be eligible for award in multiple Pools under a single Contract Number."
		Since this RFP is both "unrestricted and small business," it is not clear how the Government will ensure small business participation in any of the pools. Is it 40 Full & Open awards and 40 Small Business awards in each pool and the lists of 40 highest scored offers are compiled separately (i.e. F&O awardees in one list and SB awardees in another list)?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are conducting TWO procurements: one a full and open unrestricted procurement with a stated goal of 50% Small Business subcontracting and one a 100% Small Business set aside. Each procurement will have 40 awardees in each Pool.
399	M.4.4.1 Past Performance, Page 98 and 99	On a Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR) in addition to the standard areas, a government customer may provide a rating on 'Other Areas.'Please elaborate on the scoring if additional areas are rated.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
400	L.5.4. (Volume 4 - Past Performance (1), Page Attachment 4, Page 2	"If Yes above, is it limited to 1 or 2 projects only? (Note: if NO, your offeror is ineligible for award)" If a contractor has 5 government past performances, none of which have a CPAR, can the contractor submit 5 Past Performance Rating Forms?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> If CPARS exists for a given project, we will use that. If not, we will use the rating form at Attachment J.6.
401	Section G.3.1., page 30	Does the Contract Access Fee (CAF) need to be included in the Time and Materials Labor Rates proposed?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. Treat CAF independent of all pricing.
402	Section G.3.1., page 30	Does CAF apply to travel/ODCs?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> CAF applies to total invoice amount inclusive of everything.
403	Section M.5, p. 100	Can GSA clarify the evaluation methodology--will it include narrative explanations/documenting the rationale for the points awarded under each of the criteria and sub-criteria?

		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. Offerors either have the items for points or they do not. No narrative is required. In the event an Offeror claims something that we disagree with, we will document our findings in detail.
404	L.4, Page 77 and L.5.2.1, Page 85	GSA Form 527 (Rev. 3-99) Section III - Financial Statements states "Prepared Financial Statements with notes may be provided in lieu of completing Section III." Please confirm that our most recent SEC 10-K filing will suffice to meet the requirements of Section III.
		<b>RESPONSE: Answer pending.</b>
405	L.4 Proposal Format, Volume #5, Section Reference L.5.5.6, ISO 9001:2008, Page 78 and L.5.5.6 IOS 9001:2008 Certification, Page 89	Please confirm that the proposal instructions "NTE 1 page for POC Information, page numbers and paragraph references" should also include the "distinction between which business unit or sites or geographic locations have been certified" requirement in L.5.5.6
		<b>RESPONSE: Yes.</b>
406	M.4.4.1 Past Performance, Page 98 and 99	On a Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR) individual areas are rated (Quality of Product or Service, Schedule, Cost Control, Business Relations, Management of Key Personnel, Utilization of Small Business) by the government, however a summary rating is not provided. Please elaborate on the scoring if the average CPAR score is not a whole number. For example, how many points will a contractor receive if the average CPAR rating, as calculated by GSA In L.4.4.1, is 3.5 or 4.5
		<b>RESPONSE: Please see responses to similar questions.</b>
407	Section M.2 Basis of Award, p.95	Please clarify the number of awardees. Section M.2 currently states that "The Government intends to make 40 awards in each OASIS Pooling resulting from this solicitation." This computes to at least 240 awardees. Based on comments from GSA the actual intent is to award 40 contracts, plus ties for OASIS. Please confirm our understanding and revise the RFP accordingly. Similar language regarding the 40 per pool appears throughout Section M--see, for example Section M.3.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> You are mistaken in our "intent". Some in the program "think" we will have closer to 40 awards than 240 awards. Some think we will have closer to 80. Some have other opinions. The simple truth is that absolutely nobody knows how many awards we will have and that our true intent is to award to the Top 40 Offerors within each Pool. Your guess is as good as anyone's as to how many Contractors that ends up being in total.
408	Section M.3, p. 95	This section states that once the screening process is complete, the OASIS evaluation team will assign preliminary score (in accordance with the Scoring System in Section M.5. of the OASIS solicitation) for all offers based upon the Offeror's proposal checklist. Then the OASIS evaluation team will then verify that the Top 40 Offerors (based upon score) in each OASIS Pool has successfully passed all of the Acceptability Review requirements in Section M.4. of the solicitation. Will this assignment of a preliminary score and Acceptability Review include those offerors who are tied at the position of number 40?
		<b>RESPONSE: Yes.</b>
409	Section M.4.4.1, p. 98-99	Some customers add criteria/considerations to the 6 mandatory/default criteria identified in Section M. Please confirm that GSA will only use the ratings on the 6 criteria listed in Section M and not any additional criteria/considerations added by customers agencies.
		<b>RESPONSE: We are only evaluating the criteria identified in Section M.</b>
410	Section L.5.4.3, p. 87	This section requires in part that for each of the Five (5) Relevant Experience projects submitted under Section L.5.3.2., the Offerors shall submit a copy of the Individual Summary Report (ISR) or Summary Subcontract Report (SSR) that was finalized in the eSRS system. Another requirement is that for each project that is identified as a task order awarded under an IDIQ Contract or GSA Schedule, that has been completed within the past five (5) years prior to the solicitation closing date, Offerors must submit the Final SSR related to IDIQ Contract or GSA Schedule if the task order did not have a Subcontracting Plan requirement at the task order level. Given that the SSR is an agency level report that potentially includes reporting across multiple contracts issued by the agency, isn't the ISR for the contract the more appropriate report?
		<b>RESPONSE: Yes, and that's what we want if it exists. We only want the SSR if the ISR does not exist. We will clarify the language.</b>
411	Section L.5.4.1, p. 86	Please confirm that CPAR's "preceding interim" refers to the most recent annual CPAR submitted by the customer and not the average of all the previous CPARs submitted for that task order.
		<b>RESPONSE: That is correct.</b>
412	Section L.5.4.1, p. 86	Please confirm a CPAR's performance period may not always be the most recent performance period of the task (if a customer did not complete a CPAR for the past year, however they did one in a prior year). In a previous industry meeting, the OASIS team indicated that a CPAR would be accepted if it was finalized but not uploaded into the system by the agency. Please confirm and clarify this section accordingly.
		<b>RESPONSE: That is correct.</b>

413	Section L.5.3.1, p. 85 and M.5, Scoring, p. 100	We'd like GSA to define "Involve" in the following sentence, "Involve the performance and/or integration of at least Four (4) out of the Six (6) OASIS Core Disciplines. The OASIS Core Disciplines are described in Section C and include Program Management Services, Management Consulting Services, Scientific Services, Engineering Services, Logistics Services, and Financial Management Services." For example, if a single project involves performance of four of the six core disciplines, but are through more than one task order or modification to an existing task order--will that receive credit? If not, why not?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Single task orders would count even if modified to later include other core disciplines. The rationale behind examining single requirements is that combining of task orders after the fact does not involve the level of planning and implementation that would have otherwise taken place had the entire scope of work been awarded in a single requirement.
414	Section L.5.3.1, p. 85 and M.5, Scoring, p. 100	It is our understanding that the average task order size under Alliant is significantly less than \$50 million. Since OASIS is most often compared to Alliant, it would be helpful to provide an explanation as to how the project dollar levels for evaluation credit were developed. When read together, it appears that L.5.3.1 and M.5 require each project to exceed \$50 million per year in total value, including options, in order to receive the maximum point score. Is this level relevant/consistent with potential OASIS task orders?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We aren't sure where you are getting your information, but the average value of Alliant orders is \$43 Million. There have been several Alliant orders over \$1 Billion. Accordingly, we don't think our consideration for scoring on task orders is unfounded if OASIS ends up anything similar to Alliant. If you look at everything, each of the 5 relevant experience examples would need to be over \$50M/year, all require all 6 core disciplines be performed, all have been performed in multiple locations, all include ancillary support, and at least 2 of the examples would have to have been performed OCONUS in order to receive the maximum point total. We consider these measures of complexity. We will be very surprised if we see a perfect score in relevant experience. The system is not designed for everyone to get ALL of the points. The system is designed to distinguish between Offerors.
415	Sections H.6.1 through H.6.9 and H.6.10.1, p. 42-45, 46	Please address how the Government will be managing the information submitted by companies--will it be protected as proprietary if identified as such by the submitter?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes, assuming that it is actually proprietary information.
416	Sections B.3.2 and B.3.3 p. 14 and C.4, p.21.	Please confirm whether services subject to the Service Contract Act and the Davis Bacon Act are outside the scope of OASIS. As currently structured Section B.3.2 and C.4 appear somewhat inconsistent. If such services can be included on an order, then they are within scope. Recommend clarifying the language regarding the services subject to the Service Contract Act and/or the Davis Bacon Act.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions. If you recommend the language be clarified, please provide the language.
417	Sections B.2.5.1, L.6, p.13	The Draft RFP states that in accordance with Section B.2.5.1, OASIS will only establish ceiling rates for T&M/L-H task orders/CLINs placed on a sole source basis or when adequate price competition is not anticipated, therefore, the proposed ceiling rates do not apply to fixed-price, cost-reimbursement, or T&M/LH task orders when adequate price competition is anticipated. When the provision FAR 52.216-30, Time-and-Materials/Labor-Hour Proposal Requirements--Non Commercial Item Acquisitions Without Adequate Price Competition is selected or; FAR 52.216-31, Time-and-Materials/Labor-Hour Proposal Requirements--Commercial Item Acquisition is selected and there is an exception to fair opportunity, OASIS establishes maximum allowable labor rates in the form of fully burdened ceiling rates for all professional, non-ancillary, CONUS, T&M/L-H labor for both Government and Contractor Sites. Please confirm.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct.
418	Section B.3.1, p. 14.	Please clarify the process for adding specialized professional services labor categories. Will the rational additions be based on a single contractor's experience regarding specialized professional services categories or must it involve multiple contractors experiences on various task orders? When a new specialized professional services labor category is identified for addition to the contract, we assume modifications and pricing would be negotiated separately with all OASIS contractors--please confirm. Additionally, please confirm whether specialized professional services labor categories can only be included in a task order when such services are considered ancillary support. Many specialized professional labor categories may fall within the very heart of the six core disciplines identified in Section C.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We will examine the input of specialized labor categories to see if there are trends. When it seems appropriate, we will consider adding labor categories. This would be negotiated as a bi-lateral modification with all awardees. Specialized professional services labor may be included whenever appropriate subject to the approval of the OCO.
419	Section B.3.6	Please clarify the relationship between travel costs and indirect costs. Contractors should be able to apply indirect rates to travel consistent with the contractor's accounting practices.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Contractors are to apply all costs consistent with the rules of their accounting system unless otherwise stated in an individual task order solicitation.

420	Section B.2.1, p. 11	This section identifies that OASIS provides standardized labor categories that correspond to the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) for which the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) maintains compensation data. Given that each Professional Employee Compensation Plan is required to include supporting rationale, such as recognized national and regional compensation surveys or studies of professional, public and private organizations used in establishing the total compensation structure, the BLS SOC may be in conflict with what is considered acceptable under these Compensation Plans. How will GSA evaluate/determine the acceptability of a proposed Compensation Plan? (e.g. What factors will be considered?)
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
421	G.2.6.1 Corporate OASIS SB Program Manager (COPM) and G.2.6.2 Corporate OASIS SB Contract Manager (COCM) (page 29)	Both the COPM and the COCM are required to attend ALL OASIS SB Program Management Review Meetings and other OASIS SB meetings and conferences as scheduled. Please state a number anticipated each year and whether both the COPM and COCM are required for ALL.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We have 4 planned PMRs every year. Some of those may be virtual. Beyond that, Key Personnel would need to attend any meetings regarding specific contract issues. Those meetings are not planned, but may be necessary.
422	L.5.3.1 Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements (page 80)	Please confirm that a contract agreement performed as a GSA schedule holders performing as Team Members in ANY current CTA arrangement will be considered a "prime contract" with regards to GSA OASIS relevant experience. Please note, the OASIS CTA definition is very specific. Consider removing reference to Section L.5.1.7 with regards to Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements (L.5.3.1).
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The CTA experience would count IF the same CTA is applying for an OASIS contract.
423	L.5.3.1, p. 85	Please confirm that a project for the U.S. Postal Service would be considered a project for the Federal Government for the purposes of the OASIS procurement.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
424	L.5.2.1 Financial Resources (page 80)	Solicitation states, "the offeror shall thoroughly complete and submit GSA Form 527". Please review GSA Form 527 Section VI and VII and provide confirmation whether these sections are applicable to OASIS.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We will review and edit as necessary.
425	G.2.6.1, p. 30 and M.5, p.100	Please confirm that for the COPM, experience working as a Federal employee specializing in the acquisition strategy, procurement, and operational implementation of agency-wide and multiple agency MA-IDIQ vehicles will count towards years of experience points.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
426	Q. 259 (from Clarifications Document dated 4/26/13), Government Response.	The Government's response included: <i>We are allowing for affiliates with meaningful relationships to be utilized for relevant experience, past performance, and systems. The only thing that must still be in the specific name of the Offeror are certifications.</i> Please confirm that for the purposes of determining acceptability of documentation for past performance and for systems, that systems can be in the parent company name (just like they can be in an affiliate company name) as long as there is a meaningful relationship.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct.
427	Q. 262 (from Clarifications Document dated 4/26/13), Government Response.	Please confirm that an Offeror whose accounting system was audited by EPA or NIH will receive the same number of extra points as a company whose accounting system was audited by DCAA or DCMA.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct.
428	L.5.3.2.1, p. 85; L.5.3.2.3, p. 86; and M.5, p. 100; also Questions 263, 324 and 334 from clarification document dated 4/26/13.	Please confirm that GSA will accept any official contract documentation (including monthly status reports, invoices, etc.) as proof of OCONUS work and work in multiple locations (as is the case for proving work in multiple core disciplines, per question 324).
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We shall, but those two specific items should be in the actual contract award document or solicitation. Please note that TDY assignments do not count for OCONUS or multiple location points.
429	Question 263 from clarification document dated 4/26/13.	Please confirm that an RFP would also be an acceptable contract document to use as proof of work in multiple core disciplines (as well as proof of work in multiple locations and proof of OCONUS work).
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes. But as a caution, if a solicitation was subsequently amended to delete the core disciplines, we would interpret this as submission of misleading/falsified information and disqualify the Offeror who submitted it.
430	M.4.4.1, page 98	If CPAR scores will be rounded, will a CPAR with an average of 4.8 be given more credence than a CPAR with an average score of 4.6 even though both average to a score of "5" in order to differentiate between proposals with identical Volume 4 scores?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
431	M.4.4.1, page 98	When determining past performance scoring, what is the rounding criteria used for evaluation scoring purposes? For example, is a arithmetic average score of 4.5 or above for the 6 different criteria considered a "5" for scoring purposes?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.

432	M.5 - Scoring for Volume 3, page 100	While ancillary support services for the OASIS contract are defined in the RFP, how are we to interpret the definition for ancillary support for our identified past performance? Work defined as ancillary for OASIS may have been "in scope" for a different contracts, and vice-versa. Since each contract is potentially vastly different, it's unclear whether what we consider to have been ancillary work on a contract will be concurred to and allowed by the government, thus effecting our overall evaluation score. Please advise.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Any services or products provided in support of the contract that were obviously not the intent of the contract are permissible. Offerors should use sound judgement in selecting these examples for us to validate.
433	General	Will GSA please provide a soft-copy high-resolution JPG file of the "OASIS" logo for proposal use?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We'll see what we can do.
434	M.4.4 & M.4.4.1, page 98	Is there a bounding of the CPAR performance history period? Does "all CPAR references combined" mean the entire Period of Performance, performance falling in the last five years, or some other method?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We do not understand the question. Please clarify.
435	L.5.3 & L.5.3.1, page 85	Paragraph L.5.3. VOLUME 3 – Relevant Experience, L.5.3.1. Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements states one of the minimum conditions is: "5. At least One (1) project must be for work performed under a Cost-Reimbursement contract type" Does this mean that the entire contract must be a CR- type, or that the contract must contain CR-type CLINs?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We have deleted the requirement.
436	L.5.3.1 item 3, page 85	The RFI states that in order for a contract to be relevant that it must have "a total award value of at least \$5 Million Per Year." Is this value based on a simple average or must each contract year have been valued at \$5 million or greater? For example, would a three year contract with a total value of \$21 million (average of \$7M/year) be acceptable if the funding profile has been Year 1 - \$10M, Year 2 - \$7M, and Year 3 - \$4M?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
437	L.5.3.2.3, page 86	Please clarify which supporting documents (one or all?) the customer wants (per contract). Does GSA expect to see only the document which proves work scope?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Enough to validate the core discipline being claimed.
438	Section L, Table Legend Note 1	Are images and graphics inside certification/verification/graphics/SOWs documents exempt from the 12-point Arial formatting? Many of these documents are pre-existing and will be scanned documents.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Scanned documents will be exempt. We will edit the language.
439	B.1.5, page 11	How should CAF be treated during rate build-up?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> CAF should be ignored for rate build up on the master contract.
440	B.2.3, page 12; J8 Cost/Price Template	Will GSA provide a column for FCCOM to exclude from profit calculation?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
441	G.3.3.1, page 34	At what level is the subcontract plan required? - Prime? - Task Order level?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Prime.
442	H.4.2.1, page 40	Pools - unclear as to how they will be used?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
443	J.3. (Attachment 3)	With a size standard of \$14M for the OASIS SB Pool 1, many responsible and experienced mid-tier companies will be pushed to the Unrestricted contract by default. However, the scoring criteria of the Unrestricted contract (e.g., projects exceeding \$10M, \$20M and \$50M) will prove insurmountable to these same companies. We feel size standards of the SB contract and scoring criteria of the Unrestricted contract needlessly negate the ability of mid-size (\$15M-\$100M) companies to compete in the Program Management area. While OASIS SB is geared for small companies and OASIS Unrestricted toward large companies, how does GSA envision mid-size companies will be afforded a fair opportunity to compete and obtain a position on this vehicle?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> As the heaviest weighting factor is past performance, which has no monetary association, we feel that the OASIS contracts are open to companies of all sizes. Depending on a company's status and situation, we hear pleas for consideration of ultra-small, mid-small, just-graduated-from-small, small-mid, medium-mid, upper-mid, and large-but-not-ultra-large. Simply stated, we do not know who will end up scoring what and what mix of companies will end up on the contracts other than Small Businesses on OASIS SB and Full and Open Competition on OASIS. Furthermore, we don't feel that anyone else knows what that mix will end up looking like either. We are not gearing the competition towards any "tier" or "category" of company size. We are looking for the highest technically rated companies based upon Past Performance, Relevant Experience, and Systems Certifications and Resources who offer fair and reasonable pricing. May the best companies win.
444	L.4.	Do you have specific instructions as per naming convention for the 6 folders composing the entire proposal package? For example, do you want the company name or abbreviation in the folder name similar to the file names?

		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are exploring the limitations of ITSS currently and will post very specific instructions for file/folder naming in the final solicitation.
445	L.4.	Since we cannot use a slash, please clarify the name of the folder for Volume 6. For example, should we use a space or no space between the words "Cost" and "Price?"
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are exploring the limitations of ITSS currently and will post very specific instructions for file/folder naming in the final solicitation.
446		2. Regarding Section J.5 Attachment 5 OASIS SB Relevant Experience Template, when attaching contractual and proposal documents does the Government want offerors to attach entire documents or only relevant sections as referenced in the table? For example, if we are referencing a particular subsection of the PWS should we only include that subsection or the entire PWS?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous response to this question.
447		3. Within the Q&A already released the Government has noted that the \$ value threshold for SB past performance examples will be changed from a minimum of \$2 million per year to \$750,000 per year. Given this adjustment, will the \$ value thresholds in M.5 scoring table also be modified?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes. Please see previous responses to this question.
448	L.5.2.3	Will the government allow offerors to submit PDFs of scanned images of other project documentation, such as project status reports, to demonstrate that the relevant experience project covers the core disciplines?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
449	Section I Contract Clauses, page 61	Reference FAR 52.232-99 Providing Accelerated Payment to Small Business Subcontractors (DEVIATION) (AUG 2012). Please confirm that this clause was included in error since DOD rescinded Class Deviation 2012-O0014 in February of this year.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. Please see previous response to this question.
450	Section I Contract Clauses, page 58	Reference 52.230-4 Disclosure and Consistency of Cost Accounting Practices—Foreign Concerns. Please clarify the intent of this clause since it applies to negotiated contracts with foreign concerns
		<b>RESPONSE: Answer pending.</b>
451	L.5.3.2.3. Contractual and Proposal Documents for Relevant Experience Projects, page 86	Reference identification of labor categories for relevant experience projects. Can the government please provide guidance as to how firm-fixed price projects can be compliant with this requirement? For example: most FFP contracts do not have specific labor category requirements and/or they do not require reporting at the labor category level
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The inclusion of documents and information is only to allow contractors flexibility in claiming credit for having performed core disciplines. Even for FFP, a contractor's proposal usually identifies types of labor to be implemented as part of a solution.
452	L.6.2. Indirect Rates/Profit, page 93	Reference indirect rates required according to contractors most current DCAA/DCMA approved billing rates and/or FPRA if available, in accordance with the Offeror's approved accounting system. Will GSA confirm that they will accept DCAA/DCMA forward pricing recommended rates (FPRR) in lieu of FPRA?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
453	L.5.4.1, page 86	Reference "...overall past performance evaluation was finalized in CPARS...". Can the government please confirm that "finalized" means CPARS completed and uploaded into the system? And will GSA accept <b>accept</b> electronic image copies of CPARS that have been finalized by the Government and countersigned by the contractor but which are not yet available in the PPIRS or CPARS databases in the event that there is a government delay in the process?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes and yes.
454	Section L.5.4.2 Past Performance page 87 and Section M.5 Scoring System page 100	<p>"CAUTION: At least Three (3) of Five (5) past performance projects must be work that was for the Federal Government under a contract or task order awarded by the Federal Government AND must be the past performance for the same Five (5) relevant experience projects under Section L.5.3.2." and</p> <p>"Average rating of '5 – Exceptional' on Non-Federal Projects" (100 points) and "Average rating of '5 – Exceptional' on Federal Government Projects" (200 points)</p> <p>We understand the reference to Federal Government is meant to refer to the U.S. Government. We further understand the Government's position that Federal Government projects should be awarded additional points, given the greater independence of the Federal Government's Contracting Officer and the likelihood that these evaluations would be more objective and potentially less biased.</p> <p>Will the Government allow the use of English-language Canadian federal and provincial government past performance references? Would those references be assigned the same point values as U.S. Federal Government past performance references given that the evaluations were</p>
		<b>RESPONSE: Interesting question. Answer pending.</b>

455	L.5.3, Relevant Experience and L.5.4, Past Performance and M.5	As written, the RFP requirements define Federal Government experience as being work performed for the U.S. Government. Several foreign governments manage major projects using the same or similar technical and contractual requirements as are applied to U.S. Government work.  Would GSA consider defining the "Federal Government" experience and past performance to include any Federal Government for any country and not only the United States?
<b>RESPONSE: Interesting question. Answer pending.</b>		
456	L.5.4.1 Past Performance (No Proposal Submission)	CPARS are appropriately identified as a source of information for evaluation of relevant experience. CPARS results, however, are not always written in a manner which captures the full range of relevant experience for a given program/task order.  Can you clarify how, based only on CPARS text, GSA will validate that a project meets the Core Disciplines? Would GSA change requirements such that Offerors must provide a written description of up to 2 pages in length for each relevant experience project?
<b>RESPONSE: We are not using the CPARS text to validate core discipline performance. We are using contract documents to validate core discipline performance.</b>		
457	M.4.4.1 Past Performance	The use of CPARS to evaluate past performance is understandable and a positive approach. CPARS, however, do not contain an overall performance rating. How will GSA identify and determine an overall rating to score based on CPARS content?  Similarly, once determined, if an overall score averages to a 4.5, will GSA consider that as a 5 or a 4 in the scoring system or would that have its own rating with a different point value?
<b>RESPONSE: Please see previous responses to the same or similar questions.</b>		
458	L.5.5.4. Forward Pricing Rate Agreements and/or Approved Billing Rates, page 89	Reference FPRA. If available, requires verification from DCAA/DCMA, or any Fed Civ Audit Agency of Forward Pricing Rate Agreements (FPRA) and Approved Billing that has been audited and determined acceptable. Verification requirements include a copy of the Offeror's official FPRA, Approved Billing Rates, audit report and audit report number from DCAA or DCMA or any Federal Civilian Audit Agency identifying the rates in the FPRA and Approved Billing Rates. Regulations allow the government to use either a negotiated agreement (FPRA) to document that rates are fair and reasonable or to make a unilateral determination that rates are fair and reasonable in a Forward Pricing rate Recommendation (FPRR). Will GSA accept Forward Pricing Rate Recommendations (FPRR) if an offeror does not have a FPRA?
<b>RESPONSE: Yes.</b>		
459	L.5.5.5, Approved Purchasing System, page 89	Will GSA replace "approved" purchasing system with "audited, and acceptable for..." Notable delays in DCMA reviews have resulted in a backlog of pending approvals. As a result, DCMA will determine that a firm has an acceptable purchasing system for compliance in federal subcontracting functions by stating "...pending final approval". Firms with acceptable purchasing systems should not be failed for the initial selection criteria or withheld point values (ref: M.5 Table) in the OASIS evaluation due to administrative delays in DCMA.
<b>RESPONSE: Yes, we will allow for that.</b>		
460	Questions/Answers April 19th, 2013	Reference alternative audit authorities to validate or re-certify accounting systems. Will the government please confirm/acknowledge that the government has agreed to amend this language and allow for third-party audit and approval of systems. We want to confirm that this change will be for both the OASIS Full and Open and SB competitions.
<b>RESPONSE: That is correct.</b>		
461	L.5.4 Past Performance, page 86	Reference Past Performance Volume 4 CPARS. Given that Contractors do not have control over when the government officials upload evaluations to the CPARS system (which would then report in PPIRS). Will the government allow offerors to submit electronic copies of finalized CPARS that have not yet been loaded into the system by government staff?
<b>RESPONSE: Yes.</b>		
462	L.5.1.6.Subcontracting Plan, page 80	Reference subcontracting plans. It appears that a sentence fragment is missing in the following. "GSA strongly encourages Offerors to submit and Individual Plan for OASIS." Please confirm how the sentence is supposed to read.
<b>RESPONSE: The sentence should read, ""GSA strongly encourages Offerors to submit an Individual Plan for OASIS."</b>		
463	B.3 Ancillary Support, page 13	Reference ancillary support, products and services. Ancillary support, products and services appears to be used interchangeably throughout the solicitation and supporting attachments. Can the government please confirm that ancillary products and services are subordinate to ancillary support, which is defined in B.3?
<b>RESPONSE: That is correct.</b>		
464	White Papers due May 1st.	Reference White Papers due May 1st. There appears to be significant overlap between the RFI responses and the White Papers. Can the government please confirm what unique topics should be addressed in the White Papers?
<b>RESPONSE: Please see the blog at: <a href="https://interact.gsa.gov/blog/white-papers-industry-one-one-sessions-due-may-1">https://interact.gsa.gov/blog/white-papers-industry-one-one-sessions-due-may-1</a></b>		

465	M.5 Scoring System, Volume 4 - Past Performance. (Page 100)	The evaluation scoring is based on an average CPARS rating of "4 - very good" and "5 - exceptional." It is highly unlikely for a contractor to receive an average score of 5; this requires all 5 across the board. Will GSA allow a rounding of scores in determining whether a CPARS rating is scored as very good or exceptional (i.e., rounding from x.5 and up for the next highest score)?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see the previous responses to this question.
466	E.1 Inspection and Acceptance (Page 22)	Clause E.1 includes only FAR 52.246-4, Inspection of Services - Fixed Price. While the Task Order will invoke the required Inspection clause, does Clause E.1 also need to include inspection clauses for other contract types?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Not for the master OASIS contracts, no.
467	F.3 Period of Performance Term (Page 23)	Clause F.3 states that the cumulative term of the contract may extend to 10 years however Provision L.6 requires 15 years of rates and clause B.2.5.1 also shows a 15 year period of performance. Please clarify.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see the previous responses to this question.
468	Section L.5.5.3 Acceptable Estimating System and PSC OASIS Working Group Comments (Page 88)	Will offerors with approved estimating systems that are out of cycle and no longer valid, that is that have not been audited by DCMA/DCAA within the last four years, receive a partial or no score for this element?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No score.
469		Do the same pools exist for small and large companies? Once a company wins a seat on the vehicle are they allowed to bid on any and all core disciplines that task orders are listed under?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes, the same Pools exist on OASIS and OASIS SB. Winners within each Pool are allowed to compete for all work competed within that Pool only.
470		When you say that 40 companies will be on this vehicle is it safe to assume that is a mix of small and large businesses, not 40 for Small and 40 for the unrestricted portion? Do you plan to award an even number for each small and large?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses related to these questions.
471	Section H-2, Observance of Federal Holidays, Page 38	The section states "The Contractor shall observe Federal holidays and other days identified in this section unless otherwise indicated in individual task orders." Are there any other requirements outlined within the solicitation that could be superseded by individual task-order requirements?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
472	Section L-3 Instructions, Page 75	Would the failure to register within the AAS Business Systems Portal at least one month prior to proposal document submissions bar potential offerors from bidding on contracts?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
473	Section L.4 Proposal Format, Page 76	Note 1 to the table legend states that all pages must be of 12-point Arial Font. Is there an exception for tables/graphics within the proposal for smaller font and/or a different font style?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are considering something of this nature.
474	L.5.1.7 Existing Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA), if applicable, Page 79	Requirement 4 states that "The existing CTA represents all Relevant Experience and Past Performance projects submitted under this solicitation." Does this mean that any and all Past Performance information submitted within a proposal response must only pertain to those engagements in which the prime/sub are team members actively engaged on those contracts? In other words, past performance submissions must not include prior engagements on which the team members worked separately and nonaffiliated?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct.
475	L.5.4.1 Past Performance (No Proposal Submission) Page 82	The requirement indicates that "For each of the Five (5) Relevant Experience projects submitted under Section L.5.3.1, the Government will retrieve [...] CPARS, therefore, no proposal submission is necessary." Does this requirement indicate that for any past performance information detailed within attachment J.5 is located within the CPARS system, then no additional past performance rating documentation for these references is required within an offeror's proposal? Can an offeror supplement any past performance, even if relevant rating information is located within CPARS, with Attachment 6 (Past Performance Rating Form), if the offeror feels this will provide a clearer picture of the quality of services provided?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We will use CPARS if it is present. If present, do not submit additional material.
476	Section L.6 Cost/Price, Page 87	The section describes the labor categories and the corresponding education/experience criteria are defined. Does the government take into consideration various professional certifications, i.e., Certified Public Accountant (CPA) or Project Management Professional (PMP) in lieu of potential contract resources possessing graduate-level degrees?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. If you have specific recommendations, please let us know.
477	Section L.6.2 Indirect Rates/Profit, Page 88	The section states that the profit rate is "TBD." How and under what criteria does the government intend on determining an acceptable profit rate? How does the government intend to determine what constitutes "clear and convincing" rationale to support an Offeror's profit rate that exceeds that rate established by the government?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses related to these questions.

478	Section M.4.1.5 Uncompensated Overtime Policy, Page 92	The section states that this will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis and references requirements L.5.1.5, which states that "The Offeror shall submit their policy for addressing uncompensated overtime consistent with its cost accounting practices used to accumulate and report uncompensated overtime hours." Does the mere submission of said policy satisfy the pass/fail requirement? <b>RESPONSE: Answer pending.</b>
479	Section M.4.4.1., Past Performance, Page 93	The section states that "Offerors are strongly cautioned that inability of the Government to contact references, verify information, or receive responses to surveys may result in ineligibility for award (emphasis added)." There are many requirements outlined within sections H, L, and M of the solicitation with a "may" designation. Is there certain mitigating criteria considered by the government in making the ultimate determination regarding these requirements? Even if the government does not have specific criteria, a statement of what can be considered would prove helpful to offerors. <b>RESPONSE: We will examine every instance and make a determination accordingly.</b>
480	SECTION J.8., ATTACHMENT (8) - COST/PRICE TEMPLATE; Row 9, Tab Gov Site	Attachment J.8 includes a "C" (Contractor site) designator for the Junior Actuary category at the Government site. Suggest the entry in cell A9 on the Gov Site tab be changed to "1G." <b>RESPONSE: Thank you for the edit.</b>
481	Section J.2., Attachment (2), pg. 2	Attachment J.2 provides BLS direct labor rate ranges for the 70 labor categories defined in Attachment J.1. In most cases, there is a reasonable spread between the National Minimum rate and the High State Maximum rate. An exception is category 46, Sr. Engineer-Group 4, where the minimum and maximum rates are the same at \$56.89. Please confirm that these rates are correct. <b>RESPONSE: That is an error. Thank you for bringing it to our attention. The DoL recently released their annual update, so we will be updating all of that information soon.</b>
482	H.12. DORMANT STATUS, pg. 54	The draft RFP states, "If the OASIS CO is not satisfied with the response, the OCO will issue a final decision, in writing, placing the Contractor in a Dormant Status." Is the term "OCO" incorrect as stated? Should term OCO be replaced with OASIS CO? <b>RESPONSE: Yes.</b>
483	L.5.3.1, pg. 85	Please provide a definition of a "distinct project" <b>RESPONSE: Please see previous response to this question.</b>
484	L.5.4, pg.86	We have heard that task orders on "IT" contracts such as Eagle and Alliant can not be included as past experiences even if their scope is directly relevant to one of the core disciplines. Is this true? <b>RESPONSE: That is correct.</b>
485	M 4.2, pg. 98	How will the information in FAPIIS be used in the evaluation process? <b>RESPONSE: In making responsibility determinations.</b>
486	M.5, pg. 100	It is unclear what the definition of "multiple locations" is. Is work on Government site and on Contractor site constitute multiple locations? Does work in two buildings in the same city or locale (e.g., greater Washington DC) constitute multiple locations? <b>RESPONSE: Please see previous response to this question.</b>
487	Section L.5.3.1, pg. 85	Despite answers to the two sets of Q&A responses, we believe it is still unclear how total award value is to be calculated. In particular, we are unclear if this value is the total award value of contract on the date of award divided by the length of the contract in years, or the total amount of the contract funded to date divided by the duration of the contract to date in years? Admittedly, for contracts that have been completed, these two answers would be the same. However, for contracts in progress, these two definitions would produce significantly different results. <b>RESPONSE: For completed years, use the obligated amount. For years in progress or future years, use the total award value.</b>
488	L.5.3, pg.85-86	We recommend that the Government add wording barring the use of contracts whose primary purpose is software development or hardware development/systems integration. <b>RESPONSE: Thanks for the recommendation. We will take it under consideration.</b>
489	M.5, pg. 100	Bidders receive credit for meeting or exceeding various small business goals. If a contract/task had no small business goal, would the bidder automatically receive full credit? If not, would this discriminate against those bidders who shared a large portion of work with small businesses but did not have a specific goal? <b>RESPONSE: If there are no goals, then no points will be provided.</b>
490	M.5, pg. 100	Under Past Performance, the point total allocated to SB categories seems excessive relative to the points provided by other items. The Yes/No nature of these goals is problematic. Some of the SB categories will have a higher goal than others. Also, no consideration is given to how much a company misses the goal by. A company could hit a 2% goal on one category and miss a goal of 5% on another category by 1 point yet have a higher absolute percentage <b>RESPONSE: We've tried to keep the evaluation strategy very straightforward and as yes/no as possible. If you have a specific recommendation for changing this area, please let us know.</b>
491	Section L5.1.6, pg. 80	The company has an approved subcontracting master plan and normally submits the master plan with and individual plan where the individual plan is specifically tailored to the solicitation. Is it permissible to submit the master plan with the individual plan and reference the master plan in the individual plan? If so can the page limit be doubled?

		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes, and we will increase or eliminate the page limit as well as edit the solicitation language.
492	H.4.2 , pg. 40	The criteria by which the OCO will assign a task order to a SB pool are unclear. Will it simply be the desired size of the companies that the agency wishes to see in the competition or is the type of work implied for the NAICS codes. For example, would Pool 6 be selected because the OCO's agency wants SB companies under 1500 or because the work involves providing professional services to Aircraft systems? Or stated another way, can Pool 6 be used to provide professional services to non-aircraft systems?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Thank you for the question. We hope the answer will clear up some apparent confusion. The process is actually very simple. A task order requirement often contains elements from many different NAICS codes. An OCO will examine their requirement and select the NAICS code that represents the greatest percentage of anticipated cost/price for that particular requirement. The NAICS code selected has a size standard associated with it. That size standard determines which OASIS Pool the requirement is competed in. OCOs cannot arbitrarily select a size standard or NAICS code for their requirement. The selected NAICS code must represent the greatest percentage of anticipated cost/price for that particular requirement. The size standard is simply a by-product of the NAICS code selection.
493	L.5.4 , page 81	If a subcontractor performs most of the work in one of the core disciplines, but the small business prime contractor is still ultimately the responsible entity, is the correct interpretation that the government will allow that small business prime to cite the past performance including the core discipline?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
494	L.5.5.1 and .3, pages 82-83	For small businesses, particularly those proposing in Pool 1, it is unlikely that many companies will have an "acceptable" estimating system as defined. It is our understanding that "if available" means that the requirement is not mandatory for an award. Is that correct?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct.
495	L.5.4.2, page 82	The contractor would like to site as a past performance example a long running contract for engineering support that has been provided to a major prime contractor. This experience is critical to addressing one of the core disciplines. Is it acceptable to show this contract reference experience even though it was not as a direct government contract award, but as a subcontractor to a major government prime?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
496	L.5.5.11.2, page 86	Is it the governments intent that the resumes of the designated Contracts Manager and Program Manager for the OASIS effort be current employees already working for the contractor, or could they be candidates to be brought onboard after contract award?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We expect that proposed key personnel be employees of the Offeror at the time of proposal submission.
497	M.5. Scoring System, page 95 Section L.5.5.5. VOLUME 5 - SYSTEMS, CERTIFICATIONS, AND RESOURCES	Can you share with us why your clients believe that an Approved Purchasing System for Services contracts (what OASIS is about) is so important to them for OASIS? In theory, material purchases on Services contracts should constitute a minor percentage of the cost of each task, if there are any of these costs at all. Given that belief, we feel that the points for this system are out of proportion to the frequency of its importance on OASIS tasks, and respectfully request that you consider reducing the points awarded for this element.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> This applies to subcontracts for services as well as materials. There is an entire Section of the FAR dedicated to subcontracting. If anything, the OASIS contracting team is more concerned that the point allowance for purchasing systems is too low as opposed to too high.
498	Numerous questions in oasis_q_and_a_april_26_recom mendations	There are numerous questions throughout the "oasis_q_and_a_april_26_recommendations", recommending a change to the requirement for SBs to have five projects of \$2M/year or more. The Government's response in the most recent answers is, "RESPONSE: We have revised the minimum requirements. Please see the changes blog." We have searched the blog but see no cited changes to the requirements for minimum project size. Would you please clarify the location of the posting?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> <a href="https://interact.gsa.gov/blog/changes-oasis-sb-draft-solicitation">https://interact.gsa.gov/blog/changes-oasis-sb-draft-solicitation</a>
499	Attachment 8	Please add space to provide labor rates for personnel working OCONUS or who have Secret, TS, or TS-SCI clearances, which typically warrant a rate premium.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The ceiling rates may be exceeded for OCONUS and/or classified requirements.
500	M.5, page 95; H.6.2, page 43; L.5.5.3, page 83	Please clarify whether there is a difference between an "acceptable estimating system" and an "approved estimating system." It can be construed that the former meets the criteria of Clause H.6.2 without having been formally approved by DCMA.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Estimating systems must be approved by a cognizant audit agency.
501	B.2 Task Order Pricing, page 11-13	Please confirm that Offerors are to follow their disclosed practices when pricing Task Orders.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We aren't sure we understand this question. Please expound.
502	B.2.1. Labor Categories and Standard Occupational Classifications, page 11; L.6. Volume 6 - Cost/Price, page 92	Please confirm that the following two applications of the Standard Occupational Classifications (SOC) are correct in accordance with Draft RFP Sections B.2.1. and L.6. SOC rates will be solely applied to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Master contract for the sole purpose of validating rate card ceilings</li> <li>• Task orders that have been deemed to not have adequate competition</li> </ul>

		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The SOCs apply to all description of labor regardless of contract type. The ceiling rates to be provided apply to task orders that have been deemed to not have adequate competition.
503	B.2.5.1. Ceiling Rates for T&M and L-H Task Orders, page 13	To ensure uniformity across OASIS contractors, please confirm that the Government will calculate the Economic Cost Adjustments as necessary during Contract Years 5 through 15 and will provide the Adjustment values to all OASIS prime contractors.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct.
504	F.4.2. Compliance (Table Item G.3.5), page 26	Please confirm that the task order close-out process will be initiated by the OCO via email notification to the contractor. In addition, please confirm that the 60 calendar-day response time starts on the date of the close-out email from the OCO or when final costs are determined in the case of Cost-Plus orders.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are editing the language of this section.
505	H.6. Systems, Compliances, and Certification, pages 42-44	We are requesting a clarification to GSA's April 19, 2013 posting to Interact. A company may have multiple U.S. legal entities under a single parent company that are subsidiaries, affiliates, or divisions of a single parent company. However, one of the legal entities may be a shared-services company that provides systems, compliances, and certifications across all of the parent company's U.S. national firms. Please confirm that it is acceptable to submit a commitment letter - including identification of the prime contractor for OASIS, the definition of "meaningful relationship", and an itemization of resources devoted to OASIS -- on the letterhead of the shared-services company. This arrangement for shared services is a common business practice that has been recognized as acceptable and compliant by cognizant Federal authorities (DCAA, DCMA).
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We have done this for systems and relevant experience. We are exploring the issue of certifications.
506	I.2. OASIS CLAUSES, Clause 52.203-16 Preventing Personal Conflict of Interest, page 57	Please confirm that the subject clause only applies to individual task orders that will be providing "Acquisition functions closely associated with inherently governmental functions" as defined in 52.203-16 and that it does not apply to all task orders under the IDIQ.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The clause applies to task orders when: (1) The task order exceeds the simplified acquisition threshold; and  (2) Include a requirement for services by contractor employee(s) that involve performance of acquisition functions closely associated with inherently governmental functions for, or on behalf of, a Federal agency or department.
507	L.3. INSTRUCTIONS, page 76	The instructions state, "Offerors are prohibited from modifying, in any way, shape, or form, any documents, printed or electronic, associated with this solicitation and any amendment(s) thereto." Can you please provide guidance on where we should include the standard non-disclosure statement in the electronic documents for proposal submission? Also, please specify that the inclusion of the standard non-disclosure footer on individual pages doesn't violate the prohibition against modifying solicitation documents.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We will edit the language to correct this.
508	L.3. INSTRUCTIONS, page 76	"Offerors are prohibited from modifying, in any way, shape, or form, any documents, printed or electronic, associated with this solicitation and any amendment(s) thereto." Are company logos required/desired at the top of proposal submission pages, including the forms in Section J of the Draft RFP?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Logos are neither required nor forbidden.
509	L.5.3.2.2. Relevant Experience Matrix, page 85; L.5.3.2.3. Contractual and Proposal Documents for Relevant Experience Projects; J.5., Attachment 5, C. Attach Contractual and Proposal Documents, page 2	Are contract deliverables admissible as "Contractual and Proposal Documents"?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
510	L.5.5.4. Forward Pricing Rate Agreements and/or Approved Billing Rates, page 89	The process for submission and approval of Forward Pricing Rates/Approved Billing Rates is cyclical and not a stand-alone event. The timing of OASIS proposal submissions may be such that the Forward Pricing Rate Proposal has been submitted to DCAA, but DCAA has not yet responded with a Forward Pricing Rate Recommendation or granted the Forward Pricing Rate Agreement. Please confirm that submission of a Forward Pricing Rate Proposal is sufficient and will be treated in the same manner as an Forward Pricing Rate Agreement.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We want Offerors to submit the most recent Forward Rate documentation available as of time of proposal submission.
511	M.4.1.4. Professional Employee Compensation Plan, page 97	The requirements in Section M.4.1.4. for the Professional Compensation Plan state that proposed salaries for the professional labor categories will be evaluated and that the compensation levels must be substantiated. In Section L.6.1., offerors are encouraged to propose direct labor rates that are within the ranges provided in Attachment J.2., "Direct Labor Rate Ranges."  Please confirm that additional substantiation is not needed if an offeror proposes direct labor rates that are within the ranges specified in Attachment J.2.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct.

512	Section L.5.3.1 #1 and #2 Relevant Experience, page 85; and, Section C.2.1.1 Program Management Services, page 17	The relevant experience requirements state that the primary scope of work for each past performance must be one of the 6 OASIS disciplines and involve the performance and/or integration of at least 4 of the 6 OASIS disciplines. In order to count the Section C.2.1.1. Program Management Services discipline for each project, can the project management services be performed to support the contract that the Offeror has with the Government, or is this a discrete set of services provided to the Government for other projects? <b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to this question.
513	B.2.1, p. 11	This section identifies that OASIS provides standardized labor categories that correspond to the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) for which the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) maintains compensation data. Given that each Contractor's Professional Employee Compensation Plan is required to include supporting rationale, such as recognized national and regional compensation surveys or studies of professional, public and private organizations, used in establishing the total compensation structure, the BLS SOC may be in conflict with what is considered acceptable under these Compensation Plans. Because this is a Pass/Fail criteria, will Contractors fail because the SOC is not referenced in the Professional Employee Compensation plans? <b>RESPONSE:</b> No. The SOC does not have to be mentioned. The Professional Employee Compensation Plan is an overall compensation analysis that considers fringe benefits, direct labor, and other concerns to ensure a stable work force for contract performance. While this is more applicable to a single award contract, it is still required by regulation for our OASIS contracts.
514	B.2.5.1, p. 13	This section states in part that if the average index in Year 5 is equal to or below the average index at time of award, the ceiling rates will remain unchanged. This same statement is made for what would occur at Year 10. Please confirm that should the average index be equal to or below the average index at those times that the rates would still include the escalation factor being utilized in Attachment J.8. <b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct.
515	B.2.5.1, p. 13, L.6, p. 92	The Draft RFP states that in accordance with Section B.2.5.1, OASIS will only establish ceiling rates for T&M/L-H task orders/CLINs placed on a sole source basis or when adequate price competition is not anticipated; therefore, the proposed ceiling rates do not apply to fixed-price, cost-reimbursement, or T&M/LH task orders when adequate price competition is anticipated. When the provision FAR 52.216-30, Time-and-Materials/Labor-Hour Proposal Requirements--Non Commercial Item Acquisitions Without Adequate Price Competition is selected or; FAR 52.216-31, Time-and-Materials/Labor-Hour Proposal Requirements--Commercial Item Acquisition is selected and there is an exception to fair opportunity, OASIS establishes maximum allowable labor rates in the form of fully burdened ceiling rates for all professional, non-ancillary, CONUS, T&M/L-H labor for both Government and Contractor Sites. The two FAR clauses which are referenced in these excerpts require either separate fixed hourly rates for each category of labor to be performed by (1) The offeror; (2) Each subcontractor; and (3) Each division, subsidiary, or affiliate of the offeror under a common control (FAR 52.216-30), or that the offeror specify whether the fixed hourly rate for each labor category applies to labor performed by (1) the offeror; (2) Subcontractors; and/or (3) Divisions, subsidiaries, or affiliates of the offeror under a common control. (FAR 52.216-31). <b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct.
516	B.3. p. 13; C.3, p. 20-21; M.5, p. 100	This paragraph identifies Subcontractors as considered ancillary support for tasking in addition to travel, materials, equipment. Are Subcontractors considered ancillary support for purposes of C.3, and is the use of subcontractors scored as part of the evaluation factor for use as Relevant Experience/ Projects including Ancillary Support? <b>RESPONSE:</b> Subcontractors who perform core discipline work for which there are OASIS labor categories are NOT considered ancillary. Subcontractors who perform non-core discipline work for which there are not OASIS labor categories ARE considered ancillary. Ancillary support, as it applies to services, refers to the type of work performed, not who it was performed by. If a prime proposes non-professional services not covered by OASIS labor categories to be performed by the prime, that is still ancillary support even though the prime is providing the services.
517	B.3.1, p. 14	(1) This section states that if the use of specialized professional services labor becomes frequent, additional labor categories and their associated ceiling rates may be added by bi-lateral modification to OASIS. Please confirm that this modification would be issued to all OASIS prime contractors and that each would be able to price their own associated ceiling rates. (2) This section states that the Contractor may propose specialized professional services labor when proposing ancillary support. It would seem that task order level solutions might require one, the other, or both, but not that specialized professional services would only be necessary when ancillary support is also part of the solution. Please clarify. <b>RESPONSE:</b> For question number 1, you are correct. For question number 2, we will clarify the language. The point is that Offerors may provide specialized professional services and/or ancillary support services at the task order level.

518	B.3.2, p. 14; B.3.3, p. 14; C.4, p. 21	<p>Those services identified as not being in scope at section C.4 include a requirement that primarily uses employees not employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity as defined in 29 CFR Part 541 and/or employees primarily employed as labor or mechanics as defined in FAR Subpart 22.401.</p> <p>Per FAR, the Service Contract Act (SCA) applies to all Government contracts, the principal purpose of which is to furnish services in the United States through the use of service employees, while the Davis-Bacon Act (DBA) provides that contracts in excess of \$2,000 to which the United States or the District of Columbia is a party for construction, alteration, or repair (including painting and decorating) of public buildings or public works within the United States, shall contain a clause (see 52.222-6) that no laborer or mechanic employed directly upon the site of the work shall receive less than the prevailing wage rates as determined by the Secretary of Labor.</p> <p>In light of the scope restriction at section C.4 how could any task order be subject to SCA or DBA and not be considered out of scope of the contract?</p>
		<p><b>RESPONSE:</b> Please read Section C.4 very carefully. The section introduction states with emphasis: <i>"The OCO shall not issue a task order and a Contractor shall not accept or perform work for the following services when the <b>primary</b> task order scope of work is..."</i> Accordingly, SCA and/or DBA would not be considered out of scope if not the primary task order scope of work.</p>
519	L.5.4.3 p. 87	<p>(1) The ISR is the Individual <u>Subcontracting</u> Report and not the Individual <u>Summary</u> Report as indicated. (2) This section requires in part that for each of the Five (5) Relevant Experience projects submitted under Section L.5.3.2., the Offerors shall submit a copy of the Individual ISR) or SSR that was finalized in the eSRS system. Another requirement is that for each project that is identified as a task order awarded under an IDIQ Contract or GSA Schedule, and has been completed within the past five (5) years prior to the solicitation closing date, Offerors must submit the Final SSR related to IDIQ Contract or GSA Schedule if the task order did not have a Subcontracting Plan requirement at the task order level. Given that the SSR is an agency level report that potentially includes reporting across multiple contracts issued by the agency, is the ISR for the contract vehicle under which the task order was placed the desired report as it would more closely relate to achievement of goals for the task order?</p>
		<p><b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes. We are editing the language in this area.</p>
520	L.5.4.3 p. 87	<p>This section states that if any of the relevant experience projects are Non-Federal projects, Socio-economic past performance will not be considered. Please confirm that "Non-Federal" does not include those projects where the Offeror is a subcontractor and has a Small Business Subcontracting Plan with ISR/SSR reporting requirements.</p>
		<p><b>RESPONSE:</b> Subcontracting examples are not eligible, so we are not sure what your request is asking for. Please rephrase.</p>
521	M.5, p. 100	<p>Please clarify what is meant by projects performed at multiple locations. Is this different states, different zip codes, or some other geographic definition? We would recommend that at least one program have relevant experience in at least 2 different states or regions since this results in another level of complexity of the kind inherent in OASIS customers. Having staff at Government site and Contractor site, for example, should not be considered comparable.</p>
		<p><b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to this question.</p>
522	Page 15, Section B, paragraph B.3.6, Materials and Equipment	<p>Will the contractor be allowed to apply indirect costs (e.g., overhead, G&amp;A) to the Material and/or Equipment costs?</p>
		<p><b>RESPONSE:</b> Contractors will be required to follow the rules of their accounting systems.</p>
523	Page 16, Section C., paragraph C.2., Scope	<p>Given the statement "...OASOS SB may be used to support and/or improve an organization's Program Management, Management Consulting, Engineering, Scientific, Logistics and Financial Disciplines...", is it accurate to describe the professional services in support of the disciplines cited herein to be considered as "Advisory and Assistance Services" as referred to in FAR Subpart 37.2 as opposed to non-personal services?</p>
		<p><b>RESPONSE:</b> No. Advisory and assistance services are a subset of the services to be provided on the OASIS contracts.</p>
524	Page 43, Section H., paragraph H.6.2., Acceptable Estimating System	<p>Please confirm that offerors not in possession of an acceptable estimating system would not have their proposals rejected?</p>
		<p><b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct. This is optional, not mandatory.</p>
525	Page 44, Section H., paragraph H.6.5., Approved Purchasing System	<p>Please confirm that offerors not in possession of an approved purchasing system would not have their proposals rejected?</p>
		<p><b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct. This is optional, not mandatory.</p>
526	Page 61, Section I., paragraph I.4.2, Ordering	<p>Are all Warranted U.S. Federal Contracting Officers authorized to issue delivery orders against the forthcoming Oasis contract?</p>
		<p><b>RESPONSE:</b> If they receive a delegation of procurement authority from the OASIS Program Office, yes.</p>

527	Pages 80 & 81, Section L., paragraph L.5.3.1, Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements & paragraph M.5., Scoring System Table	In paragraph L.5.3.1, please expand on the term "Five (5) distinct projects". In the table under M.5, Scoring System, Section L.5.3.1, are the dollar amounts shown in the column heading "Element" dollar amounts per project or does it represent the dollar amounts in total (cumulative of all 5 Potential Occurrences). Also, can an offeror consolidate individual projects/task orders that are similar in scope and client into 1 project? In the M.5., Scoring System table it states "including options". In the scenario where our client issues one year task orders that do not vary in scope, geography and client, can the award of 5 successive 1 year individual task orders be depicted by the offeror as options with respect to meeting or exceeding the dollar thresholds?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Each project is to be identified separately. Consolidation is not allowed. Subsequent task orders are not options.
528	Page 86, Section L, paragraph L.5.5.11.2., Corporate OASIS SB Contract Manager	In the paragraph, the RFP cited 4 NCMA Certifications. For prior U.S. Civil Service GS-1102 employees who possess a USAF Acquisition Professional Development Program (APDP) Level II Certification, can the APDP certification meet or exceed or be substituted for the 4 NCMA Certifications shown in the paragraph?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We will clarify the language in this area. Please see previous responses to the same or similar questions.
529	G.3.5, Page 36	60 days to close-out a cost reimbursable type effort would not be possible since final DCAA audited indirect rates would not be available at that time. Should this read 60 day for LH and FP, and consistent with the Allowable Costs and Payments clause 52.216-7, within 120 days (or longer period if approved in writing by the Contracting Officer) after settlement of the final annual indirect cost rates for all years of a physically complete order for Cost reimbursable or T&M efforts with indirect rates applied to ODCs, unless a quick closeout is negotiated?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are editing the language of this section.
530	J.3, Attachment 3, Page 2	Is there anything that precludes an offeror from proposing in all six Unrestricted OASIS Pools?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
531	L.2..3, page 74; L.5.1.2, Page 79	Are there any additional requirements associated with proposing in more than one or all six Unrestricted OASIS Pools?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
532	M.2, page 79; M.3, Page 95	Are there any additional evaluation criteria associated with proposing in more than one or all six Unrestricted OASIS Pools?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
533	L.5.3.1. Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements	Due to funding limitations, some federal agencies have resorted to issuing multiple single award task orders through a GSA schedule to fulfill needs on long-term programmatic projects. If an offeror can demonstrate that, through multiple task orders, they have provided the same scope of services to the same client for a multi-year period on a project with a total award value of at least \$5 million per year, will GSA consider the project as meeting the requirements stated in Section L.5.3.1?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to the same or similar questions.
534	L.5.3.1. Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements	In some circumstances, BPA contractual requirements prohibit issuance of task orders over a certain dollar threshold. For continuity of effort, contracting officers may issue multiple task orders for the same services for the same client on a multi-service integrated project successively as the threshold is reached. In instances where this threshold is below \$5 million, can offerors combine multiple BPA task orders for the same services to the same agency client to meet the \$5 million per year minimum requirement indicated in L.5.3.1?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to the same or similar questions.
535	L.5.3.1. Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements	GSA has issued, and GAO has favorably addressed, "no cost" contracts for a variety of service requirements that integrate multiple professional service disciplines. While award amounts stated for these contracts are minimal and meant only to be applied to the GSA's own administrative activity, the compensation received by Contractors from third parties is only limited by a maximum amount, in at least one case exceeding \$100 million. Will GSA consider such programs as meeting the requirement for award value of at least \$5 million per year if a contractor can demonstrate receipt of payment of at least this amount under a "no cost" contract?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We will research this and take it under consideration.
536	H.4.2 and L.5.1.2	H.4.2 states: "Section C defines the scope of work under which task orders can be solicited under OASIS SB. NAICS codes only define the business size standard for an individual task order solicitation." Do we also have to have applicable pool NAICS codes listed in our SAM registration to be eligible for a given pool? Or if we meet the size standards can we automatically apply for any pool even if we don't use any of the listed NAICS codes in SAM?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The codes your company has listed in SAM are irrelevant for the purposes of applying for an OASIS or OASIS SB contract.
537	G.3.1 Contract Access Fee (CAF)	The CAF % is listed as "TBD". When will this be determined? This information will be important to our clients and their decision to use this vehicle.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The CAF issue has to be approved by the highest levels of GSA Management. We hope to announce the OASIS CAF structure soon.

538	H.7.5 Minimum Task Order Awards	To avoid being considered "dormant" or off-ramped, OASIS awardees are required to win award of at least 3 task orders prior to the exercise of Option 1. If there are 40 awardees in a pool, and each company wins only 3 awards each, this suggests there will be a minimum of 120 task orders issued under each pool within this period -- and that is true if each awardee wins only 3 task orders. Our decision to invest in a proposal for OASIS depends somewhat on confidence that the vehicle will be valuable to us over the long-term. Therefore, we need to be confident that OASIS will be used for a sufficient number of task orders. How many task orders are anticipated to be competed through OASIS 0-12 months, 12-24 months, 24-36 months, 36-48 months, and 48-60 months following GWAC award?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please note that OASIS is not a GWAC. OASIS has no previous contract to draw information from. Accordingly, we cannot tell you, with any degree of confidence, how many task orders will be placed on the OASIS contracts. We know that we have a tremendous amount of interest in the contracts and that many clients are excited and waiting for the contracts to be awarded. We can also tell you, as it states in the solicitation, that Dormant Status will only be imposed after careful consideration of the situation and collaboration with the Contractor to resolve the issues. But overall, we feel the OASIS contracts will be extremely successful and well utilized. Offerors will have to make their own assessments as to OASIS' long term value.
539	C.2.1.3 page 18	Does Environmental Services include Geospatial Solutions?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please define geospatial solutions.
540	Section L.5.1.6 Subcontracting Plan Page 80	Can Small Disadvantaged Businesses be exempted from this requirement?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Subcontracting plans do not apply to Small Businesses.
541	Section L.5.5 Systems Certifications & Resources	Instead of mandating the audit report requirement, can small businesses not yet audited be excepted
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to this question and others like it.
542	C.4. SERVICES NOT IN SCOPE	Can OCO issue a task order that has Program Management Services (Core Discipline) and Information Technology Ancillary Support Services?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes, so long as the ancillary support services are integral and necessary.
543	Section M.5.5 Certification Scoring	In the scoring for section L.5.5 the Government provides scoring based on CMMI, ISO 9001, ASI9100 and ANSI/EIA Standard-748. This scoring is applied across all NAICS pools. The cost of obtaining and maintaining CMMI, ISO 9001, ASI9100, and ANSI/EIA will run into the millions of dollars. Does the Government feel it is fair and realistic to have a scoring requirement for a company with annual revenues of \$14M, \$19.5M, and \$35.5M as scoring standards used on pools with 1,500 employees?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes, we do. We know that there are many small businesses in these size standards who already have these certifications.
544	H.4.2.1	Can offerors pursue NAICS codes not specifically listed in this section, but that fall within the same size standards?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Offerors may pursue any requirement that is competed in their pools. If you feel there needs to be additional NAICS codes added to the contract, please let us know.
545	H.4.2.1	Can an offeror propose a NAICS not on the list provided by GSA?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Offerors do not propose NAICS codes on task orders. If you are asking if you can suggest that we add additional NAICS codes to OASIS, then the answer is yes, please provide recommendations.
546	G.3.1	What is the expected CAF for this program?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> To be determined.
547	Misc.	Will the government explain how the OASIS program will interact with other existing schedules such as Alliant or MOBIS?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> OASIS is intended to be a complement to existing GSA vehicles.
548	Section L.6.1.	Section L.6.1. Direct Labor Rates has a sentence that reads "Also identified are the States where each occupation is paid the highest", however information on the States showing highest paid labor categories are missing from the draft solicitation.  Suggest that GSA include a copy of the missing information with Section J.2, Attachment (2)
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The information is not missing. The citation means that the BLS identifies the states where each occupation is paid the highest.

549	Section L.6.3.	<p>Section L.6.3. Cost/Price Template Instructions states "The Cost/Price Template has restricted areas where Offerors cannot enter information. If entry is attempted in such an area, a message will appear indicating the area is locked. Offerors shall not change any information or formulas on the spreadsheets, including the cell protection. <b>However, Offeror's with a different indirect rate structure than that identified in Columns D through F may adjust their columns accordingly.</b>"</p> <p>Section B.2.5. T&amp;M and L-H Task Orders states that "The Contractor to may provide separate and/or blended loaded hourly rates for the prime Contractor labor, each Subcontractor, and/or each Division, Subsidiary, or Affiliate in accordance with the provisions set forth in FAR 52.216-29, DFARs 252.216-7002, FAR 52.216-30, or FAR 52.216-31." How shall we complete the cost template if the template is set up to load a direct rate per category and display the associated overhead rate/dollars per category? To display this with a blended rate would require significant alteration to the template, since there is the possibility of multiple burden pools and contractors in each category. Furthermore, the prime Contractors access to the Subcontractor's indirect rates is normally restricted between the Subcontractor and the Government only.</p>
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Section B.2.5 applies to task orders. Please follow the instructions in Section L.
550	L.5.1.7. Existing Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA), if applicable, page 79	Please clarify whether the Past Performance & Relevant Experience is for the CTA "team lead" only or if it is applicable for the other team members as well.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The past performance and relevant experience applies to the CTA entity.
551	L.5.3.2. Relevant Experience Template, pp 81	This section is very confusing due to non consistent taxonomy across organizations. For example, Technical Advisory Services could be defined in one organization as (section C.2.1.2 Management Consulting services) and in another organization as SETA work which includes Systems Engineering and Technical Advisory activities. Also, please clarify if the Govt is requesting attachment of the entire award documentation, which can be quite numerous for each Relevant Experience. Suggest to limit the page count. Since this varies from contract to contract, suggest Govt. eliminate contract verification attachment. "The Offeror shall document each of the 5 relevant experiences and attach verification documents in accordance with Section J.5., Attachment (5), "RELEVANT EXPERIENCE TEMPLATE". No other format or additional proposal documentation will be considered.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are editing the language of this section, but the basic requirement will be to provide as much information as necessary to validate that you have performed work that meets the definitions of the core disciplines, regardless of what label an agency or organization may have placed on it.
552	C.2.1.2. Management Consulting Services, pg18	Concept Development and Requirements Analysis (C.2.1.2 item 4) are redundant in C.2.1.4 Engineering Services. Please clarify if the Govt intends to have duplicate requirements in both sections. Will the Government please clarify the different requirements between the two sections?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> First of all, these are examples, not requirements. Secondly, we think that concept development in a management consulting context would likely be or could very well be very different than concept development in an engineering context. The interpretation of the words used to describe work depends on the paradigm of the reader. There are likely at least a dozen different connotations in the Industry community of what "concept development" means even within a narrow mission space. Finally, this is a draft. If you have suggestions for editing things, please provide specific recommendations for change and a rationale for that change. As we have already demonstrated during this process, if the recommendation makes sense and we feel it is in the best interest of the contracts and our clients, we will implement it.
553	L.5.4.2. Past Performance (Proposal Submission, if applicable), pg 82	Please Clarify whether the Past Performance & Relevant Experience is for the " team lead" only or for the other members or if it is applicable for the other team members as well.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Teaming is not considered at the contract level except for existing JVs, in which case it means the JV entity as a whole.
554	L.6. VOLUME 6 – COST/PRICE, pg 86	Please clarify if the Govt is legally allowed to determine contractors rate based on BLS ECI or any factor that is not DCCA approved " Offerors shall only provide the ceiling rates for Year 1 of the contract. Ceiling rates for Years 2 through 15 (which includes the years 2 through 5 of the initial base period, the 5-year option period, and an additional 5 years of task order performance under OASIS SB, when applicable) will automatically be calculated for each labor category by an escalation factor embedded in the spreadsheet.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
555	H.7.5. Minimum Task Order Awards, pg 50	Please clarify if Govt Agencies will be required to use this contract vehicle. Since it is not clear exactly how many Govt. Agencies will be required and/or actually use this vehicle, it is suggested that this requirement be eliminated.This requirement could result in high turnover of OASIS' vendors if enough Govt Agencies don't use this vehicle. Suggest that this requirement eliminated altogether becasue we dont know what Govt Agencies will use the vehicles and when they might use it. "Failure to attain the minimum number of task order awards prior to the exercise of Option I may result in Dormant Status and/or result in a Contractor being Off-Ramped (See Sections H.12. and H.13.)."

		<b>RESPONSE:</b> There is no requirement for agencies to use OASIS or OASIS SB. We feel that both OASIS contracts will be extremely popular, however. If a company has reservations about their ability to remain engaged on the OASIS contracts throughout the life of the contracts, reservations about the Governmentwide use of the contracts, or does not trust that the OASIS Contracting Officers will exercise professional judgement in the execution of their duties, then they should refrain from competing for an OASIS award. Bottom line, if OASIS contractors are actively engaged in the competitive process, we will not put you in dormant status or off ramp you based upon the number of task order wins. Contractually, however, we need firm "teeth" to do so in the event you are not actively engaged on the contract. Given the quality of contractors we anticipate having on the OASIS contracts, the OASIS Program Office never intends on exercising Dormant Status or Off Ramping any of our Contractors. We simply reserve the contractual right to do so should it become necessary.
556	C.2.1, page 17	Each of the six Core Disciplines has an enumerated list of service areas which comprise the scope of the domain. Each list has a caveat stating that the service areas include, but are not limited to, the listed areas. Please clarify the process which bidders should follow to add a previously un-enumerated item to a Core Discipline. That is, if the enumerated lists are by definition not all-inclusive, what is the process (and on-boarding criteria) for adding an in-scope service area to a Core Discipline?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Thank you for the question. The definitions in Section C are what comprise the scope of the core disciplines. The lists are just examples to help clarify. If you have suggestions for those lists, simply make the suggestion now about what should be added or deleted from the list. There is no process necessary to perform a service area not identified on the example lists.
557	C.2.1, page 17	Each of the six Core Disciplines has an enumerated list of example service areas which comprise the scope of the domain. Please describe the process through which GSA will ensure a level playing field in terms of bidders suggesting/including previously un-enumerated service areas as acceptable examples of the Core Discipline. For example, if GSA accepts one bidder's inclusion of a previously unenumerated service area to one of the Core Disciplines, will all bidders be notified that this new service area is "allowable" and will other bidders be allowed to resubmit their proposals to avail themselves of this new criterion?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Any and all service areas are "allowable" so long as the work being performed fits the scope of the contract as defined by the core disciplines. All OASIS task orders (except those done on a sole source basis) are subject to Fair Opportunity, which means that all contract holders within a given OASIS Pool, will be able to compete for any and all task order requirements.
558	M.5, Page 100	If a past performance project reference had a socio-economic subcontracting goal that was higher than an agency's goal, which goal is used to evaluate the "meet or exceed" scoring criterion? For example, if bidder's subcontracting plan for a past performance targeted 10% WOSB subcontracting, and the agency's target was 5% WOSB subcontracting, how would section M.5 be scored if the past performance actually achieved 7% WOSB subcontracting?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The agency can only provide a goal suggestion. The actual goal is the one the Contractor imposes on themselves.
559	L5.5.3, Page 83	States that "if available, the offeror must provide verification from the DCAA or DCMA...of an estimating system that has been audited..." However, the Contractor Checklist (Section J.4., Attachment(4), specifically states that if the offer does not include an Acceptable Estimating System, the offer is ineligible for award. Can you explain this contradiction? Note that the language in Sections L.5.5.3 through L.5.5.10 is identical to that in Section L.5.5.3 but the Contractor Checklist does not specify that an answer of "No" makes the offer ineligible. This is extremely confusing and may cause otherwise qualified businesses to refrain from submitting a proposal.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Estimating systems are not required. We will clarify.
560	L.5.3.1, Page 80	Why is all relevant experience required to be as the prime contractor? For a substantial portion of small businesses, much of their relevant experience has been as a subcontractor. This requirement seems designed to exclude, rather than include small businesses.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Because the prime contractor is responsible for all work performed. This is a very important distinction. We are not looking to include or exclude any business. We are looking for proven results.
561	L.5.3.1, Page 80, Paragraph 2	Why do you specify that every relevant experience must integrate at least three of the core disciplines when the scoring matrix in Section M5 awards points only if at least four disciplines are integrated? If you want four, why not say so? Also, many small businesses do not maintain that breadth of services or are niche providers, making them instantly ineligible, even though they are among the best in one or two of the core disciplines.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are looking for integrators, not niche companies. The scoring represents complexity of experience. The more disciplines required for a given contract or task order, the more complex it is and the more points are scored.
562	L.5.3.1, Page 80, Paragraph 3	Why do you specify that every relevant experience must integrate a total award value of at least \$2 million per year when the scoring matrix in Section M5 awards points only if the total award value is at least \$3 million per year? If you want \$3 million, why not say so? This requirement also seems designed to include only "large" small businesses.

		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to the same or similar questions.
563	M.3 page 90	Text states Government will examine 40 highest technically rated Offerors within each Pool by socio-economic sub-group. You list SDVOSB but not VOSB. Should VOSB also be a specified category?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> VOSB is not recognized for set-asides in accordance with FAR Part 19.
564	Section L.5.4, Page 81	Regarding the statement "Offerors are strongly cautioned that the inability of the Government to contact past performance references....," the contractor has little control over whether a reference answers the phone or returns calls. While the contractor contacts the reference and insures they are willing to participate, there is little the contractor can do if they do not respond.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> And by the same token, the past performance cannot be counted if we cannot validate it.
565	Section M.5, Scoring in Reference to Section L.5.3.1, Page 94	Based on the scoring sheet provided in Section M.5, it appears that the government will be scoring projects performed in multiple locations with a greater value. Could the government please provide a more robust definition of what is meant by "Multiple Locations"?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
566	B.2.1. Page 11	Please clarify that the OCO will be trained to provide government estimates, and the expectation is the SB will provide their cost proposal using the BLS SOC system. Is the expectation: GSA is to train all SB too, this is not addressed, only OCO training? Yet in Sec H.6.2. you allow the SB to provide an acceptable estimating system, not BLS SOC.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> What any business uses to price their requirements is up to them. We will provide training to OCOs and OASIS awardees on the SOC and the estimating tool developed from the SOC.
567	Section H.6.10, Page 45	RFP states: "In general, all necessary facility and employee security clearances shall be at the expense of the Contractor." Should we assume that personnel/facility security clearance cost must not be billed directly to the government and should be included as part of the indirect costs in the price proposals?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes, as consistent with your accounting system rules.
568	Section H.6.10.1, Page 46	RFP states: "There are no mandatory levels of facility security clearance for Contractors under OASIS SB; however, task orders may require an FCL at any level, under OASIS SB." The very next sentence contradicts the first: "The Contractor, at its own expense, must maintain their FCL by the Defense Security Service (DSS) for the entire term of OASIS SB."
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> If you have one, you must maintain it. If you don't have one, then it doesn't apply.
569	H.7.4 Page 49	Actively pursuing work is difficult to evaluate, could you assist by defining GSA's responsibility in Marketing OASIS?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are not sure we understand your question. Please rephrase.
570	L.5.3.1 page 80	A portion of our business has been awarded as a Direct Award via another contractor's BPA. This direct award establishes privity of contract with the Federal customer. Please confirm that these awards are considered prime contracts for OASIS.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. There are no "direct awards" to a subcontractor made by the Government. They are not considered prime contracts.
571	M.5, Page 100	How will the government use the information in CPARS to evaluate Past Performance when multiple reports exist.–How many of the CPARs will the government use in evaluating past performance? Will the government average the ratings over for each year or will they just use the final CPAR rating? Will greater weight be given to the more recent reports?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are examining those reports that correspond to the examples of relevant experience. We will use the final ratings. All reports count equally.
572	G.3.3.1, ISR Reporting, page 34	Please confirm that the ISR goal is of subcontracted dollars and not total awarded dollars.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct.
573	G.3.3 Subcontracting Plan page 34	States that the contractor's Subcontracting Plan is incorporated by reference. Where are the requirements/guidelines for this plan?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Attachment J.7.
574	L.5.4.3 Socio-economic Past Performance page 87	Copies of the ISR/SSR reports are required to demonstrate socio-economic past performance for all contracts and task orders to be considered in the determination of past performance. These forms were not in existence for the entire period of performance (last 5 years) that can be referenced. The earlier version of this information is the Standard Form 294 (SF-294). Can the SF-294 form be used to demonstrate achievement of contract small business goals for contracts and task orders prior to the adoption of the ISR/SSRs?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Answer pending.
575	L.5.1.5, Uncompensated Overtime Policy, page 80	As an application of law, an exempt employee must always be paid on a salary basis not subject to reduction based on the quality or quantity of work performed. Since our company abides by the current law we have no written uncompensated overtime policy. Would it be acceptable to state we have no written policy or can the contractor write to the reasoning there is no written policy?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Answer pending.

576	Page 28, Contractor Key Personnel	Can GSA edit its terms to recognize that a small business in Core Disciplines One and Two can use less than Full-Time-Equivalents for the Program and Contract Managers at the start of the Contract, making the expected level of effort relative to the number of Task Orders subsequently awarded? <b>RESPONSE:</b> Key Personnel do not have to be full time positions.
577	Page 29 and Page 33, Contract Manager Authorities	Can GSA edit its terms to recognize that an SDVOSB who wishes to maintain its VA Certification can assign duties consistent with its verification and regulations and does not need to meet the express terms about company authority as noted in this draft? <b>RESPONSE:</b> Contract requirements have nothing to do with VA certification.
578	Page 80, L.5.3.1 (also see M.5 Scoring) – Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements	An offeror is to have references for three out of the six Core Disciplines (point 2.). Note also that this section says there is a primary scope decision to be made by an offeror, and this implies that there needs to be other non-primary Disciplines for which an offeror is bidding. Can an offeror bid one or only two of the Disciplines, or is an offeror to bid for at least three? Can the government consider that a small business may not be able to bid on three Core Disciplines for natural reasons, and limit any requirement to two (2) Disciplines, and limit the Experience requirements to the pools to which they are bidding? <b>RESPONSE:</b> Offerors do not bid on Core Disciplines. Please re-read the solicitation.
579	Page 80, L.5.3.1 – Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements and M.5 Scoring System, page 94	Does each Experience reference need to be valued at \$2 Million or can an offeror provide a reference of lower value as long as it is relevant in terms of the type of scope or size expected in the Discipline area in which they are bidding? Can GSA set the minimum values by Discipline? <b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
580	Page 81, L.5.3.1 – Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements – point 5	At least One (1) project must be for work performed under a <u>Cost-Reimbursement</u> contract type. The business model of many small businesses is to <i>avoid</i> cost-reimbursement type contracts, so this provision will compel all of these companies to join or form a CTA where one of the companies can supply such a reference. Note that this will compel all offerors and CTAs to obtain DCAA/DCMA approvals for accounting and estimating systems. In the interest of favoring competition and the small business purposes of this Solicitation, can the government require this cost-reimbursement experience reference <i>if and only</i> if the offeror or CTA-offeror intends to bid on <u>Task Orders of this type</u> ? <b>RESPONSE:</b> The requirement has changed. Please see previous responses.
581	Page 81, L.5.4, Volume 4 – Past Performance	An offeror may be ineligible for award if it does not have 5 relevant references. Can GSA confirm that this is a total of 5 references, no matter how many Disciplines are involved? Should GSA ask for fewer references if an offeror is only bidding for one or two of the Disciplines? <b>RESPONSE:</b> Offerors do not bid on Core Disciplines. Please re-read the solicitation.
582	Page 83, L.5.5.3 – Acceptable Estimating System	1. Can the government edit this to recognize that it only applies when the Offeror is planning to bid on Cost-Reimbursable work? <b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
583	L.5.5.1 and 5.4 and 5.5; also H.6.1 conflict	Can the government edit 5.1, 5.4 and 5.5 too, so it is not in conflict with the second paragraph of H.6. where it is recognized that FP and T&M work is excepted? <b>RESPONSE:</b> All contract types are permissible and an acceptable accounting system is required to be on the contract.
584	Page 74, L.3 Instructions	GSA is only accepting proposals from prime contractors or a CTA, a formal legal arrangement. This will limit competition, limit the talent pool available under the Contract, and discriminate against the small firms like SDVOSBs. Can GSA recognize that small companies, such as SDVOSBs, and others who are competing solely for Disciplines One and Two, may use formal Teaming Agreements, disclosed in the bid, instead of a CTA? <b>RESPONSE:</b> Offerors do not bid on Core Disciplines and SDVOSBs are specifically authorized for set-asides. Please re-read the solicitation.
585	L.5.5.8, page 84	Is it acceptable if the offeror is in the CMMI L3 assessment phase. There are 3 phases to the assessment, proof of verification will not be provided until the end of phase 3. Is this sufficient to provide verification of the initial assessment? <b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
586	H.6.5.5, pg. 44	The ACO/OCO determines the need for a contractor purchasing system review (CPSR) based on, but not limited to, the past performance of the contractor, and the volume, complexity and dollar value of subcontracts. Generally, a CPSR is not performed for a specific contract. In accordance with the FAR (Subpart 44.3—Contractors' Purchasing Systems Reviews (CPSR)), a contractor must be awarded a contract were sales of commercial items were expected to exceed \$25 million during a 12 month period in order for the ACO/OCO to be requested to review and approve their purchasing system. If the contractor's purchasing methods have not been reviewed by the ACO/OCO and thereby determined to be adequate and acceptable for use in Cost Reimbursement contracts, but has processes established to fully support, has been DCAA audited, and is ISO-9001-2008 certified is that sufficient? <b>RESPONSE:</b> This question is not clear. Please clarify.
587	H.6.4., page 76	ORCA should be replaced with SAM <b>RESPONSE:</b> Thank you for the edit.
588	K.1.4, page 69	What is the anticipated acceptable minimal, average and maximum scores for all pools? This would allow contractors to perform a self-assessment before submission.

		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Minimum is zero. Maximum is 6,800 right now. We have no average or anticipated scores. We do not feel any company, in any Pool, on either contract, will score a perfect score.
589	L.5.5.9, page 85	The Government will only preform an EVMS audit if a contract exceeds a certain value and if the Government Contract Management Office request is made. Is self verification of EVMS guidelines established by ANSI Standard EIA-748-A sufficient for small businesses in Pool 1?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
590	M.3, page 90	Please futher explain the example provided. The total representatives eligible for award equals 42. In additiona, it is indicated that 2 representatives in the 40 highest technically rated offer. Is there a total of 6 that are eligible for award?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We don't understand the question here. Please clarify.
591	M.3, page 90	Is there a percentage used for awards in each socioeconomic sub-group per pool? How many awards are anticipated for each socioeconomic sub-group per pool? (So per pool, there are 3 awards per a socioeconomic sub-group, and there are 5 socioeconomic sub-groups. So will that mean that there will be 15 total awards to the socioeconomic contractors?)
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We don't have any "anticipated" number of socioeconomic sub-group awards in each Pool other than we would like a minimum of 3 in each of the groups.
592	M.5, Pg. 94-95	We believe this evaluation scoring system means the GSA only wants the largest of the small business to bid and see this harmful a large group small businesses. If GSA wants to greatly reduce the number of the companies that have less than \$5million in receipts from bidding, GSA should state that up front
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We don't want to reduce anything. There are no legal or regulatory "tiers" of Small Businesses. We are seeking the Highest Technically Rated Small Businesses regardless of their revenues.
593	Page 75,Section L.3. INSTRUCTIONS.	"GSA is only accepting proposal submissions that represent the Prime Contractor only, except for existing Contractor Team Arrangements (CTAs)." Then, later on page 84, "Offerors are strictly prohibited from forming a new CTA for the purposes of submitting an offer to meet the evaluation standards for OASIS under a Partnership or Joint Venture." With OASIS intending to address complex, multidisciplinary challenges, the ability to approach OASIS with an established, multidisciplinary team will be critical. Furthermore, at the first OASIS industry day, vendors were encouraged strongly to begin looking for teaming partners. These statements, therefore, come as some surprise and we suggest that teams be allowed to be formed, as there will be very few firms able to meet all of the multidisciplinary needs and they will favor the very large firms.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please read previous responses regarding teaming. There has never been an OASIS Industry Day, so we are not certain what you are referring to there.
594	Page 83, Section L.5.1.6.2. GSAR 552.219-73 Goals for Subcontracting Plan (JUNE 2005).	"GSA believes that this contract provides significant opportunities for the use of small, HUBZone small, small disadvantaged, women-owned, veteran-owned, and service-disabled veteran owned small business concerns as Subcontractors. Accordingly, it is anticipated that an acceptable subcontracting plan will contain at least the following goals." The table that follows identifies a 50% small business concern goal. We suggest that this goal is too high: a. There already is a small business OASIS vehicle being created to provide extensive small business set-aside opportunities on OASIS-type multidisciplinary work. b. Under the existing expectations of subcontracting, any work a large business would win, 50% of it immediately would need to be given away. We submit that 50% is too burdensome and makes pursuit of OASIS work, which already will carry risk due to its multidisciplinary nature, unappealing to large businesses. c. With past performance references that show 50% subcontracting, GSA will be unable to distinguish between the performance of the prime and their ability to address the disciplines and the performance of their subcontractors, that could make up half the team. We are concerned that GSA would make evaluations where only half of the performance can be ascribed to the bidder.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The 50% goal applies to dollars subcontracted, not total award dollars.
595	Page 100, Section M.5. SCORING SYSTEM. Page 85, Section L.5.3.1. Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements	6. Page 100, M.5. SCORING SYSTEM. On page 85, L.5.3.1. Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements Scoring criteria, past performance must "have a total award value of at least \$5 Million Per Year." On page 100's scoring system table, however, zero points would be awarded for firms that demonstrate \$5M/year past performance. Points are only awarded for those that have \$10M/year past performance. Please confirm that this was intentional and that points in this area are awarded only for exceeding the minimum average contract values.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> This is intentional. If points are awarded for minimum requirements, then everyone gets them. Accordingly, points for minimum requirements serve no purpose in segregating between Offerors.
596	Page 44 Section H.6.5 Approved Purchasing System	Please discuss whether advance notification and consent to subcontract will be required of all contractors who do not have an approved purchasing system.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Notification and consent requirements will be defined at the task order level, but in general, the answer is yes. This is why approved purchasing systems are very valuable to our clients.
597	Page 40 Section H.2.4.1 NAICs Pools	Please confirm that bidders do not need to qualify for all NAICs codes in a Pool in order to be able to bid on that Pool.

		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct.
598	Page 40 Section H.2.4.1 NAICs Pools	Please confirm that the Business Size Standards listed for each pool apply only to OASIS SB.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is incorrect. Pools apply to both contracts.
599	B.1.5; page 11	Does GSA have an estimate for the CAF fee percentage? In the past, some clients have mentioned that as the reason for not using GSA schedules.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
600	L.5.3.1; page 81	In the 3 of 5 Federal contracts, can an offeror reference work as a subcontractor as long as the end client was the Federal government?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
601	H.6.12	Clarify how the Government defines a "proprietary solution."
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
602	M.5 Scoring System - Volume 4 (Pages 100-101)	Will a company receive partial credit for fulfilling part of the small business socio-economic goal? For instance, if a given goal was 3% for 40 points and 1.5% was achieved, would the offeror be awarded 20 points?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
603	M.5 Scoring System - Volume 4 (Pages 100-101)	CPARs include in their rating an assessment of the contractors performance against that Federal agencies small business requirements for that contract. The M.5 Scoring System includes scoring for both the CPARS and specific small business goals. Aren't the evaluation factors for Total Small Business Goal, HUBZONE, SDB, WOSB, VOSB and SDVOSB duplicative?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> It's a matter of opinion. Often times CPARS information does not rate this area. We felt it important to recognize companies who had been successful in meeting small business subcontracting goals.
604	M.5 Scoring System - Volume 4 (Pages 100-101)	Small business goals vary significantly, by percentage and category, across Federal Agencies and individual contracts. How will variances in customer goals that do not align with the OASIS Past Performance criteria be handled when scoring the small business factors?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are examining that right now. We will likely eliminate the sub-goals and stick with the total SB goal, but increase the point value.
605	M.5 Scoring System - Volume 4(Pages 100-101)	If a Federal Agency does not include a particular socio-economic category in its small business goals (essentially a goal of 0), and the program still demonstrates tangible performance in that category (effectively exceeding the goal), would GSA still award the full credit of 40 points.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No, but we are currently examining the point structure in this area.
606	Section L.5.2.1 Financial Resources, Page 85	For a large publicly traded enterprise, may submittal of the company's most recent Form 10-K substitute for completion of the GSA 527 form?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Answer pending.
607	GSA 527-99 form, Contractors Qualifications & financial information (Page 85)	The GSA 527-99 form expired on 8/31/12. Will an updated form be provided with the RFP?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
608	Section K Representations and Certifications (Pages 63-73)	These requirements have already been completed in the System Award Management (SAM). Recommend the GSA evaluate the data in SAM vs. requiring the data be submitted again.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The unique nature of the Pools does not allow for this.
609	Section H.4.2.1 Pools (Pages 40-42)	What is the relevance of the pools for the unrestricted/full and open contract? There is no proof of performance required for the pools, only a checklist to be filled out And there are no evaluation factors relative to the pools. Suggest the pools be eliminated.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to this question/recommendation.
610	L.5.4 (Pages 86-87)	The current scoring for small business performance allocates 300 points per program (200 for the five socioeconomic categories and 100 for overall SB participation). This amount is equal to the points allocated for overall program performance and 3 times the number of points allocated for program size/complexity. Please provide the rationale for valuing small business performance significantly (3 times) more than program size and complexity.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We placed great importance on small business subcontracting.
611	L.2.3 FAR 52.216-27 Single or Multiple Awards Page 74	Please clarify the intent to make 40 awards in the six Pools. Will these pools of contractors include both small and large business; i.e., each pool will have a total of 40 awardees? Or will there be 40 large awadees in each pool, and 40 small business awardees in each pool?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> There are two contracts. OASIS is unrestricted and will include 40 awards in each Pool. Those awardees may be large or small. OASIS SB is a 100% SB set-aside and will include 40 awards in each Pool of nothing but Small Businesses.
612	L.5.4.3 Socio-economic Past Performance Page 87	The guidance as written does not take into account contracts awarded to a company that has graduated to a large business, but had eligible contracts awarded as a small business and a subcontracting plan was not required and ISR/SSR Reports were not submitted. Guidance is needed how to identify work that was performed as a small business before graduation to a large business.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Work performed as a small is treated no differently than work performed as a large for the unrestricted OASIS contract.

613	L.5.3.1. Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements, Pg., 85	Point 2 states that - at least Four (4) out of the Six (6) OASIS Core Disciplines - for IT services is it sufficient that the experience show cases lies within any of the 4 core disciplines?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Experience examples of IT contracts are not authorized.
614	L.5.3.1. Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements, Pg., 85	Point 3 states that - a total award value of at least \$5 Million Per Year - is this monetary value for each individual work order or the minimum amount of business being achieved with multiple work orders?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Each individual order.
615	L.5.3.1. Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements, Pg., 85	Point 6 states that at least 3 out of 5 projects must be for work that was for the Federal Government under a contract or task order awarded by the Federal Government - we are a Company with presence in the commercial sector and now focussing on the Federal government business. We would like to know if examples from the commercial sector or the local & county government be considered for this work?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes, two of the five relevant experience examples may be from the commercial sector.
616	L.5.1.6. Subcontracting Plan, Pg., 80	We would like to know if the reporting requirement be restricted to the Offeror-OASIS Agreement alone?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Only prime contractors have reporting requirements if we understand your question correctly.
617	B.2.5.1 (page 13); F.3 (page 23)	In discussing the indexing for ceiling rates indicates that indexing will be conducted "Years 6 through 15" and for "Years 11 through 15." By way of comparison, Section F.3 indicates that the period of performance is a 5-year base period with 1, 5-year option (totaling 10 years). Though it is understood in Section F.3 that task orders may run for up to 5 years after the end of the base contract term, why is the base contract concerned with labor category ceilings for that five year period (Years 11-15). Shouldn't pricing for those years be left to the OCO for the relevant task order?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> It is in place for the same reason as the pricing for years 1-10, to establish limits on T&M task orders not resulting from adequate price competition.
618	B.3 (page 13)	An OCO is granted the authority to independently determine and evaluate pricing for a labor category not specified in the Base Contract. Similar with the prior question, shouldn't the OCO likewise have the authority to determine fair and reasonable labor pricing for Years 11-15 (after the term has technically expired)?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We have established ceiling rates for them to make that determination easier and more expedient. Otherwise, they would very likely need to request certified cost and pricing data in accordance with FAR 15.4 by way of FAR 16.505.
619	F.4.2 (page 25); H.16.14 (mentioned on page 26 but H.16 isn't a section within the DRFP as H ends at H.13)	The "Limitation on Subcontracting" requirement provides that at least 50% of the task order performance incurred for personnel shall be expended by the OASIS SB Prime Contractor. GSA has clearly enumerated on many occasions its desire to not permit teaming or subcontracting on the base contract level, but rather have a preference for teaming and subcontracting on the task order level. That being said, doesn't the "Limitation on Subcontracting" term create an unintended consequence of precluding small business from collaborating fully on the task order basis? What if a small business, who is not an OASIS SB prime, has better qualifications than the OASIS prime for a particular task order? The Limitation on Subcontracting and the fact that small business joint ventures are precluded would limit the non-OASIS' small business to fully compete and demonstrate its capabilities for an agency-customer in excess of 50% of service labor.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is the law.
620	H.6.4-H.6.10 (starts page 43)	The Draft RFP provides that Contractors are encouraged to have a Forward Pricing Rate Agreements, an Approved Purchasing System, an ISO 9001:2008 Certification; an AS9100 Certification; a CMMI Maturity Level 3 or higher; an Earned Value Management System; and a Facility Security Clearance. Though later in Section M.5, the Draft RFP identifies a complex scoring mechanism for giving credit for these qualifications. The scoring seems arbitrary, capricious, and unbalanced as to what is desired by obtaining qualified Small Business at size standard revenue thresholds starting at \$7 million. How does GSA intend to seek balance and obtain the best offerors under the small business RFP?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We disagree with your opinion, but thank you for the feedback. Our solicitation approach is as the draft documents suggest and is based upon an abundance of feedback from clients and industry.
621	L.5.1.7 (page 79)	Though Clause L.5.1.7 requests specific information regarding the structure of a pre-existing CTA, as written it ignores the facts that non-populated Joint Ventures with a majority stakeholder are little more than glorified prime contractor-subcontractor relationships. Stated otherwise, other than the fact that a preexisting non-populated CTA is formalized into a legal entity, via a legal partnership or joint venture, there is little difference to a traditional prime contractor-subcontractor relationship. Accordingly, the draft RFP appears to give an unfair advantage to this formalized legal structure as opposed to a traditional prime-sub relationship, where the relationships between entities may be just as long standing and operate similarly to the pre-existing CTA. That said, why wouldn't GSA permit a newly formed, formal CTA compete on OASIS if it can also be demonstrated that the relationship between entities is long standing and collaborative?

		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We aren't sure we understand your point here. If a historical prime/sub relationship exists that would allow competition on OASIS, then why would that prime need to form a CTA/JV to compete? Why wouldn't the prime just compete as a prime and reference the subcontracted efforts for relevant experience purposes?
622	L.5.1.7, Paragraph 3 (page 79)	What constitutes new versus existing? As indicated in item five (5), it appears to be solicitation closing date. Is that correct?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Existing means that the entity has performed as an entity on contracts before.
623	L.6, Senior JD (page 86)	Is there an experience equivalent for the degree requirements?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Not currently. We are considering it now.
624	Section J.8., Page n/a	Is the team expected to bid 100% of the labor categories or to bid only those categories it can currently support?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Offerors shall provide pricing for all labor categories.
625	Section J.1, Attachment (1)	OASIS labor categories have been mapped to the Office of Management and Budget's Standard Occupational Classifications and the labor categories are defined as Junior, Journeyman and Senior. The Junior and Senior labor categories are representative of a junior or senior level individual. The Journeyman category covers a very wide range of experience (3-10 yrs) and education (BA/BS-MA/MS degree). Our concern is that a ceiling rate for a Journeyman with 3 years' experience and a BA will also be the ceiling rate for a person with 9 years' experience and a MS degree. Please clarify GSA's rationale for the wide range of experience/salary that must be covered under the 'journeyman' designation.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> A ceiling rate is not a flat rate. A ceiling rate encompasses the most expensive situation within a given area. For Journeyman positions, this would be the 9 years of experience, an MS degree, and employment in the highest paid state in the country.
626	Section G.3.1, Contract Access Fee (CAF)	Many Customers believe a CAF cap should be applicable for large task orders, similar to the cap on Alliant CAF per the memo issued June 1, 2009 by GSA ( <a href="http://www.gsa.gov/graphics/fas/AlliantCAFCAPMemo.pdf">http://www.gsa.gov/graphics/fas/AlliantCAFCAPMemo.pdf</a> ). Lack of a cap on CAF for large task orders could inhibit the use of OASIS for high dollar task orders. Will GSA consider a CAF cap similar to Alliant?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We do not intend on utilizing a cap like Alliant. However, we will share the OASIS CAF structure as soon as it is internally vetted.
627	<a href="https://interact.gsa.gov/blog/industry-one-one-sessions-coming-soon-april-1-2013">https://interact.gsa.gov/blog/industry-one-one-sessions-coming-soon-april-1-2013</a>	The allocated slots for the one-on-one meetings (16-17 MAY) filled so quickly that we did not get an opportunity to secure a time-slot. We believe this is a valuable communication between Industry Partners and GSA. As such, will GSA consider adding additional time so that Industry Partners can avail themselves to this critical interaction with GSA?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We have provided a One-on-One slot for every company who submitted a timely white paper.
628	C.2.1.1 pp.17-20; L.5.3.1 p.85	We notice that GSA includes "evaluation of programmatic activities and administrative systems" under Program Management Services Core Discipline, "analysis of existing organizational problems and development of plans for improvement under the Management Consulting Services Core Discipline, "evaluating" under the Scientific Services and Engineering Services Core Disciplines, and "monitoring" under the Financial Services Core Discipline. Could GSA kindly confirm that monitoring and evaluation of project elements in one or more of these Core Disciplines meets the requirement in L.5.3.1 that Relevant Experience projects "involve the performance and/or integration of at least Four (4) out of the Six (6) OASIS Core Disciplines?"
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
629	H.11.3, pp.53-54	Can offerors that submitted bids for the initial OASIS proposal be considered for on-ramping in the absence of an open-season (e.g. a contractor is ranked 41, would they be awarded a contract if one of the 40 is off-ramped)?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. In the event we drop below 40 vendors, we would likely conduct an open-season soon thereafter.
630	H.11.3, pp.53-54	During open-season, may any contractor prepare a proposal for consideration, or only those that submitted proposals for the initial OASIS procurement?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Any contractor.
631	H.11.3, pp.53-54	Does submitting an initial bid enhance the Offeror's chances of receiving an award during on-ramping or during open season?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
632	H.11.3, pp.53-54	With respect to the point 7. "An Offeror's proposal must receive a proposal score equal to or higher than the lowest scoring Contractor within the Pool(s) being applied for Note: The lowest scoring Contractor is based on the lowest evaluated numerical score within a given Pool in accordance with the scoring table in Section M.4. of the solicitation at the time of the original awards." If on-ramping is contemplated, it may be because insufficient competition has resulted from the initial awards, or the 40 awardees are insufficiently active. However, by definition, no additional proposals would have received a score the same as the 40th ranked awardee (or they would also have received an award). We therefore do not fully understand how organizations would qualify for on-ramping at that point. Could you please provide some further clarification regarding the on-ramping process?

		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The legal requirement here, and a big reason why you don't see contracts that use subjective trade off evaluation approaches conduct on-ramps, is that an agency cannot lower evaluation standards for subsequent on-ramping. For subjective trade offs, it is virtually impossible to ensure the same trade off decisions as the original award, so on-ramping can be problematic. For OASIS, however, because of our objective, highest technically rated approach, we can easily ensure that the evaluation standards are maintained. Accordingly, we would assume that some time after the original awards when we conduct an on-ramp, that either a new competitor or an original competitor who didn't get an award (say number 41) now knowing the minimum score required to get onto the contract, would have obtained sufficient points to reach <u>that mark and be on-ramped.</u>
633	L.3.5.2	In the Q&A dated April 19, Q&A #17 states: Under Section L.5.3.2., Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements, there are five VERY limiting requirements for any SB. #1. You may not use experience from a CTA formed specifically for this opportunity, only JV. #2. All work must have been completed as the prime and not a subcontractor - where much of SB get their work; #3. The prime must provide THREE of the SIX core disciplines on each project; #4 each project must be at least \$2M; and #5 at least one of the five project must have completed as a Cost-Reimbursement contract - which comes with expensive DCAA audited accounting requirements. Please let me know if I am misreading these requirements.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> You are interpreting those requirements correctly except for #3. The relevant experience examples must include 3 of the 6 core disciplines. Those may have been performed by the Prime, a sub, a teaming partner, or whomever. Please bear in mind that we are not looking for every SB to be able to compete for an OASIS SB award. We are looking for the highest technically rated SBs to perform complex requirements. We are looking for SB companies with proven, verifiable success performing complex work as a prime contractor. We are looking for SB companies with the existing systems, certifications, and resources to perform at a high level for these kinds of requirements. Accordingly, the standards are set high. We are certainly open to feedback, but recommendations designed to reduce the standards would only be considered if it is apparent that there would not be a sufficient pool of contractors to compete for the 40 spots we will be awarding in each Pool. EDIT: Requirement has been relaxed. See changes blog for details. Follow up Question: Can you please confirm that for the open-award OASIS, is it also the case that the relevant experience examples in 4 of the 6 core disciplines may have been performed by the Prime, a sub, a teaming partner, or whomever?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct.
634	L.5.5.11.1 p.91	GSA encourages offerors to propose a COPM with a "Master's Degree in Program/Project Management or other discipline relevant to the 6 core disciplines under OASIS." We read this to mean that this includes, for instance a Master's Degree in Communications, which includes aspects of Social Media Consulting in the Management Consulting core discipline, or a Master's Degree in Psychology under Social Services in the Scientific Services core discipline. Would GSA kindly confirm that this is reading is correct?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct.
635	OASIS Community Blog "Changes to the OASIS Draft Solicitation" 1.	Although GSA has removed the requirement to have a DCAA audited accounting system as a Pass/Fail element, the Community Blog mentions that "already having a DCAA audited accounting system is now present in the scoring system as a significant factor." Would GSA kindly: a) Indicate how many points will be allocated to offerors for possession of a DCAA audited accounting system; and b) Whether these points will increase the current point ceiling of 6,800, and if not, which other categories the audit system points will be drawn from.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We haven't decided yet. We will share that information as soon as that decision is made.
636	L.5.3.1 Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements	We have been excited about the OASIS opportunity but as currently written, we will not be able to bid on this solicitation. We believe we provide the services you seek but as a very small business, we do have the number of past performances specified nor the dollar value of contracts specified.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are sorry to hear that, but we are confident that we will have on-ramp procedures for OASIS SB. Recertification of size status is at the 5 year point, so please focus your efforts on becoming eligible to be on-ramped by then. Best of luck to you.
637	L.5.3.1 Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements	While we believe we are qualified to provide these services, if this procurement goes forward as written, we will be shut out of some possible lucrative business opportunities. Our only avenue approach is to find winning vendors and team with them on subsequent OASIS tasks.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Seek subcontracting opportunities and work towards becoming eligible for a future on-ramp.
638	1. General:	Is OASIS simply differentiating itself from LPTA? Or, alternatively does GSA offer a new, pricing model that is separate and distinct?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We aren't sure that we understand your questions. OASIS is at the other end of the evaluation spectrum from LPTA.

639	2. General:	Will the requirements of Past Performance be modified to offer a larger reserve of SB participation? Currently, it would seem that SDVOSBs and other diversity enterprises would be unfairly penalized by what appears to be "length and breadth" of past performance rather than more objective criteria as to quality of performance in perhaps a shorter period of time, but on point for the express requirement of OASIS to offer the government viable "complex solution sets?"
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We have already made adjustments. Please indicate if you have specific recommendations.
640	3. General:	OASIS does not appear to maximize the intended efficiencies of the vehicle by virtually relegating "tools" required for performing a service to simple ODCs. Tools may require complex integration themselves and may not be simply classifiable as ODCs. A list of possible ODCs allowable under the contract would help.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> ODC stands for Other Direct Cost. Any task order direct cost that is not labor is an ODC. There is no "relegation" of tools or any other task order requirement. Any ODC may be added at the task order level so long as it is integral and necessary to the task order solution.
641	4. General:	Is there any proposed modification to the sole use of CPARS under OASIS as a single citation for past performance such that a more comprehensive, objective history of performance under a task order might be utilized to assess a contractor's actual work? In some cases, CPARS may reflect a single interpretation of the why and how of the performance, based on a personal preference not necessarily the accomplishments or conversely the lack thereof, achieved.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> CPARS is the Government's Past Performance system. It is not perfect, but then again, nothing is. At very least, the information in CPARS is vetted and Contractors have the right to dispute and challenge what the information contains. Again, the system is by no means perfect, but it is the best we have available to us.
642	6. Pg 39, Para H.3.1	Will those companies that receive "direct awards" also be eligible and/or to receive awards in the competitive set-aside award?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
643	7. Pg 42, Par H.6.1	If a small business has yet to receive a DCAA audit for their accounting systems at time of award, will that preclude them from receive an OASIS SB Contract?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see changes and previous responses related to this question.
644	8. Pg 42-43, Para H6.6-H6.9	In these paragraphs the Government states that "Contractors are encouraged to have [required certification], during the entire term of OASIS SB. Does this mean that the Contract must have the "required certification" in order to receive and award?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No, this means that if you had one of these certifications at award, and were awarded points for having it, that you must maintain that certification throughout the life of the contract.
645	H.11, page 53	Will there be an "up lift" to the next pool for successful small business primes?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please explain what you mean by "up-lift".
646	H.11, page 53	Will it be possible to establish company preference or priority for each submission in the event that a company qualifies for multiple pools?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We don't understand what you mean by "company preference or priority". You can apply for as many Pools as you desire and qualify for. You don't have to pick one over another.
647	H.11, page 53	Will small business prime be permitted to compete for task orders released in pools "above" the prime's small business pool? For example, would a prime in Pool 6 be able to receive, vet, and compete for task orders released against the unrestricted category?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. Awardees may compete within the Pools and contracts they are awarded.
648	H.3.1, page 39	There is still some question as to how task orders will be issued. For example, a complex manufacturing task is issued under 33xxx--would it be released against Pool 5 or unrestricted (or both)?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The decision to set-aside a requirement for Small Business is made during the Acquisition Planning stage prior to contract vehicle selection in accordance with the criteria of the requiring agency. If a set-aside is determined to be appropriate, OASIS SB may be utilized. If a set-aside is not determined to be appropriate, OASIS may be utilized. The NAICS codes assigned to the OASIS contracts are found at Section H.4.2.1. A requirement from NAICS code 33xxx... would not be performed on OASIS. If you feel more NAICS codes need to be added, please provide specific recommendations.
649	Section H.4.2.1, Pages 40-41, NAICS Pools	If a company is less than 1000 employees and wants to compete across all scope areas under the OASIS contracts, would such company select and be evaluated under OASIS Unrestricted for purposes of Pools 1-4, and under OASIS SB for Pools 5 and 6 under OASIS SB? How would their submission be evaluated?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We assume you mean a company with less than 1,000 employees and annual revenues averaging more than \$35.5M. If so, then yes, that company would likely submit a proposal for Pools 5 and 6 on OASIS SB and submit a separate proposal on OASIS for Pools 1-4. Thier submission will be evaluated like all other received for each perspective contract.

650	Section K.1.4. FAR 52.219-1 Small Business Program Representations, Pages 68-71.	Related to Item (b)(1) to (6), would the Government please clarify how an offeror should represent themselves if they are over the size standard on one NAICS, but under on another within the same Pool?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> All NAICS codes within a given Pool have the exact same size standard. That is the reason that the Pools are constructed the way that they are.
651	Section L, Part L.4 Proposal Format – Volume 5 Systems Certifications and Resources, page 75	For clarification purposes, would the government please confirm that if the vendor has not experienced an official DCAA or DCMA audit for official Accounting System, CAS templates, Estimating System, & Purchasing System, then the Government may allow and evaluate a detailed description of internal processes and procedures in lieu of Audit Report Documents/Letter Verification?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is not accurate. We have allowed alternatives for accounting systems, but none of the other systems.
652	Section L., Part L.5.1.6.2., Page 83	Would the government please provide guidance on whether if an awarded OASIS Prime does not have any subcontracting dollars on a single task order, if that would affect the overall subcontracting plan in any way? Please confirm that FAR 52.219-8 would not apply.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> There would be no affect and the clause would not apply.
653	Section J.7; Subcontracting Plan Template, Page 2	Would the government please clarify how an offeror should calculate goal dollar amounts for their individual subcontracting plan goals? Since the base contract does not have any actual dollar values associated with the offeror's bid, and with this being a new type of IDIQ with limited real market indications for the value of task orders or the value of awards, any dollar values would be arbitrary. Would the government please consider revising the template table to only request percentages from the total subcontracted dollars as part of the individual plan?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Use your best estimating techniques is all we can tell you. We can't revise the template, but our concern is subcontracting percentages.
654	Section J.7; Subcontracting Plan Template, Page 3	Would the government please confirm if "Supplies/Services" refers to the GSA OASIS Core areas of references?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We do not understand the question. Please clarify.
655	Section L.6.3. Cost/Price Template Instructions, Page 88, AND Draft Section J.8 Attachment 8, OASIS_SB Cost/Price Template	Only Year 1 (column H) contains a formula to round Loaded Hourly Labor Rates to two (2) decimals. In order for Vendors to comply with section L.6.3 instructions, will the Government provide an updated template with formulas in all contract years (Gov. and Cont. site) to round two (2) decimals?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
656	Section M.3, Page 95, Screening and Evaluation Process	Would the Government please clarify that items 1-3 will be done for all submitted solicitations in line with the established evaluation scoring sheet? In this way, please confirm that all submitted proposals will receive an initial "OASIS evaluation team" assigned preliminary score.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
657	Section M.3, Page 95, Paragraph 4, Screening and Evaluation Process.	Would the government please clarify for OASIS Unrestricted that offers will only be sorted from highest to lowest score irrespective to the OASIS Pool system given NAICS are irrelevant at the Unrestricted level?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Offerors will be sorted from highest to lowest score within each Pool they have selected to be considered for.
658	Section H.4.2.1, Pages 40-41, NAICS Pools	Assuming an award under Pools 5 and 6 under OASIS SB, for what types of Task Orders under OASIS SB would a company that is less than 1000 employees and qualifies as a Small Business under Pools 5 and 6 be eligible to compete?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Only Research and Development requirements for specialized situations. Please refrain from applying for these Pools if you do not do this kind of work.
659	Small Business DRFP: Section M, Part M.3. Page 95 & Section L, Part 2.3 page 75, paragraphs 1-4	Would the Government please confirm that Small Business Prime scores from Pool 1 will be applied across the remaining pools, Pool 2 qualifying small businesses will carry across the remaining pools, and so on such that Pool 6 is a list of all qualifying initial scores for OASIS Small Business consideration, organized by ranking initial score for any offeror able to certify as small for OASIS?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The scores from any Offeror, regardless of contract or size status, will be applied for whatever Pools the Offeror is applying and qualified for.
660	L.5.1.4 Professional Employee Compensation Plan	FAR 52.222-46 (a) implies it is applicable to recompetes ("(a) Recompensation of service contracts ..."). Please provide clarification as to how this requirement is applicable to OASIS, which is not a recompete, or consider including clarification in the final solicitation.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> This is a regulatory requirement.
661	L.5.1.4 Professional Employee Compensation Plan	FAR 52.222-46 states: "Supporting information will include data, such as recognized national and regional compensation surveys and studies of professional, public and private organizations, used in establishing the total compensation structure." Please indicate, or consider including in the final solicitation, which sources GSA will accept as "recognized" for proposal responses to OASIS so as to allow for more consistent comparison of responses to OASIS..
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Use your best judgement.

662	L.6 Volume 6	Please provide clarification, either through the blog or in the final solicitation, regarding how the Price Reduction Clause is to be addressed with GSA OASIS. Specifically, it would be extremely important for Offerors to understand whether a company with an existing GSA schedule with Labor Categories that are similar to those defined in the OASIS RFP were to be awarded OASIS with a lower rate than its other GSA Schedule contract, the Price Reduction Clause would require the vendor to lower their price on the other GSA Schedule.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The Price Reduction Clause does not apply to the OASIS contract. Accordingly, we have no opinion regarding this clause.
663	L.3. Instructions, page 75 (OSB)	"The Offeror's proposal shall be formatted in six (6) separate electronic folders that correspond to the Volumes identified in Section L.4. Offerors shall upload each proposal folder into the AAS Business Systems Portal (formerly known as ITSS). Offerors are hereby instructed to register in the AAS Business Systems Portal at least one month prior to submitting proposal documents."  Will there be an Action Item Link in ITSS Action Items to upload the proposal, even if the module is not fully functional?
		<b>RESPONSE: Answer pending.</b>
664	Page 13, B.2.5.1 Ceiling Rates for T&M and L-H Orders	The last paragraph states the ceiling rates for Years 11 through 15 will be adjusted based on the Year 10 Bureau of Labor Statistics Economic Cost Index. Since OASIS is a 10 year contract, is the expectation that the Years 11 - 15 ceiling rates will apply only to those task orders extending up to 5 years after the OASIS term expires as noted in Section F.3 - Period of Performance Term?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
665	Page 41, H.4.2.1 NAICS Pools	This section states that task orders will be solicited under one of 6 established NAICS Pools. This approach seems to contradict GSA's intent to provide a contract wherein the full range of services can be acquired under a single task order. How does GSA intend to procure services that falls under various NAICS codes within two or more Pools since there may be a limited number of vendors receiving awards for each Pool?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> A requirement may contain elements of every single NAICS code that can be performed under OASIS. The OCO must select the one NAICS code that represents the most significant portion of each requirement to represent that requirement. That selection determines the size standard, and accordingly, the Pool in which the requirement would be competed in. The Pools are not functional. They are only based upon size standard.
666	M.5, Page 100 L.5.4.3 Page 77 L.5.1.6.2 Page 81	We acknowledge your rebalancing of the point system to put less weight on small business compliance. In the April 12 clarifications, Question #49, you answer "No" to the question "Is there an alternative for a transitioning SB to get credit for meeting socio-economic goals?" In answer 98 of the same document, you state "a company can potentially be awarded a contract even if their subcontracting goals do not match those provided in the solicitation." In any event, it appears as though a business that has graduated the small business program relatively recently is disadvantaged on the points table even if it is capable of meeting the OASIS requirements.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Companies in just about any given situation, at any given time, can claim some disadvantage to any proposed solicitation. Simply stated, we don't gauge the solicitation to try to have every unrecognized tier of organization that exists as part of our awardee pool. We are looking for the highest technically rated regardless of corporate standing or self-reported grouping. The saving grace for Industry partners, however, is that while a company may not be ready for OASIS now, they know what they have to do in order to be ready for OASIS in the future through an on-ramp.
667	L.5.3.1 (page 85) and M.5 (page 100-101)	Can GSA provide additional clarity to what constitutes a "project"? For example can two related tasks under a single contract be considered as a single distinct project if they are closely aligned in developing a deliverable to the client? What criteria would determine the definition of a project?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
668	L.5.4.1	Section L.5.4.1 states - "For each of the five (5) Relevant Experience projects submitted under Section L.5.3.1., the Government will retrieve past performance information from the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) database that links to the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), therefore, no proposal submission is necessary. " Industry has no control over whether or not our government customers enter CPARS into this system. Will there be any alternate method for obtaining past performance information?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to this question.
669	Section A.1.2 GSAR 552.219.219-71 Notice to Offerors of Subcontracting Plan Requirements (MAR 2012)	Would the Government please elaborate on what constitutes a creative and innovative program for involving small business concerns in the performance of this contract.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is in the judgement of the Offeror.
670	B.2 Task Order Pricing	Has the contractor's pricing been determined to be fair and reasonable upon award of an OASIS vehicle?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Exactly which pricing are you referring to?

671	B.2.1 :abpr Categories and Standard Occupational Classifications	Can GSA elaborate on use of the BLS SOC system for preparation for submitting pricing proposals at the task order level.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to this question.
672	B.2.3 Cost Reimbursement Task Orders Page 12 paragraph 4	Is the acquisition of non-commercial items on a T&M or fixed price task order allowed if noncommercial items are listed under a cost reimbursable CLIN?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes. This would constitute a hybrid task order and is permissible.
673	B.2.5 T&M and L-H Task Orders	Can the GSA describe how ancillary subcontract labor is to be addressed in proposals by the contractor at the task order level? Please confirm that ancillary subcontract labor will be considered an ODC?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Subcontract labor will be considered according to the contract type and the applicable clauses implemented at the task order level. We need a more specific question to answer your first question.
674	B.2.5.1 Ceiling Rates for T&M and L-H Task Orders	For FAR 52-216-30 and Far 52-26-31 (with an exception to fair opportunity) is the OCO authorized to exceed the OASIS ceiling rates for those labor categories that include Secret/Top Secret/SCI labor and/or OCONUS locations?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
675	B.2.5.1 Ceiling Rates for T&M and L-H Task Orders	Please confirm that the ceiling rates do not apply to FAR 52.216-29 or FAR 52.216-31 when there is not an exception to fair opportunity?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> T&M Ceiling Rates only apply when adequate price competition is not present or anticipated.
676	B.3 Ancillary Support	Can GSA provide us with the timeframe they anticipate the OASIS Management Module will be available to awardees?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We anticipate the OMM to be operational by contract award.
677	B.3 Ancillary Support	Can an OASIS task order include only product (hardware/software/ODCs) with not supporting labor component? This is not allowed under the Alliant GWAC (IT Services contract).
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. The requirement must be based on the performance of professional labor within the scope of OASIS. OASIS task orders may include hardware/software/ODCs as ancillary support, but not be the purpose of the task order.
678	B.3.1 Specialized Professional Services Labor	Can specialized professional services labor categories be added to the contractor's individual OASIS Master Contract (vs. all awardees)?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No.
679	B.3.6 Materials and Equipment	Can the contractor apply indirect costs to Materials and Equipment in accordance with the contractor's usual accounting practices?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes. Contractors shall identify this in task order solicitations and include it in their pricing submissions to task order solicitations.
680	B.3.7 Subcontracting	Can the contractor apply indirect costs (G&A, M&H, etc.) to subcontract labor included as an ODC (ancillary labor)?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> All costs shall be presented in accordance with the rules of their acceptable accounting system unless otherwise specified at the task order level.
681	E.1 Inspection and Acceptance	Why did GSA include FAR Clause 52.246-4 (Inspection of Services - Fixed Price) and not include 52.246-5 and 52.246-6?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Because those clauses don't apply to the services provided at the contract level.
682	F.4.1 Deliverable and Reporting Requirements	eSRS only allows one SSR be submitted at the GSA Agency level. A company can only submit one SSR for a given DUNS number (contractors have multiple GSA contracts under a given DUNS number). Please clarify how does GSA what OASIS contractors to report at the SSR level?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are working on clarifying this.
683	F.4.1 Deliverable and Reporting Requirements	OASIS Management Module - Deliverable states that that we have to update the Management Module on a monthly basis including Invoice, and CAF data. Can GSA change the requirement to update the CAF data on a quarterly basis in the Module aligned with G.3.1 requirement? This will help to decrease the administrative burden for the contractor.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
684	F.4.1 Deliverable and Reporting Requirements	Please correct ACCORD 25, Certificate Insurance to ACORD 25, Insurance Certificate
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Thank you for the edit.
685	F.4.1 Deliverable and Reporting Requirements	Section G.3.8 requires posting of FAPIIS in the Central Contractor Registration Database. Request that the language be changed to: "posting the required information in SAMS".
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We shall.
686	G.3.2.1 TO Award Data	Will a Template be provided for the TO Award data report. Will this report be submitted to the OASIS PMO or within the OASIS Management Module? Will TO data for orders awarded in the AAS populate in the OMM?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We aren't sure right now. We hope so, but are examining systems capabilities.
687	G.3.2.3 Invoice Data	In TO awarded in the AAS, which block of the Form 300 are you referring to as the Task Order Award Number? Number 5 of this section requires for Cost Type TO that the Direct Labor rate of each employee be entered into the OMM, was your intent to actually have the fully burdened rate that we would be charging the government included?

		<b>RESPONSE:</b> First question, the answer is block 2. Second question, the answer is no. Fully burdened rates do not apply to Cost Reimbursement. We are asking for the direct labor rate.
688	G.3.2.4 CAF Payment Data	Is it the intent of the government to have a function in the OMM such as is presently used in the AAS GWAC Module to allow for the calculation , tracking and payment of the CAF? If no,t how does the government intend to track CAF payments over the life span of the OASIS contract?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are cloning the GMM and making enhancements to suit our needs.
689	G.3.3.2 SSR Reporting	Will a specific e-mail address be established to report SSR submission for GSA? Our current SSR references code 4700 for GSA reporting purposes, will this suffice for the OASIS contract?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Answer pending.
690	H.6.3 Cost Accounting Standards (CAS)/L.5.5.2 Cost Accounting Standards/M.4.5.2 Cost Accounting Standards	Companies that are undergoing current reviews due to company reorganization often have accounting issues that need to be negotiated and worked out with the DCAA. These are often a function of different interpretations of the FAR. It can take 12-24 months for DCAA to finalize negotiations and issue adequacy on any of the 19 standards that are in contention while under review. Will the GSA provide clarification on pass/fail criteria for CAS compliance? Companies under review may have issues that are being negotiated with DCAA and the negotiation process can take 12-24 months.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We need the question to be more specific in order to provide an answer.
691	H.6.4 Forward Pricing Rate Agreements and Approved Billing Rates	This section indicates that the OASIS website will maintain a record of which OASIS Contractor has n FPRA or approved billing rates for the CO, as applicable. Will this information only be visible to the OCO or will it be available to all OASIS awardees? This information should not be available to other contractors. Recommend the GSA take steps to ensure the security of this information from the OASIS Contractors.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are looking into this now. No proprietary information shall be released on the OASIS website.
692	J.1 Labor Categories and Definitions - Attachment (1)	Junior, Journeyman and Senior Labor categories have specific requirements for years of experience and college degrees. Can the Government provide clarification on the policy and protocol for substituting years of experience for college degrees? Experience substituted for education is allowed under GSA Schedules and other type contracts. By excluding this substitution the Government is potentially eliminating many qualified applicants with vast experience.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Currently, there are no substitutions at the contract level, but we allowed for deviations at the task order level.
693	L.5.3.1. Relevant Experience	Minimum Requirements - If the experience cited meets all 6 criteria AND was performed as a subcontractor, will this be acceptable as one of the five (5) distinct projects?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. Performance as a subcontractor is not acceptable.
694		How frequently will vendors be required to recertify size status -- annually or after the base period before exercising the 5-year option period?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Recertification is required prior to the exercise of the option at year 5.
695		There is no mention of subcontractors, only existing CTAs. Hence, it appears proposals are based on the prime's experience and past performance only. Recommend considering small business offerors to propose subcontractors/teaming partners similar to the US Coast Guard's Technical, Acquisition and Business Support Services, which must remain intact the first 2 years of the IDIQ contract. As long as the Prime is complying with the Subcontracting restriction to perform at least 50% of performance, then what difference does it make in the proposal process? Additionally, why restrict small businesses from entering into CTAs for the purpose of proposing on the OASIS SB solicitation?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses on similar questions.
696		The Program Manager for OASIS BP IDIQ requires a Master's Degree and at least one PMI certification. The Contracts Manager requires a Master's Degree and at least one current NCMA certification. Again, this is unreasonably restrictive to require a Master's Degree for IDIQ contract management, task order tracking and reporting. As long as offerors can demonstrate experience with IDIQ contract management and reporting, such as 8a STARS, DHS-wide TABSS, etc., then what value is the Master's Degree and PMI/NCMA certification if the candidates do not have Federal contracting experience or experience with existing IDIQ contracts requiring the same management oversight as OASIS SB? Additionally, the RFI document seems to be in conflict with Section J.4, Attachment (4) that requires 5, 10 or 15 years of experience to be eligible but ineligibility/eligibility is not stated for the Master's Degree, PMI certification or NCMA certification.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses on similar questions.
697		The Past Performance requirement to have data in CPARS is again restrictive. While CPARS is a Federal system required for agencies to use, many agencies are NOT using it. Why should offerors be penalized for agencies' noncompliance?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We allow for CPARS or survey.
698	Section H.4.2.1, Page 40	If a business is submitting as a large business in Pools 1,2,3 and a small business in Pools 4,5,6 how do we complete the scoring system sections? Understand we do not submit two proposals – one for small business and one for large business. Do we submit two scoring system tables –one for small business and one for the unrestricted procurement?

		<b>RESPONSE:</b> If competing on both contracts, then you submit 2 proposals. One for OASIS and one for OASIS SB.
699	Section M.5, Page 100	It is not clear why we are scored on CMMI Maturity Levels since IT/Software development is an ancillary Service. If it is not a core discipline, this item should be removed from the scoring system.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses on similar questions.
700	Section M.5, Page 100	Past Performance section of the Scoring Table, the rating section penalizes contractors who do not perform non-federal projects. It would seem the government would want contractors that are familiar with working with the government and only allow points for such work.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We aren't sure how you are reading the scoring chart, but past performance for non-federal projects is scored much lower than federal projects.
701	Section M.5, Page 100	CPARS ratings, it is not clear how the government will determine an 'average' for ratings. CPARS have six components on which contractors are rated: Quality of Product/Service, Schedule, Cost Control, Business Relations, Management of Key personnel, Utilization of Small Business. The government needs to clarify how to average the rating – if there are 4 out of the six with 'Exceptional' and two with 'Very Good' does the contractor average the rating to 'Exceptional'?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses on similar questions.
702	Section M.5, Page 101	Earned Value Management System (EVMS) ANSI/EIA Standard – if we have all of the components in place for compliance can we so state? Or do we need a certification of audit?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Self certification is not sufficient.
703	Section L.5.3.1, Page 85	Please clarify what is meant by total award value of <u>at least \$5million Per Year</u> ? Do you mean a single task order that is valued at \$5M or more for a period of performance that is 12 months? Or an IDIQ contract that has a ceiling of at least \$5M per year? This seems to be a rather high dollar threshold.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses on similar questions.
704	H.11.2, 54	Can a SB offer a proposal for both restrictive and unrestrive contracts?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> If you mean can a business submit a proposal for OASIS and a proposal for OASIS SB, then the answer is Yes.
705	SECTION G.2.6.1; PAGE 29	According to Contract Key personnel it is required that the COPM and COCM be assigned for resolving OASIS issues to include traveling for PMR and OASIS SB meeting/conferences. Question: Are these two positions chargeable to the contract?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> If you mean to ask can contractors bill the OASIS Program Office for the expenses associated with Key Personnel, then the answer is no.
706	Unrestricted Solicitation F.4.2 (page 26) & H.6.5 (page 44)	The Table at F.4.2 states that the Contractor shall maintain an Approved Purchasing System; however, H.65 states that Contractors are encouraged to have a Purchasing System approved by DCMA. Can GSA please clarify this issue?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
707	Unrestricted Solicitation H.6.4 (page 44); L.5.5.4 (page 89); L.6.2 (page 93)	The referenced sections cite Forward Pricing Rate Agreements (FPRA) for verification of a Contractor's indirect rates for pricing purposes. Will the Government also accept an offeror's Forward Pricing Rate Proposal (FPRP) as verification of their proposed indirect rates? This approach is consistent with the offeror's disclosed accounting practices and has been accepted by other Government agencies as a form of verifying their proposed indirect rates.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We will consider Forward Price Rate Agreements and Forward Price Rate Recommendations.
708	NAICs Pools: Section H.4.2.1., Page 40; Section L., General Over All Section J.3., Attachement (3), Page 2	The Government intends to award multiple contracts in 6 separate Pools. If an Offeror/Contractor intends to bid in multiple NAICs Pools does the Offeror submit a separate proposal for each NAICs Pool or can the Offeror combine the NAICs Pools they intend to bid on in one proposal submission?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> For multiple Pools on the same contract, Offerors need only submit one proposal. If competing on both contracts, then two proposals are required, one for each contract.
709	Contract Access Feee (CAF) Secton B.1.5., Page 11; Secton G.3.1., Page 30	The Draft Solicitation states " <i>Total CAF Remittance is calculated as follows: Total Paid Invoice(s) multiplied by the CAF Percentage.</i> " Does the "Total Paid Invoice(s)" refer to labor only?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. Total Invoice Paid means exactly what it says. CAF applies to any and all expenses invoiced on a task order.

710	Section M.5. SCORING SYSTEM Section L.5.3. VOLUME 3 - RELEVANT EXPERIENCE Section L.5.3.1 Page 94	As currently constructed, the scoring system only allows the top score to be considered among the five past performances (PP) allocated across the \$3M, \$4M and \$5M per year thresholds. This allows some potential gaming of the scoring in that if a contractor had 4 PP that met the \$4M threshold and 1 PP that met the \$5M threshold, they would receive 300 points ( 4 x 75 for the \$4M PPs) as 300 would be the top score. If they elected to list the \$5M PP as a \$4M PP, since \$5M is greater than \$4M, they would receive 375 points ( 5 x 75 for the \$4M PPs) or 75 points more than if they correctly categorized their respective PP by the dollar thresholds. One could expect that some contractors will realize this (each criteria is a subset of the next level criteria) and take advantage while others may not and would therefore be at a competitive disadvantage. Suggest rather than using the top score technique, GSA consider using the total score from all PPs eliminating any incentive to recast the PP for points advantage and in doing so provide a better measure of the totality of the relevant past performance for the contractor while maintaining the relative ranking the scoring is designed to create.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> You seem to be misunderstanding something about the scoring mechanism. Each relevant experience example and associated past performance will be scored independently.
711	Section M.5. SCORING SYSTEM Section L.5.3. VOLUME 3 - RELEVANT EXPERIENCE Section L.5.3.1 Page 94	As currently constructed, the scoring system only allows the top score to be considered among the five past performances (PP) allocated across the 4, 5 or 6 core disciplines. This allows some potential gaming of the scoring in that if a contractor had 4 PPs that met the 5 core discipline threshold and 1 PP that met the 6 discipline threshold, they would receive 300 points ( 4 x 75 for the 5 core PPs) as 300 would be the top score. If they elected to list the 6 core PP as a 5 core PP, since 6 is in the greater than 5 core discipline set, they would receive 375 points ( 5 x 75 for the 5 core discipline PPs) or 75 points more than if they correctly categorized their respective PP by core disciplines. One could expect that some contractors will realize this (each criteria is a subset of the next level criteria) and take advantage while others may not and would therefore be at a competitive disadvantage. Suggest rather than using the top score technique, GSA consider using the total score from all PPs eliminating any incentive to recast the PP for points advantage and in doing so provide a better measure of the totality of the relevant past performance for the contractor while
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> You seem to be misunderstanding something about the scoring mechanism. Each relevant experience example and associated past performance will be scored independently.
712	B.2.1 Direct Labor Rates (4th para), Page 11	It is mentioned that the BLS ranges will be available on the OASIS website. Currently, the BLS ranges are not listed on the OASIS website. When can we expect those to be posted? Will contractors be required to reference ranges on the o-net website or only use what is posted to the OASIS website?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The Direct Labor Rate ranges are in Attachment J.2 of the draft solicitation.
713	J.2, Attachment (2), Pages 1 & 2	It appears that the minimum rate listed is actually the 2011 median rate from BLS (found on the o-net website). Does this minimum rate and median rate change by state? B.2.1 states that rate information for each state, metropolitan, and non-metropolitan area in the United States will be provided so this may mean that the rate ranges listed in J2, Attachment (2) is representative. Will the Government please clarify?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
714	J.2, Attachment (2), Pages 1 & 2	It appears that the Junior level positions were mapped to the SOC codes and matching rates. Please confirm this is accurate. If so, what was the basis for mapping the other two levels of each position?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
715	L.4 Proposal Format, Page 77	Do the instructions to use Arial allow for fonts in the Arial family (e.g. Arial Narrow)?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We will clarify the language regarding fonts and sizes.
716	L.4 Proposal Format, Page 77	We appreciate the Government taking the questions about font size under advisement. 12 point Arial is a large font and greatly reduces the readability of tables and figures. Please confirm that for tables and figures that are not predominantly text, offerors are allowed to use smaller font. We suggest to 8 point font.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We will clarify the language regarding fonts and sizes.
717	L.4 Proposal Format, Page 77	Are 11x17 pages allowed? And if so, do they count as two pages?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. They are no allowed.
718	L.5.3.1, Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements, Page 85	Past Performance requires the integration of at least Four (4) out of the Six (6) Oasis Core Disciplines. Please further define "integration" as used in this reference.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
719	G.3.1., p.30	Contract Access Fee (CAF) - will the Government allow for changes to cost proposals when GSA increases the CAF %?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We will address this issue when we include the CAF language.
720	H.4.2., p.40	"The OCO has the responsibility to determine which predominant NAICS code applies to a task order solicitation, whether or not the task order is unrestricted or set-aside, including..." -- This statement seems to imply that OASIS Small Business may not be wholly restricted to small businesses. Perhaps an artifact of the Unrestricted contract text?

		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. You are reading too much into this. We are simply describing OCO responsibilities. All contractors on OASIS SB shall be small businesses and all task order requirements placed under OASIS SB are set-asides.
721	H.7.3., p.49	Contractor OASIS Webpage -- Please clarify that this webpage is a contractor-provided website on their own corporate page supplied at the contractor's expense.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> That is correct.
722	General	Is GSA OASIS another contract vehicle in addition to the existing GSA schedules? Or, is it intended to replaced some of the current schedules? If so, which ones?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The OASIS contracts are designed to be a complement to the current GSA offerings in the Schedules program much like the relationship between the Alliant contracts and Schedule 70. The OASIS contracts are designed to fill a void in GSA's current contract offerings which cannot address cost reimbursement contracting as well as address some other key issues.
723	General	Based on our overall review of the draft RFP, including the minimum experience requirements and the evaluation criteria, it appears that GSA has set the bar extremely high and has made this difficult for small businesses to pursue. For example, it will be difficult for small businesses in Pool 1 (\$14M business size standard) to show five contracts each exceeding \$2M/year, performed within the last five years.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We have changed the requirements here based upon feedback. Please see previous responses to similar concerns/questions/recommendations.
724	General	Why would you make a requirement that firms have performed a cost reimbursable contract? The government preference is for firm, fixed price and for firms that have only pursued firm, fixed price contracting this is unnecessarily disqualifying? Instead, you could show a requirement to be able to properly manage (accounting) a cost reimbursable contract consistently with the FAR .
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We have changed the requirements here based upon feedback. Please see previous responses to similar concerns/questions/recommendations.
725	General	We understand our role in marketing this contract and making efforts to attract perspective customers to utilize the OASIS SB contract vehicle. In addition to the contractor's marketing plan, how will GSA market and promote this contract vehicle to encourage agencies to use it? We have found in many instances that agencies prefer to use their own contracting offices and vehicles, despite efforts to market the advantages of the GSA vehicle. Will you recognize the needs of contractors to market all of their GSA vehicles?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We will market the OASIS contracts through any and all means available to us.
726	Section H.4.2, Page 40	What criteria will GSA use to determine whether a task order solicitation will be issued as unrestricted versus small business? In addition, what criteria will GSA use to determine whether a solicitation is sole-source or competitive? And, finally, what criteria will GSA use to determine whether to accept a firm fixed price proposal vice a cost plus proposal?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> GSA does not establish criteria for clients in determining whether a requirement should be set aside, sole sourced, or what contract type should be used. That is up to the policies, procedures, and judgement of the client agency and OCO.
727	Section H.11.1, Page 54	If a successfully performing small business grows out of a particular NAICS pool and has to apply to be considered for a NAICS pool with a larger size standard, why do they have to submit another proposal that is essentially identical to the original version of the OASIS SB solicitation?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> They are not identical standards. The standards for evaluation of OASIS and OASIS SB are significantly different.
728	Section L.5.1.7, Page 79	When the GSA refers to an existing CTA Partnership or Joint Venture agreement, does this refer to a CTA or JV under an existing GSA schedule or under any contract? Would the GSA consider an existing JV that was formed under another contract if it can show relevant experience, past performance, and systems, certifications, and resources?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Any contract.
729	Section L.5.1.7, Page 79	Can the GSA explain why new CTAs or JVs are not allowed for purposes of submitting a proposal under GSA OASIS? This seems inconsistent with long-standing GSA policy supporting teaming arrangements under the Schedules.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
730	Section L.5.3.1, Page 80	Please define what the GSA means by "distinct projects." Does projects include contracts, as well as individual task orders and can it include subtask in complex task orders that set out multiple work requirements?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
731	Section L.5.3.2.1 and L.5.3.2.2, Page 81	Please explain the difference between Paragraph A (Background) and Paragraph B (Relevant Experience Matrix) in Section J.5, Attachment (5). Are the projects that are included in Paragraph A different from the ones provided in Paragraph B?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> They are the same.
732	Section L.5.4.1 and L.5.4.2, Page 82	Are the projects evaluated for past performance under Section L.5.3.1 (and in Paragraph A, Background in Section J.5, Attachment (5)) different than those evaluated for past performance in Section L.5.3.2 (and in Paragraph B, Relevant Experience Matrix, Section J.5, Attachment (5))? What does the GSA mean by "No Proposal Submission" in the Past Performance subheader in Section L.5.4.1? In addition, what does GSA mean by "Proposal Submission, if Applicable" in the subheader in Section L.5.4.2?

		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The projects are the same. If CPARS exist for the project, no proposal submission is required for that project. If CPARS does not exist for the project, Offerors must complete a past performance survey for proposal submission.
733	Section M.5, Page 94	The scoring system shown for relevant experience in Section M.5 is not consistent with the minimum requirements presented in Section L.5.3.1. Specifically, the scoring system for relevant experience shows projects being scored if they exceed \$3, \$4, or \$5 million per year, yet Section L.5.3.1 (Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements) indicates projects should have a total award value of at least \$2 million per year. Likewise, Section M.5 shows projects receiving scores if they integrate four (4), five (5), or all six (6) of the core disciplines, but Section L.5.3.1 indicates that projects should involve the performance and/or integration of at least three (3) of the six (6) core disciplines. Finally, the scoring matrix in Section M.5 refers to projects including OCONUS work, yet this is not a requirement in Section L.5.3.1.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
734	Drft Solic. G.3.4.1 Page 33	To support the development of smaller businesses, can CPAR be provided for smaller subcontractors to aid in the development of their past performance?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We do not understand the question. Please clarify.
735	Drft Solic L.6.2. Page 88	Would the GSA consider the cost of the infrastructure required to support an OASIS procurement and adjust the profit and overhead rates accordingly?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We do not understand the question. Please clarify.
736	Drft Solic. B.2.1. Page 11	How will OASIS accommodate pricing for subject matter experts in areas of a specific need that may exceed the DOL data, with clearances, and a Ph.D.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Ceilings can be exceeded for clearance considerations.
737	Drft Solic. H.3.1. Page 39	Even as a SB set aside, shouldn't the OASIS Primes have to meet the Federal standards for each of the 5 set aside areas? The 23.5% minimum including those specific standards for each of the five areas should be accommodated by the SB in each of the pools as well.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We do not understand the question. Please clarify.
738	DRFT SOLIC: M3 Page 91	Is there the possibility of more than 40 awardees to Pool 1 as hypothetically suggested in the Section M3 example?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
739	DRFT SOLIC. M3 Page 91	Given the GSA provided example in Section M3, does the government have the primary intent of awarding Pool 1 to socio-economic offerors?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We do not understand the question. Please clarify.
740	Section L.3 Page 80	How long does the Government anticipate allowing the contractors to respond to the final RFP?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> 30 days.
741	Page 85, Section L.5.3.1 Relevant Experience	The OASIS 6 core disciplines do not gibe with the 6 pools. If I am offering under pool 6, it appears that I don't need experience in pool 6, but in any of the 6 core disciplines; how will an OCO be comfortable that the pool of Vendors in pool 6 is capable in that NAICS (as that is how they are to choose the Pool for their RFP)?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see previous responses to similar questions.
742	J5	The matrix in J5 seems to make no provisions for reposting past performance as a subcontractor. Will past performance citations be limited to those performed as a prime contractor?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
743	n/a	In response to the changes decided (based on Q&As), we understand the offeror's accounting system must either be audited by DCAA or an independent 3rd party accounting firm. As long as there hasn't been a subsequent negative determination related to the accounting system (from an incurred cost or proposal audit), is there a time frame by which the audit must have been completed for the initial determination to be considered valid?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> By the date of proposal submission.
744	G.2.6 on page 29	Can the COPM and COCM be the same person if someone meets the qualifications of both positions?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> For the situation where a single person has the requisite experience to satisfy both positions, the COPM and COCM may be the same person. However, Offerors should exercise extreme caution in assigning these duties to a single individual. It is our experience that this is better handled by two people.
745	Section G, G.3.3.2, Page 35.	Please clarify whether the Summary Subcontract Report (SSR) will be required at the Contract level. We recommend that it be required at the Agency level.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are examining this right now.
746	Section B.1.5, page 11; and Section G.3.1, page 31.	Is a cap on the Contract Access Fee (CAF) planned? If yes, we recommend that the CAF cap be implemented across the entire contract or according to customer defined period of performance (transition, base, options) versus contract year (each 365 day period from award date). Many government contractor accounting systems can't accommodate both the customer specified POP and the CAF required contract years (in cases where these timeframes differ).
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are not planning on implementing a cap.
		<b>End of Questions</b>