

#	Relevant Section	Comment
1	L.5.6	To earn the maximum 1 credit for PP/SB Utilization, is it required that, across the Federal Prime Contract QPs, all have to have utilized small businesses ? For example, among the five Federal Prime Contracts QPs, four utilized small businesses and each received CPARS Small Business Utilization score of 4, but one project did not utilize small businesses, and does not have SB CPARS score. Please confirm for such a scenario, the bidder would qualify for the 1 credit.
2	L.5	Please confirm if the "Legal Business Name" field in FPDS report showing the company name of the offeror is acceptable, even though the " Ultimate Parent Legal Business Name " may be different.
3	L.5.1.7.1	How many key phrases / " specific written passages in the SOW " mapping to Functional Subareas in J.P-5 are required for each project to substantiate scope relevancy for Qualifying Project Experience?
4	L.5.3.1	Paragraph 5 of RFP Section L.5.3 states, " FEPs are not required to be relevant to the scope of the proposed Domain. " Please confirm that the projects used to meet FEP-Competitive in MA Environments do not need to meet any of the other requirements for past performance (Avg CPARS, SB CPARS) or QPE (Scale, Integrated Experience, Management & Staffing, Specialized Functional Experience) .
5	L.5.2.3.5; L.5.1.7, L.5.2.3.5	RFP Section L.5.1.7 states: "For example, the Statement of Work (SOW), or Performance Work Statement (PWS) of the Master Contract is not acceptable as supporting documentation for a task order." But with certain specialized functional experience, sometimes only the Master Contract materials explicitly state the required element, such as (for example) that the project falls under CERCLA requirements. Would the government consider allowing use of the Master Agreement award document/PWS/SOW as verification for specialized functional experience elements, or at the very least, specifically for the CERCLA requirement?
6	RFP C.2.5.1 and J.P-4 Ent Sol Domain tab	Would the Government consider adding NAICS 541690 back to ENT auto relevant list? This was an auto relevant code for ENT projects in the November 2022 draft, but was removed from the March 2023 Draft. This NAICS code includes a great deal of relevant work for Enterprise Solutions Domain with \$250M value and is frequently used by FEDSIM.
7	L.5.2.3.3	A project may be proven relevant (under L.5.2.3.1) to domains via the auto relevant NAICS or PSC codes. Since these codes are in the FPDS reports and easy for the government to verify, would the government consider allowing the use of the auto-relevant codes to verify multiple distinct functional areas for scoring under L.5.2.3.3?
8	B.9	Why was JTR removed in travel section?
9	C.2.1.1	Regarding the codes added, offerors are unable to receive past performance except for 11, 12 and 13. Offerors can do the work on the project for the rest of the codes, but not receive credit except for the ones listed. The concern is that the qualification determination does not reflect the work on the contract.
10	C.2.2.1	NAICS Code, 541310 is on there despite being a Brooks Act code, in section C.5, FAR part 36 reference is specified to not be within the scope.
11	L.5.1.3.2	In section L.5.1.3.2 it states, Proposed Subcontractors, if applicable TBD. What does that mean?
12	L.5.1.8	Individual Subcontracting Plan Submissions Required for OTSBs states in bold and underlined "Commercial and Master Subcontracting Plans will not be accepted." Commerical Subcontracting Plans are the standard. Why are they not acceptable?
13	L	If offereors apply for multiple domains and do not quality on one of them, are they excluded?
14	L	Regarding CMI, two types of CM are considered acceptable, services and development. Why were these two CMIs selected and the others were not included? I.E., why was the supply chain CMI not included?
15	H.11.1	Many companies are allocating resources based off of the assumption that a open season will allow further competition. Could stronger language on whether or not on-ramp will occur be added?

16	L.5.1.7.1	DRFP 2 Section L.5.1.7.1 states that the offeror may use "Any other verifiable contractual document (e.g. Contract Data Requirements Listing (CDRL), SF30 - Amendment of Solicitation/Modification of Contract, Staffing Plan incorporated into the contract, Letters of Technical Direction (LOTD), subcontracting plans, approved/paid invoices, contract deliverables, final proposal, award fee documents, etc.)" as validation documentation. Some contract deliverables are not marked with the contract number(s), date of submission, etc. Will the Government accept contract deliverables that are not marked as such if the offeror indicates in the PWS or CDRL which deliverable it is?
17	L.5.1.4	We request that GSA restore the MRCL language from RFP Draft 1 to ensure that MRCL's allow Offerors to earn credit for QPs, FEPs, and past performance from Parent, Affiliates, and Subsidiaries .
18	L.5.1.4	We recommend that QPs, FEPs, and past performance from resources that can be leveraged for credit through the MRCL be added back in (they were removed from RFP Draft 2).
19	L.5.1.4	Why did GSA take the QPs and FEPs out of the DRFP2? We would like GSA to change it back and run this solicitation more like Polaris, GSA 8(a) STARSIII, ASTRO, etc.
20	L.5.6	As GSA originally explained the concept for this contract, it would be a place where firms can register their independent capabilities with clarity for Contracting Officers. In the 2nd DRFP, what GSA has is an SB contract where single small and 8(a) firms cannot achieve qualification without complex teaming arrangements that have proven unwieldy for Contracting Officers and clients. Complex teams and JVs will dominate the SB contract – by far. Would GSA consider boosting the value of independent bidder's experience with respect to JVs and subcontracting arrangements?
21	M.2	With the addition of CLINs in DRFP2, GSA has added substantial complexity to the contract which may make it less desirable for use among Contracting Officers. Can GSA peel back on the CLIN addition and restrictions?
22	M.2	With the addition of CLINs in Draft RFP2, GSA seems to be recreating something akin to the pre-consolidated Schedules program and the equivalent of maintaining multiple contracts for work within a single domain. Will GSA consider removing the restrictions to awards and task order bidding at the CLIN level within domains?
23	Attachment J.P-9 OASIS+ Domain Qualifications Matrix	For the SB DRFP2, the high threshold heavily encourages individual SBs to enter into teaming arrangements in order to meet qualifications. This approach provides an unintended advantage to teams. We recommend restructuring the values so that additional points are granted to offerors with unitary authority, decrement points for JVs and teams with no experience working together, and to lower the threshold for SBs.
24	Attachment J.P-9 OASIS+ Domain Qualifications Matrix	Could GSA please clarify what documentation or proof is required to be uploaded into the OSP to submit for the SDVOSB OASIS+ Solicitation for an SDVOSB business who satisfies the requirements above and has submitted their certification package to SBA and are awaiting application approval?
25	L	Please reconsider this idea of allocating total contract AAV across multiple domains for multi scope contract QPs. We would recommend that GSA use the total contract AAV for relevance for multi-scope QPs and not rely on sub-allocations that cannot be completed as envisioned by GSA for contracts that do not map CLINs to scope, domain, or functional area. We would also note that most of the federal government, when evaluating relevance and past performance, does not ask for allocated contract value, but rather asks for total contract value to prove these evaluation factors. b.If GSA does not provide this requested relief (of using total AAV and not allocated AAV), the impact would be significant to small and OTSBs who are relying on reuse of multi scope QPs across multiple domains to qualify for as many domains and solicitations as they can qualify for. This approach seems at odds with GSA's stated goal of maximizing the on-ramp of highly qualified vendors to OASIS +. As a former small business that has just recently grown out of our small business qualifications through successful GSA PSS leveraging over the last 20 years, and with our new MAS schedule for the next 20 years, we would strongly encourage GSA to allow and encourage and streamline the reuse of multi-scope contracts across multiple domains (with appropriate PWS mapping and not CLIN mapping) and avoid AAV allocation. Otherwise there are many small and small mid-sized businesses who may not have enough contracts to satisfy QPs across multiple domains if we cannot reuse multi-scope contracts across multiple domains easily.
26	L.5.1.3.1	Does GSA consider the OASIS+ family of 6 solicitations (Total SB, 8(a), HUBZone, WOSB, and UR) to be "specific procurements" with respect to the rules under 13 CFR 125.9(b)(3)(i)? Has GSA consulted and gained consensus/approval from SBA on this response, as the answer can have a significant impact on JVs operating under SBA-approved Mentor Protégé Agreements who intend to submit proposals under OASIS +?

27	JP-8	<p>To satisfy the JP-8 scoring criteria to show use of multiple LABCATS and Security Clearances - as neither FPDS nor the contract award docs (such as the SF 1449/SF33/SF26) show LABCAT or clearance requirements by individual, would uploading a copy of the RFP or proposal staffing (or pricing matrices, since many of our federal agencies combine the staffing and pricing matrices together), coupled with the contract award document (SF-1449, SF-33, etc.), satisfy the required proof in which these matrices either map names or labor categories in the staffing or pricing matrix?</p> <p>a. In many cases, the RFP does not require naming of proposed non key employees, and often requests staffing by LABCAT only. Will these staffing/pricing matrices with labcats, but not employee names, be acceptable to show proof for both # Labcats and Security Clearance proof?</p>
28	L	<p>If an offeror submits for multiple domains under a given solicitation, and one score fails to qualify the vendor in just one domain, is the offeror still eligible for continued evaluation and award of the other requested Domains? Will OSP allow for that situation and allow other eligible Domains to continue to be evaluated, scored, and awarded if qualified? Or, will OSP simply reject the entire solicitation proposal since a single solicitation will include the multiple domains?</p>
29	JP-3	<p>With respect to auto qualification of NAICS codes based on FPDS, we appreciate the number of clarifying answers which GSA provided to address this situation. In our case, almost 80% of our FPDS NAICS codes are incorrect and do not reflect the RFP or Contract award correct NAICS code. As a result, we appreciate that GSA has accounted for this situation with a modification to the JP-3 Project validation form for a CO to insert a NAICS Code, but this modification does not really address the situation fully and does not clearly show that the JP-3 is being used solely to correct an incorrect NAICS code in FPDS. And in this case, as the JP-3 modified form was issued in Draft #2, the form now requires the offeror to submit narrative to support/justify such a change. In the original OASIS process, a J-14 affidavit was used specifically to address incorrect NAICS codes in FPDS in which the form had three pre-filled out paragraphs for simple entry of the incorrect and correct NAICS codes and signature by the CO without the necessary narrative justifications. Based on the number of incorrect NAICS codes in FPDS, would GSA consider:</p> <p>a. Simplifying the JP-3, allowing the CO to simply enter the incorrect and corrected NAICS codes and only require a CO signature (who is warranted) as sufficient correction of the NAICS code without requiring the narratives. This effort represents a significant workload for small businesses and OTSBs who face large numbers of FPDS mistakes.</p> <p>b. Would GSA then allow that modified/streamlined JP-3 For NAICS codes changes to be used to auto qualify? Or would GSA allow submission of the RFP and contract award docs showing the correct NAICS code to be used to auto qualify?</p> <p>c. It does not seem fair that vendors are being penalized and required to provide additional narrative justification for mistakes in a federally managed database, and such vendors are being denied the ability to use auto-qualification simply because the FPDS report is incorrect - especially since vendors do not bear responsibility for such mistakes or have any ability to easily correct errors in FPDS.</p>
30	L.5.1.7.1	<p>With respect to tagging SOW/PWS docs to show validation/verification of proposed Domains, it appears that, in Q&A Set #2 in Q 246, GSA anticipates that this tagging would occur in OSP after the appropriate SOW or PWS contract documents have been uploaded into OSP. For a company that is envisioning submitting on multiple solicitations and multiple domains for which we qualify, this approach would create quite a log-jam and bottle neck for our one authorized user account in OSP. In the prior OASIS, vendors could pre-tag SOW and PWS documents before loading into OSP using the yellow highlight tag feature in Adobe PDF with bookmarks which significantly streamlined and allowed us to prepare in advance many of our documents prior to upload into OSP. As such:</p> <p>a. Would GSA please confirm, will vendors be given the opportunity to tag SOW and PWS PDF documents before they are loaded into OSP, as this was a critical and important functionality that was used during OASIS and OASIS On-Ramps?</p> <p>b. If GSA does not allow such functionality in OASIS+, would OASIS please expand the open window of proposal due dates to beyond 3 months, as this time would not be sufficient for small businesses to tag docs after upload to OSP, especially when we are applying for multiple domains and multiple solicitations?</p>
31	B.12 OASIS+ Symphony Portal	<p>Within the OASIS+ Symphony Portal, is the Proposal Manager the only person allowed to submit, or is access available to others to submit?</p>

32	Attachment J.P-9 OASIS+ Domain Qualifications Matrix	As a 40-year DoD contractor, we understand the need for an OASIS+ domain that leverages highly technical solutions to meet important missions. In our experience, many of these mission-critical programs average \$20M in annual value. In fact, a quick search on FPDS yields over 400 programs considered “Enterprise Wide” defense programs valued between \$100M-\$200M over five years. What data did GSA use to set the threshold at \$75M/year? Please consider lowering the Enterprise Solutions domain’s qualifying threshold from \$75M/year to \$20M/year, as it ensures that only companies that have delivered successfully on significant programs are eligible to compete in this domain, yet maintains a large enough differentiator from the other domains’ \$1M in annual value threshold.
33	Section L.5.2.3.6-Multiple & OCONUS Locations	Is the list of “Places of Performance” in the qualifying project’s PWS sufficient to confirm locations at which work was delivered? If a place of performance is not listed in the PWS, what constitutes an acceptable source of verification?
34	L.5.3.2 Federal Prime Contractor Experience - Federal Agencies (Federal Government Contracts Only)	The United States Space Force (USSF) is now a unique Federal Government Contractor, separate from the United States Air Force (USAF). Will the government consider clarifying the RFP to state that a program that was awarded by USAF before the formation of USSF (and thus FPDS shows USAF as the funding agency), but is now being fulfilled for the USSF, should count as meeting the experience for a unique Federal Government Customer?
35	J.8	In section J. 8, the QP Specialized Functional Experience and QP Management & Staffing scoring elements both relate to the same type of contracts—the maintenance of building infrastructure and emergency/after-hours support of those components. The scoring weight for those two elements seems unbalanced, particularly for a Domain with such a broad relevant scope. The current weighting formula disadvantages offerors who do not perform large building maintenance contracts, even though they may have complex, highly relevant facilities capabilities and Task Orders on the current OASIS IDIQ supporting clients in the other functional subareas. Would GSA consider simply re-balancing the Facilities points slightly to ensure contractors can continue to support current GSA OASIS clients that utilize the domain for infrastructure planning, resiliency, energy management, and/or force protection? Absent this change, GSA will run the risk of unintentionally excluding companies that possess highly complex facility capabilities and support current clients on the current OASIS IDIQ.
36	L.5.1.3.2	If a prime is bidding with a subcontractor/partner, can that subcontractor’s past performance and “QPs” be applied to prime contractor/bidder scorecards? (This was asked in question 81 of the Phase 2 Q&A, the answer referred the questioner to L.5.1.3.2 in the RFP, but that section reads “TBD.”)
37	C.2	When does GSA expect to add the Human Capital domain to OASIS+?

38	L.5.3.1	<p>L.5.3.1 Federal Prime Contractor Experience - Competition in Multiple Award Environments (Federal Government Contracts Only) If claiming credit for this qualification, the Offeror may submit FEPs awarded in a competitive MA-IDIQ or MA-BPA environment. To be considered competitive, the task order solicitation must have been issued using competitive procedures.</p> <p>The earlier version defined Multiple-award contract L .5.3.1 - Federal Prime Contractor Experience - Competition in Multiple Award Environments (Federal Government Contracts Only) If claiming credit for this qualification, the Offeror may submit up to 4 task orders awarded in a competitive multiple-award IDIQ environment. To be considered competitive, at least two (2) task order proposals must have been received by the agency in response to the solicitation. Task order means "an order for services placed against an established contract or with Government sources."</p> <p>Multiple-award contract means a contract that is - (1) A Multiple Award Schedule contract issued by GSA (e.g., GSA Schedule Contract) or agencies granted Multiple Award Schedule contract authority by GSA (e.g., Department of Veterans Affairs) as described in FAR Part 38; (2) A multiple-award task-order or delivery-order contract issued in accordance with FAR Subpart 16.5, Indefinite-Delivery Contracts, including Governmentwide acquisition contracts; or (3) Any other indefinite-delivery, indefinite-quantity contract entered into with two or more sources pursuant to the same solicitation.</p> <p>We recommend moving back to the previous definition of a multiple award contract.</p>
39	L.5.2.1 item 1.d.	<p>In support of GSA's OASIS+ Goals of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables federal customers to acquire innovative solutions from highly qualified businesses on a contract vehicle designed to be Best in Class (BIC) • Provides access to highly qualified contractors of all sizes from multiple industries. <p>Would GSA consider adding OTAs back into Section L.5.2.1 item 1.d., as presented in the November 15, 2022, OASIS+ draft, as acceptable Qualifying Project Experience?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L.5.2.1 item 1.d. A Other Transaction Authority (OTA) award issued under 10 U.S.C. 4021 or other applicable authority <p>Allowing OTA experience as Qualifying Projects supports attracting highly qualified contractors with innovative solutions particularly relevant in the Research & Development Domain. Although not FAR based, OTAs are legally binding agreements utilizing statutory authorities that permit federal agencies to enter into transactions other than procurement contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements. As DoD use of OTAs has consistently increased since 2015, risk of protest and risk of excluding otherwise qualified companies increases with the removal of the ability to reference OTAs as Qualifying Project Experience.</p>
40	L.5.1.4 (SB Draft RFP 2, pages 148-150); Q&A #238 (Phase 1)	<p>Q&A #238 (Phase 1) states, "MRCL are not permitted for use for the Prime/Sub or JV corporate structure."; L.5.1.4 states, "<u>Within</u> a corporate structure, an Offeror (<i>to include a member of a joint venture</i>) may utilize resources from a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary.... MRCLs shall only be used within the offering Prime Contractor's corporate structure." Please confirm that an Offeror submitting as an SBA-approved MPA JV between a Small Business and a Large Business can utilize MRCLs to earn credit from the mentor's (Large Business) Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary.</p>

41	L.5.1.4 (UR Draft RFP 2, pages 146-148)	<p>Draft RFP 2, L.5.1.4, appeared to remove an Offeror's ability to use an MRCL to earn credit for parent/affiliate/division/subsidiary QPs, FEPs, and past performance. This change could significantly impact many large businesses already delivering best-in-class projects to OASIS customers by leveraging the full resources of the Offeror's company, an ability best demonstrated through QPs, FEPs, and past performance. Engineering firms that operate as a single entity typically have multi-layered legal business entities for a variety of legal and insurance reasons. Allowing credit for an Offeror's internal divisions and wholly-owned subsidiaries ensures that OASIS+ customers can access large global businesses with the capability, capacity, and credentials to successfully deliver projects of similar size, scope, scale, and complexity anticipated under OASIS+. On behalf of industry, and to the benefit of federal government customers, we respectfully request that the GSA allow Offerors the ability to utilize all company resources from a Parent, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary through an MRCL (similar to the current OASIS, and the OASIS+ Draft RFP 1, L.5.1.4 language).</p>
42	J.P-8 OASIS+ Domain Qualifications Matrix and Scorecards; Enterprise Solutions Domain	<p>For the ENT Domain, the minimum average Annual Value is significantly larger (~50 times larger) than other Domains minimum. Industry understands the desire to obtain high-caliber enterprise support, but such high thresholds do not allow consideration of QPs that incorporate all the desired capabilities on projects that serve GSA's ENT customers well – and for reasonable costs. Our recommendation is to lower the ENT Domain minimum annual value to \$5M, with additional credit for QPs with \$15M and \$25M annual values. This enables highly competent companies to provide best-in-class ENT support and deliver relevant services directly to federal customers, saving federal agencies pass-through costs.</p>
43	Collection of Task Orders	<p>How should the average annual contract value be computed on a 'Collection of Task Orders' awarded on an active IDIQ, BPA, or BOA? The recently released Q&A (Phase 2) stated (#102):</p> <p>Note: An Offeror does not have to submit all of the task orders under the IDIQ or BPA, but must submit a "collection of task orders" that add up to the minimum annual value specified within each Domain Qualifications Matrix, and/or substantiates any claimed credits.</p> <p>We interpret this to mean that the average annual contract value should be based on the total contract value of the TOs constituting the 'Collection of Task Orders' divided by the period of performance (in days) on the master IDIQ/BPA/BOA that the collection were awarded under. According to the revised draft RFP, the period of performance on a 'Collection of Task Orders' is defined by the start and end dates of the master IDIQ, BPA, or BOA contract that the TOs were awarded under, inclusive of all options years, etc. However, the revised draft RFP continues to state that annual contract value for on ongoing project is to be computed (pp. 160-161, of the revised draft RFP, Unrestricted):</p> <p>Project value for ongoing projects is determined based on the total estimated value (value inclusive of all option periods; regardless of completed/funded status; i.e., total contract value for Federal Government or Commercial Contracts as applicable).</p> <p>Why would the annual contract value of a 'Collection of Task Orders' awarded on an active (ongoing) IDIQ/BPA/BOA contract be computed differently than that of a single active/ongoing TO? Shouldn't the annual contract value on an active/ongoing IDIQ/BPA/BOA be determined by the total (potential) contract value, the stated 'ceiling' in the contract, consistent with how the annual contract value would be computed on an active/ongoing TO (as noted on pp. 160-161, of the revised draft RFP, Unrestricted)?</p>
44	FEP - Competition in Multiple Award Environments	<p>FEP - Competition in Multiple Award Environments.' Do TO contracts awarded competitively under a BAA qualify as 'competitive' and earn points/credits on the 'FEP-Competition in Multiple Award Environments' qualification? If yes, what does an Offeror need to submit to substantiate that the TO awards were solicited and awarded competitively?</p>

45	L.5.1.3.1	<p>Unrestricted (UNR) RFP, 'L.5.1.3 Contractor Teaming Arrangements' (p. 144). The revised draft UNR RFP states that the following teaming options are open to UNR Offerors:</p> <p>Contractor teaming arrangement (CTA) as defined by FAR 9.601 means an arrangement in which-</p> <p>(1) Two (2) or more companies form a partnership or joint venture to act as a potential prime contractor or;</p> <p>(2) A potential prime contractor agrees with one (1) or more other companies to have them act as its subcontractor(s) under a specified Government contract or acquisition program.</p> <p>The first option seems to be covered by L.5.1.3.1. However, the subsequent subsection, 'L.5.1.3.2 Proposed Subcontractors, if applicable,' reads 'TBD.' Can GSA clarify if this second option for a CTA ('potential prime contractor agrees with one (1) or more other companies to act as subcontractor(s)') remains a teaming option for UNR Offerors? If yes, what are the conditions a UNR Offeror must meet for this second option for a CTA and the guidelines for what first-tier subcontractor(s) can contribute to a UNR Offeror's bid?</p>
46	L.5.1.3.2	<p>We request that GSA include language in this section or elsewhere to allow Offerors to earn credit for QPs, FEPs and past performance from their proposed OASIS+ subcontractors.</p>
47	L.5.1.4	<p>We request that GSA include language in this section or elsewhere to allow Offerors to earn credit for QPs, FEPs and past performance from their substantiated corporate Meaningful Relationships.</p>