Classified information is NOT permitted on this site.

Bid Inquiry Contractor Report
All Inquiries

Project: Utility Monitoring & Control System VI **Review**: UMCS VI (*00001*)
(sorted by CommentID)
Displaying 139 inquiries.

Id	Discipline	Sheet	Detail	Spec
11842849	Contracting	Solicitation Attachment 5		L.5 Proposal Submission
Comment Classification: N/A Section L.5 of the draft solicitation states that proposal submissions shall arrive no later than 12:00 PM CT on 22 June 2026. Is this the Government's anticipated proposal due date for the final solicitation, or should offerors expect the final solicitation to establish a revised submission deadline? On: May 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . The proposal due date will be extended to 30 days from the date the final solicitation is issued. Therefore, offerors should expect the final solicitation to establish a revised submission deadline. Currently, the solicitation is undergoing internal reviews and is pending approval at the appropriate level, which is anticipated within the next few weeks. Offerors must carefully review the Final Request for Proposals (RFP) once it is released, as it will officially establish and confirm the final proposal submission deadline. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11845325	Security	Attachment 6	Section M	
Comment Classification: N/A Since price is not evaluated at the MATOC level, will the Government provide any minimum technical thresholds, scoring standards, or discriminators that distinguish an "Acceptable" versus "Unacceptable" proposal under each Factor? On: May 18 2026.				
	Government Response. . All evaluation criteria, including the requirements for achieving an "Acceptable" rating, are provided within the Request for Proposal. As the Government intends to award to all qualifying offerors, proposals will be evaluated solely on an "Acceptable/Unacceptable" basis against the stated factors. No additional scoring standards or discriminators beyond those outlined in the RFP will be utilized for the MATOC-level evaluation. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11845335	Security	Attachment 6	Section M	Basis for Award
Comment Classification: N/A While the qualifying?offer approach allows award to all acceptable offerors, does the Government anticipate any practical constraints (administrative, programmatic, or resource?based) that may limit the number of MATOC awards? On: May 18 2026.				
	Government Response. . The Government does not anticipate any practical constraints, whether administrative, programmatic, or resource-based, that would limit the number of MATOC awards. Proposals will be evaluated solely on an "Acceptable/Unacceptable" basis against the factors explicitly stated in the Request for Proposal. All criteria and requirements necessary to achieve an "Acceptable" rating are provided within the RFP documentation. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11845343	Security	Attachment 6	Section M	
Comment Classification: N/A Will the Government provide additional evaluation standards or definitions for "Acceptable" and "Unacceptable" for each Factor to ensure consistent interpretation by offerors? On: May 18 2026.				
	Government Response. . All evaluation criteria, including the requirements for achieving an "Acceptable" rating, are provided within the Request for Proposal (RFP). As the Government intends to award to all qualifying offerors, proposals will be evaluated solely on an "Acceptable/Unacceptable" basis against the stated factors. The Government does not anticipate providing additional definitions or standards beyond what is currently documented in the RFP. Offerors are encouraged to carefully review the solicitation requirements to ensure their submissions provide sufficient			

	detail to demonstrate compliance. Since this is a pass/fail methodology, any failure to meet the minimum requirements of a factor will result in an "Unacceptable" rating for that factor, rendering the entire proposal ineligible for award. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11845348	Security	Attachment 5	Section L	

Comment Classification: N/A

Can the Government provide a cross?reference matrix identifying the exact mandatory technical elements expected within each subsection of Volume 1 (Technical Approach and Management Approach)?

On: May 18 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government does not intend to provide a separate cross-reference matrix at this time. All mandatory requirements and technical elements are outlined within the Request for Proposal documentation. Offerors are encouraged to carefully review Section L (Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors) for submission requirements and Section M (Evaluation Factors for Award) to ensure their technical and management approaches fully address the evaluation criteria. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11845350	Security	Attachment 5	Section L	

Comment Classification: N/A

Does the Government expect offerors to demonstrate prior RMF package development and ATO achievement experience, or is a detailed proposed methodology sufficient for acceptability?

On: May 18 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government evaluates the Cybersecurity Implementation Approach based on the offeror's ability to demonstrate technical capability through a detailed, comprehensive, and compliant methodology. Section L requires a narrative detailing the offeror's specific process for applying the DoD RMF for Army, Navy, Air Force, or other DoD components. This capability description must outline the steps that would lead to an Authority to Operate (ATO) for a DoD Information System (IS), and incorporate at least one FRCS such as UMCS, ESS, HVAC, FAS, and SCADA. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11845354	Security	Attachment 7	PWS 1.1, 1.4.2	

Comment Classification: N/A

Can the Government clarify which alternative energy technologies are anticipated within the MATOC scope (e.g., microgrids, solar PV, battery storage, wind, geothermal, energy storage systems)?

On: May 18 2026.

	Government Response. . Yes, all alternative energy technologies listed in the question--including microgrids, solar PV, battery storage, wind, geothermal, and energy storage systems--are within the MATOC scope. This list represents examples of anticipated technologies and is not exhaustive. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11845357	Security	Attachment 7	PWS 1.7.7	

Comment Classification: N/A

Will the Government provide contractor training, onboarding, and system access support for the transition from RMS to CMP, and will advance notice (e.g., 30 days) be provided prior to transition?

On: May 18 2026.

	Government Response. . The PWS Paragraph 1.7.7 states: "The Contractor must be prepared to transition from the Resident Management System (RMS) to the new CMP at any time during the period of performance of this contract, once the USACE enterprise implements this change." Offerors shall not assume that the Government will provide training or an advance notice of this change. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11845365	Security	Attachment 5	Section L	

Comment Classification: N/A

Although no page limit is imposed, is there a recommended maximum number of project examples or CPARS submissions the Government prefers to receive for efficient evaluation?

On: May 18 2026.

	Government Response. . Pursuant to Section L, Volume 2, Offerors are required to submit a total of six to eight project examples using the Project Reporting Form (Attachment 4). This requirement is divided into a minimum of three and a maximum of five projects for Tab A and three projects for Tab B. To ensure an efficient evaluation process, Offerors must strictly adhere to these quantities; any projects submitted in excess of these limits will not be reviewed. Furthermore, Tab C must contain the corresponding Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) or Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ) for these six to eight projects only. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11845367	Security	Attachment 5	Section L	

Comment Classification: N/A

Can the Government clarify how "Key Subcontractor" is defined for purposes of required Letters of Commitment? Specifically, does this include only subcontractors performing FRCS technical work, or all subcontractors contributing to MQR goals?

On: May 18 2026.

	Government Response. . As defined in Section L, a "Key Subcontractor" is specifically a firm expected to provide technical support, procurement, installation, monitoring and maintenance, and service for the Facility Related Control Systems (FRCS) for this contract. Therefore, the requirement for Letters of Commitment (Attachment 3) applies only to subcontractors performing the defined FRCS work and contract team arrangements. It does not include all subcontractors contributing to MQR goals unless they also meet this FRCS-specific definition. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11845370	Security	Attachment 7	PWS 1.7.6	

Comment Classification: N/A

Is a facility clearance required at time of proposal submission, at MATOC award, or only at the time of TO award requiring classified work?

On: May 18 2026.

	Government Response. . Facility clearance is not required at the time of MATOC award. These requirements will be specified at the order level. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11845379	Security	Attachment 7	PWS 1.7.6.2	

Comment Classification: N/A

Will subcontractors be required to maintain independent cybersecurity certifications (e.g., CMMC), or may they operate under the prime contractor's accredited environment?

On: May 18 2026.

	Government Response. . IAW 32 CFR 170.23, CMMC requirements apply to prime contractors and subcontractors throughout the supply chain at all tiers that will process, store, or transmit any FCI or CUI on contractor information systems in the performance of the DoD contract or subcontract. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11845465	Other		Section L	L.2

Comment Classification: N/A

Under Section L.2, the numbered item "2" is blank. Will the Government confirm this item is intended to be blank?

On: May 18 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government confirms that the blank space at numbered item "2" was an administrative error. This item is not intended to contain content and will be removed in the final Solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11845470	Other		L.7	

Comment Classification: N/A

Section L, paragraph L.7 states that "The Offeror shall provide a signed certification sheet stating that the Offeror has developed and implemented a Safety and Health Program IAW OSHA regulation 29 CFR 1926.65(b) and, if applicable, EM 385-1-1." Are the certification(s) required to be by a third party, or can Offerors self-certify their compliance?

On: May 18 2026.

	Government Response. . The Offeror is permitted to self-certify the development and implementation of their Safety and Health Program by providing a signed certification sheet from an authorized corporate representative. However, please note that while the programmatic requirement allows for self-certification, the qualifications for specific personnel do not. If a "Competent Person" is being utilized for regulated activities, their individual certifications or training documentation for roles such as the Site Safety and Health Officer (SSHO), Fall Protection, Confined Spaces, Trenching, Cranes, or Electrical must be submitted to verify compliance with OSHA 29 CFR 1926.65(b) and EM 385-1-1 standards. Additionally, the Offeror must acknowledge that the Accident Prevention Plan (APP) is required to be submitted and formally accepted by the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) or Contracting Officer (KO) prior to the commencement of work. Per EM 385-1-1 Section 2.A, the task order Performance Work Statement (PWS), and the base contract, this submission must be processed via the CMP or the follow-on document repository that HNC will transition to next year. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11845474	Other		L.7	

Comment Classification: N/A

Section L, paragraph L.7 states that "A minimum of one project shall be identified as self-performed by the Prime Contractor for one of the five FRCS types mentioned in this section." Will the self-perform FRCS experience of a Key Subcontractor be permitted if accompanied by their signed letter of commitment?

On: May 18 2026.

	Government Response. . Thank you for your inquiry regarding Section L, paragraph L.7. While we appreciate the inclusion of a signed letter of commitment, the solicitation requires that the Prime Contractor itself must have self-performed at least one project for one of the five FRCS types. The exception mentioned in the section is intended specifically to accommodate small business Prime Contractors. It means that if the small business Prime cannot provide a past project where they were the prime contractor, they are permitted to submit a past project where they previously acted as a key subcontractor. It does not, however, allow the Prime to use the experience of a separate firm that they are bringing on as a subcontractor for this current effort. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11847274	Energy Mon & Controls	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030.pdf	Requesting this to be added to Section I of the Solicitation	

Comment Classification: N/A

Would the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville Engineering and Support Center, consider including FAR Clause 52.216-24, Economic Price Adjustment, in the final RFP? Given the nature of the performance work statement requirements and the ongoing market fluctuations impacting supplies and materials, we believe that adding this clause could offer valuable flexibility to both parties involved.

On: May 19 2026.

	Government Response. . Thank you for your feedback regarding FAR Clause 52.216-24, Economic Price Adjustment. While we understand your concerns about market fluctuations, the Government does not intend to include an EPA clause at the MATOC level. Our acquisition strategy is focused on utilizing Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) task orders for these requirements. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11847278	Energy Mon & Controls	SOL__ATTACHMENT_5_IN STRUCTION_TO_OFFEROR S.pdf	VOLUME 2, FACTOR II - PAST PERFORMANCE	

Comment Classification: N/A

Reference – Attachment 5, VOLUME 2, FACTOR II - PAST PERFORMANCE, Page 12 of 14, states, "To be considered recent, these projects must have at least 12 months of performance completed within three years from the closing date of this Solicitation." The current language creates a very narrow window of acceptable projects, limiting the pool of projects to be

considered. For example, any project completed within between 24 to 36 months of the closing date will not be considered recent because they have "less than 12 months of performance" in the three-year window.

Question: Would the Government consider amending the recency requirement to the following: "To be considered recent, these projects must have been completed within three years from the closing date of this solicitation. The Government will accept ongoing projects, if the performance on the project started at least 12 months prior to the closing date of this solicitation. Ongoing projects with a performance of less than 12 months will not be considered."

On: May 19 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government has carefully reviewed your recommendation to amend the language to accommodate projects completed earlier in the three-year window. However, after thorough consideration, the Government has decided to retain the original language. The Government's intent with this specific requirement is to ensure that offerors have a full 12 months of active performance falling strictly within the three-year window. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11847279	Energy Mon & Controls	SOL__ATTACHMENT_5_INSTRUCTION_TO_OFFERORS.pdf	VOLUME 2, FACTOR II - PAST PERFORMANCE	

Comment Classification: N/A

Reference – Attachment 5, VOLUME 2, FACTOR II - PAST PERFORMANCE, Page 12 of 14, states, "To be considered recent, these projects must have at least 12 months of performance completed within three years from the closing date of this Solicitation." The current language creates a very narrow window of acceptable projects, limiting the pool of projects to be considered. For example, any project completed within between 24 to 36 months of the closing date will not be considered recent because they have "less than 12 months of performance" in the three-year window.

Question: Would the Government consider amending the recency requirement to the following: "To be considered recent, these projects must have been completed within three years from the closing date of this solicitation. The Government will accept ongoing projects, if the performance on the project started at least 12 months prior to the closing date of this solicitation. Ongoing projects with a performance of less than 12 months will not be considered."

On: May 19 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11847278. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11847280	Energy Mon & Controls	SOL__ATTACHMENT__7_PERFORMANCE_WORK_STATEMENT_UMCS_VI.pdf	8.10. Information Assurance (IA)/Information Technology (IT) requirements	

Comment Classification: N/A

This section cites DoDD 8570, which has been superseded by DoDD 8140. Please clarify.

On: May 19 2026.

	Government Response. . The Performance Work Statement has been updated to reflect DoDD 8140 (DoD Information Network (DoDIN) Workforce Management). On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11847282	Energy Mon & Controls	SOL__ATTACHMENT__7_PERFORMANCE_WORK_STATEMENT_UMCS_VI.pdf	Appendix B	

Comment Classification: N/A

The paragraphs for Senior Security System Engineer (SSSE), Security System Engineer (SSE), and Network Specialist cite DoDD 8570.01 and its IAT (Information Assurance Technical) qualifications. DoDD 8570 has been superseded by DoDD 8140. Which role, work role ID, and level are required for these positions, based on the DoDD 8140 Qualifications Matrix?

On: May 19 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11847280. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11847284	Energy Mon & Controls	SOL__ATTACHMENT__7_PERFORMANCE_WORK_STATEMENT_UMCS_VI.pdf	5.9 Key Personnel	

Comment Classification: N/A

Section 5.9 of the PWS indicates that "Required Key Personnel" are identified in Attachment 2.0 and shall, at a minimum, meet the requirements listed for each discipline shown in Attachment 2.0.

Question: No Attachment 2.0 exists with the Draft solicitation documents. Should the reference be to Appendix B Qualifications of Contractor Personnel?

On: May 19 2026.

Government Response. . Thank you for your inquiry. The Key Personnel Qualifications have been added to Section 5.9 of the PWS. On: Jun 04 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11847286	Energy Mon & Controls	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___W912DY26RA030.pdf	H.15 ANTITERRORISM (AT) REQUIREMENTS	

Comment Classification: N/A

Paragraph H.15.11. Information Assurance (IA)/Information Technology (IT) requirements cites DoDD 8570, which has been superseded by DoDD 8140. Please clarify.

On: May 19 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11847280. On: Jun 04 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11847828	Transportation	N/A – Solicitation/No drawings provided	N/A	Attachment 5, Section L; Attachment 4, Project Reporting Form; Attachment 6, Factor II – Past Performance

Comment Classification: N/A

Will the Government consider non-federal projects, including municipal, utility, power, renewable energy, industrial, and critical infrastructure projects, as relevant past performance when the project demonstrates similar UMCS, SCADA, HVAC controls, ESS, FAS, cybersecurity, or FRCS scope? If so, will such projects be evaluated on the same basis as federal projects when comparable in scope, complexity, and performance risk?

On: May 20 2026.

Government Response. . The Government will only consider federal projects as relevant past performance for this requirement. Projects performed in the municipal, utility, power, renewable energy, industrial, or critical infrastructure sectors outside of the federal government will not be accepted to demonstrate relevant past performance, even if they share similar scope (such as UMCS, SCADA, HVAC controls, ESS, FAS, cybersecurity, or FRCS). The Government has updated Section L and Section M of the solicitation to clarify that only federal past performance projects will be evaluated as relevant for this requirement. Non-federal projects will not be considered. On: Jun 04 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11847847	Other	N/A – Solicitation/No drawings provided	N/A	Attachment 5, Section L.5 and L.7 – Proposal Submission / Proposal Content

Comment Classification: N/A

At the base MATOC proposal stage, are offerors required to submit resumes or qualifications for key personnel? If yes, please identify the required roles or labor categories and confirm whether key personnel may be provided by the prime, key subcontractors, or both.

On: May 20 2026.

Government Response. . No, offerors are not required to submit resumes or qualifications for key personnel at the base MATOC proposal stage. On: Jun 04 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11847854	Other	N/A – Solicitation/No drawings provided	N/A	Attachment 2 – Small Business Participation Plan; Attachment 6, Factor III – Small Business Participation

Comment Classification: N/A

Please confirm the minimum quantitative Small Business Participation requirements for Factor III, including any required minimum percentages or dollar values by category.

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . No, offerors are not required to submit resumes or qualifications for key personnel at the base MATOC proposal stage. On: Jun 04 2026
	Government Response. . This new text supercedes ALL previous replies. The minimum quantitative requirements for Small Business Participation are detailed in Section M (Attachment 6 - Evaluation Factors For Award) under Volume 3, on page 8 of the solicitation package. Offerors are advised to review this section for the specific percentages. On: Jun 12 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11847857	Other	N/A – Solicitation/No drawings provided	N/A	Attachment 2 – Small Business Participation Plan; Attachment 5, Volume 3 – Factor III

Comment Classification: N/A

For small business prime offerors, should the Small Business Participation Plan reflect only prime self-performance, or should it also identify planned small business subcontractor participation by category?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . For small business prime offerors, the Small Business Participation Plan should identify both the prime's self-performance and any planned small business subcontractor participation by category. As referenced in Attachment 2, the Offeror is required to propose the total level of utilization of small businesses in the performance of the acquisition. This total utilization encompasses both the work performed by the small business prime offeror (self-performance) and/or the work performed by any small business subcontractors. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11847859	Other	N/A – Solicitation/No drawings provided	N/A	Section A.12; DFARS 252.204-7021; DFARS 252.204-7025; PWS Cybersecurity / IA-IT Requirements

Comment Classification: N/A

For the base MATOC proposal, what specific CMMC Level 2 self-assessment evidence must be submitted, if any, beyond representations in SAM and compliance with the applicable DFARS clauses?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . No additional specific evidence or documentation needs to be submitted directly with your proposal. The Government will independently verify contractor Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) levels and self-assessment scores using the Supplier Performance Risk System (SPRS) application, which is hosted inside the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) platform. The Government will identify and verify the contractor's CMMC level in SPRS using the contractor's Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) and/or CAGE code. Please ensure your assessment scores and related information are accurate and current in SPRS under your active UEI/CAGE code prior to proposal submission. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11847860	Other	N/A – Solicitation/No drawings provided	N/A	Section A.12; DFARS 252.204-7021 Reporting Requirements; SPRS / CMMC UID Requirements

Comment Classification: N/A

Please confirm whether CMMC UID(s), SPRS self-assessment status, SPRS score, and affirmation of continuous compliance must be submitted with the proposal, prior to base MATOC award, or only as applicable at the task-order level.

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11847859. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11847864	Other	N/A – Solicitation/No drawings provided	N/A	Section A.10; Section H.17 – On-Ramp/Off-Ramp/Dor mant Status; Section H.18 – OCONUS Task Order Locations

Comment Classification: N/A

If a MATOC holder is qualified and actively competing for CONUS task orders but elects not to propose on an OCONUS task order due to country-specific licensing, insurance, staffing, SOFA, local labor, travel/security, or partner-support requirements, will that decision be considered a failure to compete for a task order for which the contractor is "qualified" for purposes of off-ramp consideration?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . Please refer to sections A.7 and H.17 of the solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11847868	Other	N/A – Solicitation/No drawings provided	N/A	Section A.7 – MATOC Suite and Task Order Competition; Section H.17; Section H.18; PWS Sections 1.4 and 1.7.4

Comment Classification: N/A

How will the Government define whether a MATOC holder is "qualified" or "eligible" for a specific task-order competition, particularly where the task order involves specialized FRCS, ESS, FAS, cybersecurity, classified work, OCONUS performance, or country-specific licensing requirements?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . In accordance with the solicitation, "eligibility" for a specific task order is determined at the task order level based on the selected competitive suite (Unrestricted vs. Small Business Reserve). Contractors will demonstrate their qualifications and technical approach to meeting those specific requirements within their task order proposals, which will then be evaluated in accordance with the source selection criteria established for that specific task order. Please refer to sections A.7 of the solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11847873	Other	N/A – Solicitation/No drawings provided	N/A	Section A.14 – Defense Base Act Insurance; Section H.8 – General Insurance Requirements; Section H.9 – DBA Insurance; PWS Section 1.6

Comment Classification: N/A

Section A.14 states that for contract performance outside the 50 United States and the District of Columbia, including U.S. territories, the Contractor must obtain Defense Base Act insurance and provide proof of coverage. Section H.8 states that the successful offeror(s) must present evidence of insurance coverage prior to award. Section H.9.3 states that a separately priced CLIN is not required for DBA insurance, and PWS Section 1.6 states that DBA insurance requirements will be included in overseas task orders when required. Please clarify whether offerors are required to submit proof of DBA insurance coverage with the base MATOC proposal or only after award/at the applicable task-order level when DBA-covered performance is required. Additionally, for task orders where DBA insurance applies, should offerors include DBA insurance costs within the applicable Firm-Fixed-Price task-order CLIN pricing, or will the Government provide specific DBA pricing instructions at the task-order solicitation level?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . Offerors are not required to submit proof of DBA insurance coverage with their base MATOC proposal or prior to the base contract award. Proof of DBA insurance will only be required after award at the task-order level, prior to the commencement of performance for any task order that requires DBA coverage. The solicitation has been updated to reflect this change. The Government amended Section H.8 to clarify this distinction. For individual task orders requiring DBA insurance, specific pricing instructions (e.g., whether to include costs within the FFP task-order CLINs or under a specific task-order CLIN) will be provided at the task-order solicitation level. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11847876	Other	N/A – Solicitation/No drawings provided	N/A	Section B – CLINs; Section H; Task Order Requirements, if applicable

Comment Classification: N/A

Please confirm whether performance bonds, payment bonds, or other bonding instruments are required for base MATOC award. If bonding is required only at the task-order level, will each task-order solicitation identify the applicable bonding requirements, bond amount, and timing for submission?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . No. Bonding is not required for the base MATOC award and will not be utilized for this contract. The solicitation does not contain any provisions or requirements for bonding at either the base MATOC or task-order level. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11847877	Other	N/A – Solicitation/No drawings provided	N/A	PWS Sections 1.1, 1.4, 1.4.1, and 1.4.2; Section A.3 – Firm-Fixed-Price Task Orders

Comment Classification: N/A

For firm-fixed-price task orders involving existing or legacy controls, cybersecurity constraints, equipment integration, or unknown field conditions, will task-order solicitations provide sufficient site data--such as existing drawings, network architecture, equipment lists, sequence of operations, cybersecurity requirements, known deficiencies, and facility access constraints--to support accurate pricing?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . Any available information--including existing drawings, network architecture, equipment lists, sequence of operations, cybersecurity requirements, known deficiencies, and facility access constraints--that the end-user provides will be included in the task-order solicitations to assist contractors in developing accurate pricing. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11847879	Other	N/A – Solicitation/No drawings provided	N/A	PWS Sections 1.4, 1.4.1, 1.4.2, and 1.7.8.3; Task Order Proposal Requirements, if applicable

Comment Classification: N/A

Will the Government provide site visits or other pre-proposal due diligence opportunities for task orders involving legacy control systems, unknown field conditions, existing facility integration, or elevated cybersecurity/operational risk?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . Site visits or other pre-proposal due diligence opportunities for specific requirements will be determined for each individual Task Order. If applicable, specific details, instructions, and coordination procedures for such opportunities will be detailed at the individual task order level. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11847881	Other	N/A – Solicitation/No drawings provided	N/A	Attachment 5, Section L.2; Attachment 3 – Letter of Commitment; Attachment 5, Volume 2 – Past Performance; PWS Section 1.1

Comment Classification: N/A

Are there any minimum self-performance requirements for prime contractors for UMCS, HVAC controls, SCADA, ESS, FAS/life safety, cybersecurity, or force protection scope, or may offerors rely on qualified key subcontractors for specialized portions of the work when supported by required letters of commitment?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11845474. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11847885	Other	N/A – Solicitation/No drawings provided	N/A	Section A.3 – Contract Type; Section B – CLIN Structure; Section A.4 – Pricing Evaluated at Task Order Level; Section H.9.3 – DBA Insurance

Comment Classification: N/A

Will task-order solicitations provide standardized pricing templates or instructions identifying how offerors should price labor, travel, equipment, software licensing, cybersecurity tools, OEM/vendor support, subcontractor costs, DBA insurance where applicable, and other direct costs?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . Specific instructions, standardized pricing templates, and detailed requirements for pricing labor, travel, equipment, software licensing, cybersecurity tools, OEM/vendor support, subcontractor costs, Defense Base Act (DBA) insurance (where applicable), and all other direct costs (ODCs) will be provided at the individual task-order solicitation level. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11847889	Other	N/A – Solicitation/No drawings provided	N/A	PWS Sections 1.1, 1.4, and 1.4.2; Section H.11 – OCI; Section H.13 – New Technology and Upgraded Models, if applicable

Comment Classification: N/A

For task orders involving proprietary systems, brand-name software, OEM-required support, or restricted access to existing control system programming, how will the Government identify required OEM/vendor participation, licensing constraints, and responsibility for obtaining access rights or software tools?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . For task orders involving proprietary systems, brand-name software, OEM-required support, or restricted access to existing control system programming, all requirements regarding OEM/vendor participation, licensing constraints, and responsibility for obtaining access rights or software tools will be specified at the task order level. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848496	Security	Attachment 5	Volume 2, Factor II:	

Comment Classification: N/A

The Instruction to Offerors States: "The prime Contractor and proposed key subcontractors shall be assessed individually, and the results will then be assessed in their totality to derive the offeror's overall Past Performance rating. Past performance of prime contractors or key subcontractors whose firms are divided into severable segments (e.g., division, group, unit, etc.) shall only be evaluated as it relates to those segments of the firm(s) that will actually perform the work"

Question: Our company intends to use past performance examples from our parent corporation as part of our proposal. To ensure full compliance with the solicitation, could the Government please confirm/clarify the following:
Will the Government confirm if this is allowed? If so, what type of documentation (e.g., Teaming Agreement, Letter of Commitment, resource-support agreement) the Government requires to demonstrate the parent corporation's meaningful involvement in various segments of the overall contract performance?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . Per Section L, for a Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA) where a prime contractor proposes with one or more subcontractors, a signed letter/agreement is required, provided that the submitted document is signed by all participating parties and clearly identifies: 1. Who is acting as the potential prime contractor and who is acting as the subcontractor(s).2. The prime contractor's North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code.3. The prime contractor's Small Business status representation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848501	Security	Attachment 5	Volume 2	

Comment Classification: N/A

If Offerors submit past performances via "SOL__ATTACHMENT_4_PROJECT_REPORTING_FORM.pdf" and include CPARS as part of Tab C – Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), CPARS, do Offerors also need to do a PPQ (Tab D – Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ)?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . In accordance with Section L, Offerors shall submit a minimum of three and a maximum of five DoD projects for the following FRCS types: UMCS, ESS, HVAC, FAS, and SCADA. This correction will be formally incorporated into the final issued solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Government Response. . This new text supercedes ALL previous replies. In accordance with Section L, Offerors should NOT submit PPQs on projects with CPARS ratings, but shall provide the associated CPARS. On: Jun 12 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848502	Inform Sys Comm	Draft Solicitation	CMMC Level	

Comment Classification: N/A

Would the Government please confirm whether CMMC Level 2 (self-assessment) is required at time of proposal submission or at time of award?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . In accordance with Section L, Offerors shall submit a minimum of three and a maximum of five DoD projects for the following FRCS types: UMCS, ESS, HVAC, FAS, and SCADA. This correction will be formally incorporated into the final issued solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Government Response. . This new text supercedes ALL previous replies. Yes, the Government confirms that a valid CMMC Level 2 (Self-Assessment) is required at the time of proposal submission. Offerors must have their current self-assessment score and annual affirmation uploaded to the Supplier Performance Risk System (SPRS) by the proposal due date to be considered for evaluation. On: Jun 12 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848504	Special Projects	Attachment 5	Volume 2, Tab A - Volume 2, Tab A – UMCS, ESS, HVAC, FAS and SCADA Projects	

Comment Classification: N/A

Are offerors allowed to replicate the structure and format of the Project Reporting Form (Attachment 4) in a Word document for inclusion in the Past Performance volume, provided the content remains consistent with the attachment requirements, or must the original form be used without modification for each project submission?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . Offerors must use the Project Reporting Form (Attachment 4) as is, without modification. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848506	Security	Attachment 5	Volume 1, Tab B – Management Approach:	

Comment Classification: N/A

For the Corporate Safety documentation, may the Safety and Health Program Certification:, Experience Modification Rate (EMR): and Safety History be excluded from page count?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11850160. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848508	Economics	PWS, Para H.18	CLIN Structure	

Comment Classification: N/A

Paragraph H.18 Special Instructions for Task Order Locations outside the Continuous United States states that "...Each foreign country included will be identified by its own CLIN and the PWS. If it is determined that a requirement cannot be satisfied under this requirement, then a standalone contract or other acquisition method/vehicle will be pursued" but Section B., Supplies or Services and Prices, CLINS 0005 through 0008 are set up as OCONUS Regions. Would the Government please provide clarification as to how the individual country CLIN structure will be addressed?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . Paragraph H.18 has been updated to remove the requirement for individual country CLINs and resolve the discrepancy with Section B. Paragraph H.18 now reads: "Each foreign country included will be identified by region." The current countries included in this MATOC are listed in Section A.1 of the Solicitation. Regarding the CLIN structure, the task order CLIN structure for OCONUS will not appear structurally different from CONUS task orders, with the clear distinction that the OCONUS CLINs will specify performance within the respective countries identified in Section A.1. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848509	Program Management	Draft Solicitation	Small Business Participation	

Comment Classification: N/A

Since Small Business Participation is not required for OCONUS work/locations, would the Government please explain its intent with respect to A.7. MATOC SUITE AND TASK ORDER COMPETITION, "For OCONUS task orders, small business participation will be considered after evaluation of applicable Status of Forces Agreements (SOFA) and other international agreements."?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . While RFO 19.000(b) does not mandate small business programs for OCONUS acquisitions, it grants the Government the discretion to apply them. The intent of Section A.7 is to reserve the Government's right to encourage or evaluate small business participation at the task order level on a case-by-case basis. However, because international treaties and host nation laws take precedence, the Government will first review any applicable Status of Forces Agreements (SOFA) or international agreements to ensure that utilizing small business preferences does not conflict with host nation requirements before applying them to a specific order. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848511	Security	Attachment 5	Volume 1, Tab B – Management Approach:	L.5. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION, a

Comment Classification: N/A

a.Page limitations .....All pages must be numbered regardless of page limitations. Appendices are not permitted unless specifically stated for a volume. Any appendices submitted will count toward the page limitation for that volume. Attachments, exhibits, or enclosures included within a proposal volume, other than those specifically required by this solicitation, will count toward the page count.

Question: The solicitation states that "all pages must be numbered regardless of page limitations." To ensure consistent compliance, please clarify whether page numbering must be strictly consecutive throughout the entire proposal (e.g., 1, 2, 3...), or whether excluded pages (such as the cover, table of contents, lists of tables/figures/acronyms, PPQs, CPARS, SBPP, and required attachments) may use a separate numbering scheme (e.g., i, ii, iii or A-1, A-2).

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . To ensure full compliance with Section L, every single page in the submission must contain a page number, regardless of whether it is excluded or subject to page limitations. Pages that are subject to maximum limits must be clearly and consecutively numbered within their respective volumes, and any pages exceeding these limits will not be evaluated. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848880	Contracting	Attachment 5	Instructions to Offerors, Past Performance Section	

Comment Classification: N/A

Section M states that if a small business firm cannot identify a self-performed FRCS project, it may submit a project in which it served as a key subcontractor. Will the Government please clarify whether a small business offeror may satisfy this requirement using relevant FRCS experience from an affiliated entity proposed as a key subcontractor that will perform substantial portions of the MATOC requirements?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11845474. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848883	Contracting	Attachment 6	Evaluation Factors for Award, Past Performance section	

Comment Classification: N/A

The solicitation states that past performance for firms divided into severable segments will only be evaluated as it relates to the segments that will actually perform the work. Will the Government please clarify what forms of participation the Government considers sufficient to demonstrate that an affiliate, subsidiary, division, or related entity will actually perform the work?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government will evaluate past performance strictly in accordance with the stated solicitation language. To demonstrate that a severable segment (e.g., an affiliate, subsidiary, division, or unit) will actually perform the work, the proposal must clearly indicate that the specific segment itself is executing the requirements. The prime contractor and any proposed key subcontractors will be assessed individually on this basis, with the totality of those results deriving the offeror's overall Past Performance rating. Please note that an entity may not rely on the past performance of its proposed key personnel to establish the past performance of the firm or its segments. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848884	Contracting	Attachment 6	Past Performance evaluation	

Comment Classification: N/A

For offerors owned by the same parent entity with multiple affiliated operating companies under common ownership and control, how will the Government consider the past performance of affiliated entities that will have meaningful involvement in contract and task order performance?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11848884. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848887	Contracting	Attachment 6	Past Performance evaluation criteria; Draft Solicitation MATOC award language	

Comment Classification: N/A

For newly formed offerors, please clarify whether the Government will consider the experience and past performance of affiliated entities under common ownership where the proposal demonstrates those entities will actively participate in performance of the resulting MATOC and task orders.

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11848884. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848889	Contracting	Attachment 6	past performance evaluation	

Comment Classification: N/A

Language in Attachment 6 states "The prime Contractor and proposed key subcontractors shall be assessed individually...". If affiliated entities under common ownership are proposed as key subcontractors, will the Government evaluate their past performance and experience independently as part of the overall offeror assessment?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11848884. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848893	Contracting	Attachment 6	Joint Venture/Mentor Protege/ Team Agreements and approvals	

Comment Classification: N/A

Volume 0, Tab B – Joint Venture/Mentor Protege/ Team Agreements and approvals: Joint Venture/Mentor Protege Agreements and approvals (if applicable). Offerors shall submit with the proposal a copy of the JV/Mentor Protege/Team Agreements and approvals (if applicable). See Section 2 above for further information.

Will the Government please confirm if an actual teaming agreement is required to be submitted with the proposal for in the case of (2) a potential prime Contractor agrees with one or more other companies to have them act as its subcontractors under a specified Government contract or acquisition program or if letters of commitment are sufficient?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . Per Section L, for a Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA) where a prime contractor proposes with one or more subcontractors, a signed letter/agreement is required, provided that the submitted document is signed by all participating parties and clearly identifies: 1. Who is acting as the potential prime contractor and who is acting as the subcontractor(s).2. The prime contractor's North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code.3. The prime contractor's Small Business status representation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848895	Contracting	Attachment 6	Past Performance Projects	

Comment Classification: N/A

Will the Government confirm offerors need only submit five (5) projects (one project for each of the following FRCS types: UMCS, ESS, HVAC, FAS, and SCADA) under Tab A?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . In accordance with Section L, Offerors shall submit a minimum of three and a maximum of five DoD projects for the following FRCS types: UMCS, ESS, HVAC, FAS, and SCADA. This correction will be formally incorporated into the final issued solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848896	Contracting	Attachment 6		

Comment Classification: N/A

May small businesses submit projects for which they performed as a subcontractor to cover one of the five FRCS types even if they have other prime projects that cover one or more of the other four FRCS types?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11845474. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848900	Contracting	Attachment 6	Past Performance Projects	

Comment Classification: N/A

Projects often feature multiple FRCS types (UMCS, ESS, HVAC, FAS, and SCADA). Is it necessary to select just one category per project?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . In accordance with Section L of the solicitation, Offerors shall submit a minimum of three and a maximum of five DoD projects for the following FRCS types: UMCS, ESS, HVAC, FAS, and SCADA. Offerors shall use the Project Reporting Form (Attachment 4) for project submittal. Collectively, the submitted projects must demonstrate experience with all five FRCS types. A single project may demonstrate experience with more than one FRCS type. This correction will be formally incorporated into the final issued solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848902	Contracting	Attachment 6	Past Performance Projects	

Comment Classification: N/A

Projects often feature multiple FRCS types (UMCS, ESS, HVAC, FAS, and SCADA). Will the Government allow offerors to submit the same project more than once but focusing on a different FRCS (UMCS, ESS, HVAC, FAS, and SCADA)?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11848900. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848903	Contracting	Draft Solicitation Sections A.4 and A.7.		

Comment Classification: N/A

Please clarify whether small business size status for participation in the reserve suite will be determined as of the date of proposal submission for the base MATOC, or whether recertification will be required at the task order level.

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . A business that qualifies as small at the time of proposal submission for the base MATOC is generally considered small for the life of that contract. IAW RFO 19.301(a)(3) recertification of size and small business program status for long-term contracts is required within 60 to 120 days prior to the end of the fifth year of the contract; and within 60 to 120 days prior to the date specified in the contract for exercising any option thereafter. See section A.4 of the final solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848908	Contracting	PWS / Section C	requirements for UMCS, BAS, ESS, SCADA, HVAC systems.	

Comment Classification: N/A

Will OEM certifications, factory authorizations, or manufacturer partnerships held by proposed subcontractors or affiliated entities satisfy task order capability requirements where those entities will participate in performance?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . Yes, OEM certifications, factory authorizations, or manufacturer partnerships held by proposed subcontractors or affiliated entities will satisfy task order capability requirements, provided that these entities are actively participating in the performance of the contract. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848909	Contracting	Draft Solicitation Section A.12 and H.15.10.	CMMC	

Comment Classification: N/A

Please confirm the required CMMC level applicable to the base MATOC at time of proposal submission and whether self-assessment documentation will be required with proposals.

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11847859. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848910	Contracting	Draft Solicitation Section A.10	On-Ramp/Off-Ramp/Dor mant Status	

Comment Classification: N/A

Please clarify whether contractors placed in dormant status may later return to active competition status and whether dormant status affects existing task order performance evaluations or eligibility for future on-ramp opportunities.

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . Based on Section H.17.4 of the solicitation, contractors placed in dormant status shall return to active competition status at the conclusion of the approved dormant period, unless otherwise directed by the Contracting Officer. While in dormant status, Contractors may continue performing on existing task orders. Dormant status does not directly impact future eligibility once a Contractor return to active status, though it does not preclude the Contracting Officer from taking off-ramp actions if circumstances warrant during the dormant period. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11848911	Contracting	Draft Solicitation Section A.2	Contract Award.	

Comment Classification: N/A

Please clarify whether the Government anticipates establishing a maximum number of MATOC awards, or whether all offerors determined technically acceptable and responsible will receive award regardless of total award quantity.

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government does not anticipate establishing a maximum number of MATOC awards. As outlined in Section A.2, the Government intends to award contracts to all qualifying offerors. A qualifying offeror is defined as a responsible offeror submitting a technically acceptable proposal that conforms to the solicitation requirements, and for whom the Contracting Officer has no reason to believe pricing would be other than fair and reasonable. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11848913	Contracting	Draft Solicitation Section A.2	Contract Award.	

Comment Classification: N/A

Please clarify whether "qualifying offerors" includes newly formed entities that demonstrate relevant experience, past performance, and management capability through affiliated companies under common ownership and control.

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11848911. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11848915	Contracting	Attachment 6	Relevancy definitions; PWS scope breadth.	

Comment Classification: N/A

Please clarify whether relevancy assessments will consider overall technical similarity and complexity even where individual reference projects do not contain every functional element identified in the Performance Work Statement.

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government will evaluate relevancy in accordance with the criteria established in Section M (Volume 2, Factor II - Past Performance) of the solicitation. As stated in Section M, relevancy is defined as projects that are similar and logically connected to the context of this solicitation in terms of scope (dollar value, size, project type) and in the magnitude of effort and complexities of the work outlined in this solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11848974	General	Detail		Attachment 5 - Section L

Comment Classification: N/A

2. Reference: Draft Solicitation, Section A.12. Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) 2.0 Program, page 5 of 182
a. Question/Comment: The referenced section A.12 states that "The required certification level for this requirement is Level 2 (Self-Assessment)." However, the PWS Section 8.9.1. Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) and CUI-FCI Compliance shows that other Levels of CMMC may be required based on various circumstances. Draft Solicitation Section H.15.10 also appears to agree with PWS Section8.9.1. Please clarify, and if there will be circumstances that require higher than the CMMC Level 2 (Self-Assessment) and will this notification be provided in advance of the relevant, future Task Order Requests for Proposals being issued?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . While the Performance Work Statement (PWS) references CMMC levels generally without specifying the exact level for this requirement, and Section L does not mention it, the main solicitation establishes the definitive requirement. The required certification level for this requirement is Level 2 (Self-Assessment). This baseline supersedes any conflicting language regarding higher-level CMMC conditions currently found in PWS Section 8.9.1. Offerors should base their proposals on the Level 2 (Self-Assessment) requirement outlined in Section A.12. If additional CMMC levels are required at the task order level, offerors will be notified. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11848979	General	Detail		Draft Solicitation Section H.3

Comment Classification: N/A

Draft Solicitation, Section H.3 Key Personnel, Page 62 of 182
a. Question/Comment:. The referenced section refers to the PWS 5.9, "Key Personnel". However, PWS 5.9 states "Required Key Personnel are identified in Attachment 2.0 and shall, at a minimum, meet the requirements listed for each discipline shown in Attachment 2.0." There is not an Attachment 2.0 listing any Key Personnel.

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11847284. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11848983	General			Draft Solicitation Section M

Comment Classification: N/A

4. Reference: Section M, Volume 1, Tab A – Technical Approach, last paragraph, Page 4 of 9
a. Question/Comment: This last paragraph under Tab A discusses the requirement of Letters of Commitment from Key Subcontractors. Section L, Tab A does not require any mention or insertion of Letter of Commitment. Section L does require these in Volume O - Tab D – Letters of Commitment (Key Subcontractors). Does the Government require that we list our Key Subcontractors as part of our Tab A response or may we just refer to Volume O, Tab D?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . Yes, offerors may refer to Volume O, Tab D within their Volume 1, Tab A response to address the Key Subcontractor requirement. In accordance with Section L, the actual Letters of Commitment (Attachment 3) for all key subcontractors and contractor team arrangements must be physically located and submitted within Volume O, Tab D. The solicitation was revised for clarity. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11849170	General	Attachment 5, Page 1 and Attachment 6, Page 1		

Comment Classification: N/A

Will the Government please consider removing the Controlled Unclassified Information label from Attachments 5 and 6 considering they are publicly available files for access via sam.gov/PIEE?

On: May 20 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11849170. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11849213	General	Solicitation Attachment 5		

Comment Classification: N/A

Does the Government intend to include sample problems for bidders to provide solutions as part of the technical evaluation?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government does not intend to include sample problems for bidders to solve as part of the technical evaluation. All information and instructions regarding the required technical approach are listed in Section L of the solicitation. Offerors should refer directly to that section to ensure their proposals address all evaluated criteria. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11849214	General	Solicitation Attachment 5		

Comment Classification: N/A

SAM.gov is listing the RFP release date as 5/22/206. As questions are due 5/21/2026, will the Q&A be integrated into the final version? What is the forecasted release date of the RFP at this writing?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . All Questions and Answers (Q&A) received will be integrated into the final version of the solicitation, currently forecasted for release in late 3rd Quarter Fiscal Year 2026. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11849215	General	Solicitation Attachment 5		

Comment Classification: N/A

The Draft RFP does not include a min/max of projects to be cited for relevant past performance. Can the government provide the expected past performance citations?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11845365. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850132	General	Attachment 5 – Section L, Instruction to Offerors		VOLUME 2, FACTOR II - PAST PERFORMANCE

Comment Classification: N/A

Under Past Performance the Government states: To be considered recent, these projects must have at least 12 months of performance completed within three years from the closing date of this Solicitation.

Would the Government allow performance to be within five years from the closing date of this solicitation? This will allow all UMCS-V projects to be included.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government has taken this request under consideration; however, all submitted projects must meet the original solicitation criteria: at least 12 months of performance completed within three years of the closing date. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850138	General			Attachment 5, Section L.7

Comment Classification: N/A

Can the Government confirm whether graphics, workflow diagrams, system architecture drawings, captions, tables, and callout boxes embedded in the Technical Approach or Management Approach narrative count toward the applicable page limits?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Yes, graphics, workflow diagrams, system architecture drawings, captions, tables, and callout boxes embedded in the narrative count toward the applicable page limits. Per the solicitation instructions, these items are not listed among the exclusions. Please keep in mind the following format requirements for these items: If spreadsheets, tables, charts, etc., are submitted on 11" x 17" pages, each will count as two pages. Font size for these items may be reduced to a minimum of 10-point. Any narrative included within a chart, table, or graphic must be strictly limited to explaining the item itself. Any information that goes beyond this purpose may be deemed to count as regular text. Any pages that exceed the required page limits will not be evaluated. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850140	Cybersecurity			Section A.12

Comment Classification: N/A

Please confirm whether CMMC Level 2 self-assessment support documentation is required as part of the proposal submission. If required, please identify the specific proposal volume, tab, or section where this documentation must be included.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11847859. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850141	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

May a large business concern submit a proposal as a prime contractor under the unrestricted track while also participating as a member of a Joint Venture (JV) submitting under the small business reserve track? If permitted, please clarify any applicable limitations, organizational conflict of interest (OCI) considerations, affiliation concerns, disclosure requirements, or restrictions on shared resources/personnel between the two offerors.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Yes, a large business concern may submit a proposal as a prime contractor under an unrestricted track while simultaneously participating as a non-managing member of a Joint Venture (JV) submitting a separate proposal under a small business reserve track. However, this dual participation is subject to strict regulatory compliance, affiliation rules, workshare limitations, and disclosure requirements. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850142	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

May a single project be used to demonstrate experience in more than one FRCS category (e.g., a project involving both UMCS and SCADA capabilities), or must each submitted project be unique to a single FRCS category?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11848900. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850144	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

If a large business offeror self-performs one of the five required FRCS project types, may the remaining required FRCS project examples be submitted through key subcontractors or teaming partners, or is the offeror required to submit additional self-performed projects?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Yes, the remaining required FRCS project examples may be submitted through key subcontractors or teaming partners using Attachment 4. Per Section L, offerors are required to identify a minimum of one project that is self-performed by the Prime Contractor for one of the five FRCS types. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850146	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

When the Contracting Officer conducts the Rule of Two analysis to determine whether a task order will be set aside for small business reserve holders, will large business MATOC holders be notified of that determination prior to issuance of the task order solicitation?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The Contracting Officer conducts the Rule of Two analysis to determine whether a task order will be set aside for small business reserve holders or will be competed full and open. If the Contracting Officer determined the task order will be set aside for small business concerns, the Request for Proposal (RFP) is issued exclusively to those eligible small business offerors. Once an award is made, the final award notice is distributed to the entire MATOC suite to keep all contract holders informed of the outcome. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850147	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

When the Contracting Officer conducts the Rule of Two analysis to determine whether a task order will be set aside for small business reserve holders, will large business MATOC holders be notified of that determination prior to issuance of the task order solicitation?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11850146. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850150	General	Attachments 5 & 6		

Comment Classification: N/A

Given the extensive list of required elements in Section L.7 and the detailed evaluation criteria in Section M, will the Government increase the Volume 1, Tab A page limit beyond 15 pages, or clarify which elements may be addressed more concisely to avoid an Unacceptable rating?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government acknowledges the inquiry regarding the requirements detailed in Section L.7 and Section M, and the request to expand the page limit for Volume 1, Tab A. The Government will not increase the 15-page limit for this volume. Offerors are expected to synthesize their responses and clearly articulate how they meet all evaluation criteria within the established constraints. It remains the responsibility of the offeror to determine the most effective and concise method to address all required elements without exceeding the stipulated page limits. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850154	Cybersecurity			PWS 1.4.2 – Cybersecurity Engineering
Comment Classification: N/A Will the Government provide standardized RMF artifacts (e.g., control inheritance, boundary diagrams, system categorization) for UMCS/ESS systems? On: May 21 2026.				
	Government Response. . The Government will provide all available standardized Risk Management Framework (RMF) artifacts for the UMCS/ESS systems as provided by the Customer. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850155	General			PWS 5.5.2- Warranty
Comment Classification: N/A Will task orders define mission critical systems individually, or should offerors assume all operational UMCS/ESS outages are mission critical unless otherwise stated? On: May 21 2026.				
	Government Response. . Yes, all task orders will define mission critical systems individually. Offerors should not assume that all operational UMCS/ESS outages are mission critical unless it is explicitly stated within the requirements of the specific task order. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850158	General			PWS 5.2.9- PVT Requirements
Comment Classification: N/A Can the Government clarify how "consideration" for failed initial PVT attempts will be evaluated? On: May 21 2026.				
	Government Response. . The Government's assessment of consideration will be dependent upon the specific evaluation factors established in the solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850160	General	Attachment 5	Section L.7	
Comment Classification: N/A Please confirm whether safety documentation (Safety Program Certification, EMR letter, OSHA history) is excluded from the page count for Volume 1, or provide instructions on how offerors should incorporate these required materials within the existing page limits. On: May 21 2026.				
	Government Response. . Safety documentation--including the Safety Program Certification, EMR letter, and OSHA history--is included in the overall page count limit for Volume 1. These documents are not excluded from the limit. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850161	General			PWS 1.7.7.3- SSHO
Comment Classification: N/A For a Joint Venture prime, will an SSHO directly employed by either JV member be considered a "direct hire of the prime"? On: May 21 2026.				
	Government Response. . The Government will accept an SSHO directly employed by either member company of the Joint Venture as a direct hire of the prime contractor. Please note that the proposed SSHO must still meet all minimum certification, training, and experience requirements as specified in the solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850163	General			PWS 5.2.15- Warranty
Comment Classification: N/A				

For multi-phase or multi-building TOs with staggered PVTs, does the warranty start system-by-system at each PVT or at final TO completion?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Warranties begin upon successful completion of PVT. The Contractor shall track these dates and provide them to the Government On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850164	General	Attachments 5 & 6		

Comment Classification: N/A

Section M introduces evaluation considerations (e.g., feasibility, clarity, credibility) that are not delineated in Section L.7. Please confirm whether offerors must address each evaluation dimension in Section M explicitly within Volume 1 and whether additional detail beyond Section L.7 requirements is expected.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The evaluation is conducted strictly on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis. The considerations in Section M (Feasibility, Clarity, Credibility) describe how the Government will view the information requested in Section L.7 to determine acceptability. Offerors are not required to address these dimensions under separate headings, nor is additional detail expected beyond the explicit requirements of Section L.7. A complete and compliant response to Section L.7 will be sufficient to evaluate these dimensions. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850167	General			Attachment 5 - VOLUME 1, FACTOR I – TECHNICAL/MANAGEMENT APPROACH

Comment Classification: N/A

Is a name and CV overview appropriate for Key Personnel? Are key personnel resumes required/evaluated? Are these in page count?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11847847. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850169	General			Draft PWS Sections 5.2.2, 5.2.3, and 5.3.1

Comment Classification: N/A

For task order proposals requiring site validation, existing-condition surveys, or field investigations before pricing, will pre-proposal site visit costs be reimbursable, or must offerors include those costs in proposal preparation?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . All specific information and requirements regarding pre-proposal site visits, including cost reimbursement or proposal preparation instructions, will be provided at the individual task order level. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850170	General	Attachments 5 & 7		

Comment Classification: N/A

Section L requires a Foreign Execution Plan narrative. The PWS includes detailed requirements for OCONUS labor law compliance, base access rules, deployment procedures, cybersecurity training, clearances, and specific AOR requirements (CENTCOM, EUCOM, INDOPACOM). Please confirm whether the Foreign Execution Plan should address each PWS listed OCONUS country individually, or whether a general OCONUS execution framework is acceptable at the MATOC level.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . A general OCONUS execution framework is acceptable at the MATOC level. Offerors are not required to address each PWS-listed OCONUS country individually within the base contract proposal. Specific regional or country-level compliance and execution details will be addressed and evaluated at the individual Task Order level. On: Jun 04 2026

	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850172	General			Section A / FAR 52.219 / PWS 1.4

Comment Classification: N/A

For task orders containing a mix of services, construction, and supply elements, how will the Government determine the applicable limitation on subcontracting and self-performance calculation? Will the calculation be based on the predominant work type, total TO value, labor value only, or CLIN-level classification?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government determines the applicable limitation on subcontracting for mixed task orders based on the predominant work type, which is defined by the single NAICS code assigned to the contract. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850175	General	Attachments 5, 6 & 7		

Comment Classification: N/A

Section L.7 requires describing RMF and ATO approach. Section M requires demonstration of realistic ATO acquisition pathways. PWS requires cybersecurity deliverables, continuous monitoring, and compliance with UFC 4 010 06, UFGS 25 05 11, DoD 8570 M, CMMC, etc. Please clarify whether offerors must address compliance with UFC 4 010 06, UFGS 25 05 11, DoD 8570 M, STIGs, and other cybersecurity frameworks in the MATOC proposal, or whether these requirements apply only at the Task Order level.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Cybersecurity compliance requirements (including UFC 4-010-06, UFGS 25 05 11, DoD 8570.01-M, and STIGs) apply only at the Task Order level. At the base MATOC proposal stage, offerors must only demonstrate their technical approach for obtaining an ATO and managing the RMF lifecycle. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850181	General	Attachments 5 & 6		

Comment Classification: N/A

Section L.5.c and L.7 outline the structure for Volume 2 as: Tab A (FRCS Projects), Tab B (System Security Engineering Projects), Tab C (CPARS), and Tab D (PPQs). However, Section M.2's summary list identifies Tab B as CPARS and Tab C as PPQs, completely omitting the System Security Engineering projects from the tab layout hierarchy. To ensure perfect structural compliance, could the Government confirm if Volume 2 should strictly follow the structural tab sequence defined in Section L?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government confirms that the evaluation text in Section M.3 was indeed intended to reference Tab C for Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) submissions and Tab D for Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs), aligning with the structural definitions outlined in Section L and Section M.2. This correction will be formally incorporated into the final issued solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850187	General	Attachments 5 & 7		

Comment Classification: N/A

PWS lists mandatory key personnel (Program Manager, Project Manager, Quality Manager, Fire Protection Engineer, SSHO, Cyber engineers, HVAC techs, etc.) with qualifications. Section L does not require resumes or qualifications for these individuals. Section M evaluates organizational structure and staffing sufficiency. Please confirm whether resumes or detailed qualifications for the PWS Section 5.9 key personnel are required at the MATOC proposal stage, or whether offerors should provide only an organizational chart and staffing plan.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11847847. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850188	Security		Attachment 7 Performance Work Statement	

Comment Classification: N/A

Will the Government provide a Base Contract DD254 so Contractors may be prepared for Task Order security requirements?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . No, the Government will not provide a Base Contract DD Form 254. Because security requirements are highly specific to individual missions and locations, security classification guidance will be issued at the individual Task Order level. Contractors should prepare to address security requirements as they are defined in subsequent Task Order solicitations. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850195	General	Attachment 6		

Comment Classification: N/A

Please provide clarification on what minimum level of detail constitutes an 'Acceptable' rating under Factors I–III, given that the evaluation methodology does not allow for partial credit or strengths/weaknesses.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11845343. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850197	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

H.18 states that if a requirement cannot be satisfied under this MATOC, a standalone contract or other acquisition vehicle will be pursued instead. Prior to issuing a task order for an OCONUS location, will the Government notify all MATOC holders of any SOFA restrictions or country-specific limitations that may affect their ability to perform, so that holders can assess eligibility before expending resources on a proposal?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government will identify the OCONUS performance location and include applicable country-specific clauses and known SOFA requirements within the specific Task Order Solicitation or Performance Work Statement (PWS). MATOC holders will be able to review the Task Order Solicitation to assess their eligibility and capability to perform prior to submitting a proposal. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850198	General	Attachment 6		

Comment Classification: N/A

Section M.3 (Factor III) states that the Minimum Quantitative Requirements (MQRs) for Small Business Participation will be evaluated based on the 'total contract capacity value' ($5.1B). Because this is a Multiple Award Task Order Contract where the $5.1B represents the aggregate pool capacity across all awarded primes, an individual offeror cannot allocate percentages against the total pool capacity. Could the Government clarify if individual Offerors should calculate their MQR percentages based on their total estimated/proposed subcontracting dollars or an anticipated individual contract baseline?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The Minimum Quantitative Requirements (MQRs) for Small Business Participation must be calculated based upon the total contract value. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850202	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

Please confirm the basis the Government expects offerors to use when calculating dollar-value goals in the subcontracting plan submitted with the proposal.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . For the Subcontracting Plan (required for other-than-small businesses), offerors must base their dollar-value goals and percentages on the total planned subcontracting dollars. Conversely, the Small Business Participation Plan requires offerors to calculate their percentages based on the Total Contract Value. While

	the baseline for calculating percentages differs between the two documents, the absolute dollar amounts allocated to the small business categories must match and remain consistent across both the Subcontracting Plan and the Small Business Participation Plan. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850204	General	Attachments 5 & 6		

Comment Classification: N/A

In Section M.3, under the 'VOLUME 2, FACTOR II - PAST PERFORMANCE' heading, the sub-headings are labeled as 'Volume 2, Tab A – Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS)' and 'Volume 2, Tab B – Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ)'. This contradicts Section L and Section M.2, which define Tab A and Tab B as the technical project submission locations, and Tab C and Tab D as the supporting quality documentation locations. Could the Government confirm that the evaluation text in Section M.3 intended to reference Tab C and Tab D for CPARS and PPQs respectively?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11850181. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850207	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

Section L, Volume 2, Tab B requires that submitted projects "must have resulted in an Authority to Operate (ATO) for DoD Information Systems (IS)" and utilized the "DoD Risk Management Framework (RMF) for the Army, Navy, Air Force, or other DoD components." Will the Government consider a project in which an offeror successfully obtained an ATO for a non-DoD federal information system authorized under the NIST Risk Management Framework pursuant to FISMA, rather than the DoD RMF, as satisfying the Tab B requirement?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . No, the Government will not consider a project that obtained an Authority to Operate (ATO) for a non-DoD Federal Information System under the NIST Risk Management Framework (RMF) pursuant to FISMA as satisfying the requirements of Section L, Volume 2, Tab B. To be considered compliant, submitted projects must specifically have resulted in an ATO for a DoD Information System and utilized the DoD Risk Management Framework for the Army, Navy, Air Force, or other DoD components as stated in the solicitation instructions. Projects involving non-DoD federal systems will not be accepted. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850210	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

Please clarify whether subcontractors handling Covered Defense Information (CDI) or Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) will be required to independently maintain SPRS scores and/or CMMC certification.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11845379. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850211	General	Attachment 6		

Comment Classification: N/A

Section M.3 past performance evaluation text notes that an offeror with missing or sparse past performance will be evaluated as 'Neutral' and that a 'neutral rating shall be considered acceptable.' However, the Past Performance Ratings Table only lists 'Acceptable' and 'Unacceptable'. Could the Government clarify if a Neutral offeror will receive an 'Acceptable' rating on the final evaluation score sheet to align with the provided table?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Section M States the following: "In the case of an offeror without a record of recent and relevant past performance, or for whom information on past performance is not available or so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance (see RFO 15.202(c)(1), Evaluating Competitive Proposals)." Therefore, the offeror shall be determined to have "neutral" past performance. In the context of acceptability/unacceptability, a neutral rating

	shall be considered "Acceptable" for the purposes of the final evaluation score sheet and alignment with the Past Performance Ratings Table. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850213	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

For OCONUS task orders, will the Government evaluate the prime contractor independently on international execution capability, or may the prime rely on demonstrated capabilities of key subcontractors and teaming partners?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . For Outside the Continental United States (OCONUS) task orders, all specific evaluation criteria--including whether a prime contractor is evaluated independently on international execution capability or if they can leverage subcontractor experience--will be detailed exclusively at the task order level within each individual Task Order Solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850214	General		see note	

Comment Classification: N/A

Will there be a ramp on /ramp off option on this MATOC?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Yes, the solicitation does include on-ramp and off-ramp options. See Section A.10 and H.17of the solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850216	General	Attachments 5, 6 & 7		

Comment Classification: N/A

PWS includes CENTCOM, EUCOM, INDOPACOM requirements; LOA procedures; SPOT; OPSEC; CMMC; AT/FP; CAC issuance; NCIC III/TSDB screening. Section L does not state where to address these topics. Please identify which OCONUS security, force protection, and deployment requirements must be addressed in Volume 1 to avoid an Unacceptable rating under Section M.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Offerors are advised that specific OCONUS security, force protection, and deployment requirements--including combatant command-specific procedures (CENTCOM, EUCOM, INDOPACOM), LOA, SPOT, OPSEC, CMMC, AT/FP, and CAC/background screening--do not need to be addressed in Volume 1 of the base proposal. These requirements will be defined, evaluated, and addressed at the individual Task Order level based on specific mission needs. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850217	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

Will country-specific licensing, labor agreements, and local-national workforce requirements be handled at the Task Order level, or are offerors expected to demonstrate global compliance capability at the MATOC proposal stage?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Country-specific licensing, labor agreements, and local-national workforce requirements will be handled at the Task Order level. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850219	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

Please clarify how the Government anticipates applying Rule-of-Two analyses at the Task Order level for this MATOC, including:

* whether unrestricted awardees may compete on all TOs,
* whether certain TOs may be exclusively reserved for small businesses,
* and whether pools or on-ramping are anticipated.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Please refer to sections A.7, A.10, and H.17 of the solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850220	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

Will the Government evaluate the stability and exclusivity of teaming arrangements, or are non-exclusive teaming agreements acceptable?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11848893. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850221	General	Presolicitation Package		

Comment Classification: N/A

Section L does not mention CMMC. PWS establishes up to CMMC Level 3 requirements depending on CUI/FCI category. Section A.12 of the main solicitation says CMMS Level 2 Self-Assessment. Please reconcile the conflicting CMMC requirements between the main solicitation (CMMC Level 2 – Self Assessment) and PWS Section 8.9.1, which defines multiple higher level CMMC conditions.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11848974. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850222	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

Will the Government consider demonstrated MSI/enterprise integration capability separately from traditional controls installation capability during technical evaluation?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Yes, demonstrated MSI/enterprise integration capability will be considered and evaluated separately from traditional controls installation capability. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850224	Utilities Engineering		SOL__ATTACHMENT__7_PERFORMANCE_WORK_STATEMENT_UMCS_VI.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

Are there any mandatory integration requirements with existing Government-furnished enterprise energy management or metering systems? If so, can the Government provide interface specifications or preferred protocols?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Mandatory integration requirements with existing Government-furnished enterprise energy management or metering systems are task order dependent. If applicable, specific interface specifications or preferred protocols will be provided within the individual task order requirements. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850225	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

Please clarify whether Professional Engineer (PE) licensure is required at the base MATOC level, required only for specific Task Orders, or may be satisfied through subcontractor/teaming relationships.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Professional Engineer (PE) licensure is not a requirement at the base MATOC level. Instead, PE licensure requirements--including whether they can be satisfied through subcontractor or teaming relationships--are Task Order dependent and will be specified in each individual Task Order solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850226	General	Attachments 5 & 6		

Comment Classification: N/A

Small Business Participation Plan requires meeting precise percentages. Section M includes evaluation of past Small Business participation which implies documentation is required however Section L does not permit appendices unless specifically allowed. Please confirm whether supporting documentation demonstrating prior SB participation may be included in Volume 3 without counting toward page limits or violating the 'no appendices' rule.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Supporting documentation demonstrating prior Small Business participation may be included within Attachment 2, subject to a maximum limit of 10 pages. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850228	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

Please clarify whether Task Orders under UMCS VI may include:

* electrical power monitoring systems,
* microgrid integration,
* utility SCADA,
* industrial control systems,
* or OT cybersecurity modernization activities.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11845354. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850230	General	Attachment 7		

Comment Classification: N/A

PWS Paragraph 5.10 states that the Contractor shall report all manpower data using the secure website https://www.ecmra.mil. Given that the Department of Defense has decommissioned ECMRA and migrated manpower reporting functions to the Service Contract Reporting (SCR) module within SAM.gov, could the Government confirm if manpower reporting will be handled via SAM.gov at the Task Order level, or clarify if a separate USACE-specific collection platform will be utilized?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Yes, the Government confirms the contractor shall submit manpower reporting data relating to the performance of services contracts into the System for Award Management, consistent with existing service contract reporting requirements under RFO 52.204-14. The Contractor shall submit all the information required in the format specified at the following web address: https://sam.gov. Please see the revised version of the PWS. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850232	General	Attachment 7		

Comment Classification: N/A

PWS Paragraph 1.7.7 dictates that the Contractor must be prepared to transition from RMS to the new Contractor Management Platform (CMP) at any time. However, paragraphs 1.7.1.1 and 1.7.8.4 still explicitly mandate the use of RMS/QCS for tracking QC changes and uploading safety submittals. Could the Government clarify if both platforms will run concurrently upon contract award, or if individual Task Orders will explicitly designate a single platform of record?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The Performance Work Statement (PWS) has been updated to clarify that the Contractor Management Platform (CMP) will be the exclusive system of record. The conflicting requirements in paragraphs 1.7.1.1 and 1.7.8.4 have been resolved to reflect this change, and the platforms will not run concurrently. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850235	General	Attachment 7		

Comment Classification: N/A

PWS Paragraph 5.9 references "Attachment 2.0" for identifying mandatory Key Personnel disciplines and requirements; however, the actual qualification narratives are detailed inside Appendix B of the PWS. Additionally, Appendix B contains a broad list of technical roles (e.g., Fire Protection Engineer, HVAC Technician, Network Specialist). Could the Government confirm if resumes for all positions listed in Appendix B are required with the base MATOC proposal submission, or if these qualifications apply strictly to personnel proposed for individual Task Orders post-award?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11847847. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850238	Energy Mon & Controls		SOL__ATTACHMENT__7_PERFORMANCE_WORK_STATEMENT_UMCS_VI.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

Will the Government provide a list of preferred or pre-approved manufacturers for UMCS/BAS components, or is open protocol compliance sufficient?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government will not provide a list of preferred or pre-approved manufacturers for Utility Monitoring and Control Systems (UMCS) or Building Automation Systems (BAS) components. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850239	General	Attachment 7		

Comment Classification: N/A

PWS Paragraph 8.9.1 states that the "Department of War (DOW) established the CMMC Program." To ensure that regulatory compliance frameworks are precisely cited, could the Government verify that this reference should be interpreted as the Department of Defense (DoD) Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification program, and confirm that compliance tracking will follow current Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment (OUSD(A&S)) guidelines?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The reference to the "Department of War (DOW)" is accurate and represents the designated nomenclature for the Department of Defense (DoD) within this environment. The referenced program is indeed the Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) program. Compliance tracking, verification, and assessments will follow the current guidelines and rulemakings established by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment (OUSD(A&S)). On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850241	General			Attachment 5 - Section L

Comment Classification: N/A

Attachment 5 – Section L, Instruction to Offerors, Volume 0, Tab A – Solicitation with ALL Amendments and Attachments (signed), Page 9 of 14
a. Question/Comment: The referenced section addresses the SF 1449 (Solicitation/Contract/Order for Commercial Items) for the original solicitation, but the draft Solicitation uses a SF 33. Will the final RFP be on the SF 33 or SF 1449?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The final Solicitation will be issued utilizing the Standard Form (SF) 33. Attachment 5 (Section L, Instructions to Offerors) will be updated accordingly and released in conjunction with the final Solicitation package. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850243	Energy Mon & Controls		SOL__ATTACHMENT__7_PERFORMANCE_WORK_STATEMENT_UMCS_VI.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

Are there specific network segmentation or isolation requirements for UMCS/BAS networks beyond standard DoD RMF controls?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . These requirements are task order dependent and will be addressed at the task order level. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850244	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

Please clarify the anticipated annual Task Order throughput, expected average Task Order size, and anticipated ratio of CONUS versus OCONUS work.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government cannot provide anticipated annual task order throughput, average task order size, or a CONUS/OCONUS ratio at the MATOC level. Each task order will be issued based on mission requirements as they arise, and the size, scope, location, funding, and timing of future task orders are not known at this time. The use of an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity contract vehicle allows the Government to issue task orders for varying requirements during the ordering period, subject to the terms and conditions of the contract. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850245	Regulatory	DRAFT_SOLICITAION___W912DY26RA030		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___W912DY26RA030

Comment Classification: N/A

Please clarify whether task order deliverables will require turnover of non-proprietary databases, graphics, programming files, integration configurations, and administrative access credentials sufficient to permit continued operation, competition, and maintenance by follow-on contractors.

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Please be advised that all specific requirements concerning the turnover of non-proprietary databases, graphics, programming files, integration configurations, and administrative access credentials will be defined and detailed at the individual task order level. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850246	Energy Mon & Controls		SOL__ATTACHMENT__7_PERFORMANCE_WORK_STATEMENT_UMCS_VI.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

What are the Government's expectations regarding remote access for monitoring, diagnostics, and support? Are there preferred methods, restrictions, or required technologies (e.g., VPN, jump box, two-factor authentication)?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government's specific expectations regarding remote access for monitoring, diagnostics, and support will be explicitly defined within each individual Task Order. Any preferred methods, restrictions, or required technologies--such as Virtual Private Networks (VPNs), jump boxes, or Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) requirements--will be tailored to the specific security and operational needs of that Task Order. Contractors must review the individual Task Order requirements for applicable access protocols. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850247	General			Volume 1, Tab D

Comment Classification: N/A

Volume 1, Tab D – Management Approach, Organizational Structure: Resource Availability and Staffing Plan, Page 5 of 9
a. Question/Comment: As this is an IDIQ contract and Offerors are not privy to the details of planned work at the various regions the UMCS VI MATOC will cover, how are Offerors to determine the number of personnel and the mix of labor categories that are appropriate and realistic for the scope of this contract in order to be evaluated as acceptable?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The intent of the Resource Plan is to demonstrate the Offeror's overall corporate capacity and available resource pool to support this MATOC, rather than an exact staffing plan for specific, undefined task orders. Offerors shall provide a resource chart identifying the total pool of personnel, by labor category, that the Offeror and its teaming partners currently have available or plan to make available to support concurrent task orders under this contract. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850250	Contracting		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

Will any USACE offices other than Huntsville be delegated ordering authority during the base period, and how will contractors be notified?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Please refer to Section A.12 of the solicitation. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850251	Contracting		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

Are there any anticipated changes to the task order award process, ordering methods, or contract administration compared to the previous MATOC?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Any changes to the task order award process, ordering methods, or contract administration from the previous MATOCs will be defined and communicated with the UMCS VI awardees and individual task order solicitations. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850253	Contracting		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

Will the Government provide a sample or template for required project correspondence, reports, and deliverables (e.g., ICE system, PIEE, email)?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . No. The Government will not provide standardized templates or samples for routine project correspondence, informal reports, or emails. For systems such as the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE), contractors must comply with the system-guided entry screens and standardized electronic forms built into the platform. For contract deliverables, contractors must submit their own professional formats for review and approval in accordance with the Performance Work Statement (PWS) and Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL) instructions. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850254	Contracting		SOL__ATTACHMENT_2_SM ALL_BUSINESS_PARTICI PATION_PLAN.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

Are there any anticipated changes to the small business participation plan requirements or reporting compared to the previous MATOC?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . All changes to the small business participation plan requirements have been incorporated into this solicitation. Additionally, subcontracting reporting requirements have transitioned from eSRS.gov to SAM.gov. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850257	Contracting		SOL__ATTACHMENT_5_INSTRUCTION_TO_OFFERORS.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

For contractor team arrangements, will the Government evaluate the aggregate capability of the team or only the prime's experience?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . In accordance with Section L.2, offerors may submit project examples from key subcontractors in Factor 2, and their capability will be evaluated as part of the offeror's proposal, if a letter of commitment is provided. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850260	Contracting		SOL__ATTACHMENT_5_INSTRUCTION_TO_OFFERORS.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

How does the Government define a "key subcontractor" for the purposes of letters of commitment? Is there a threshold for technical or dollar value?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11848983. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850266	Contracting		SOL__ATTACHMENT_5_INSTRUCTION_TO_OFFERORS.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

Will the Government allow submission of project examples from key subcontractors for past performance evaluation, and if so, what documentation is required?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11850144. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850270	Contracting		SOL__ATTACHMENT__7_PERFORMANCE_WORK_STATEMENT_UMCS_VI.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

Under what circumstances will the Government elect to provide third-party technical inspection, and how will this be coordinated with the contractor's QC plan?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The specific circumstances under which the Government will elect to provide third-party technical inspections, as well as how they will be coordinated with the contractor's Quality Control (QC) plan, will be addressed and defined at the individual task order level. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850272	Contracting		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___W912DY26RA030.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

For OCONUS work, are there any unique host nation requirements, SOFA provisions, or local standards that supersede or supplement USACE/DoD criteria?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Any unique host nation requirements, Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) provisions, or local standards that supplement or supersede standard USACE and DoD criteria will be specified at the task order level. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850274	Contracting		DRAFT_SOLICITAION___ W912DY26RA030.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

Will the Government provide assistance with customs, import/export, or logistics for OCONUS task orders?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . Yes, the Government will provide assistance with customs, import/export, and logistics processing for OCONUS (Outside Continental United States) task orders, and the specific details and level of assistance will be specified in each individual OCONUS task order. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850275	Contracting		SOL__ATTACHMENT_6_EV ALUATION_FACTORS_FOR _AWARD.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

Will the Government provide additional detail on the weighting of technical, management, and price factors in the best value determination?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question inquiry ID 11845343. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850276	Contracting		SOL__ATTACHMENT_1_PA ST_PERFORMANCE_QUEST IONNARE.pdf-4.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

Does the Government encourage the inclusion of innovative alternative methods/processes in proposals, and if so, how will these be evaluated?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government evaluates proposals solely on an "Acceptable/Unacceptable" basis against the stated factors in the Request for Proposal (RFP), as the intent is to award to all qualifying offerors. All evaluation criteria and requirements for achieving an "Acceptable" rating are established within the RFP. While offerors may propose innovative alternative methods or processes, the Government does not anticipate providing additional definitions or evaluation standards beyond what is currently documented in the solicitation. Offerors are encouraged to carefully review the solicitation requirements to ensure their submissions provide sufficient detail to demonstrate full compliance. Because this is a pass/fail methodology, any failure to clearly meet the minimum requirements of an evaluation factor--regardless of the method proposed--will result in an "Unacceptable" rating for that factor, rendering the entire proposal ineligible for award. On: Jun 04 2026
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11850278	Contracting		SOL__ATTACHMENT_1_PA ST_PERFORMANCE_QUEST IONNARE.pdf-4.pdf	

Comment Classification: N/A

Are there any specific lessons learned from the current MATOC that the Government wants to see addressed in offerors' approaches?

On: May 21 2026.

	Government Response. . All applicable lessons learned from the previous MATOC have been incorporated into the requirements of this solicitation. Offerors should base their approaches on the requirements as currently written. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11850280	Contracting		SOL__ATTACHMENT_6_EVALUATION_FACTORS_FOR_AWARD.pdf	
Comment Classification: N/A Will the Government provide feedback or debriefs on unsuccessful proposals at the base MATOC or task order level? On: May 21 2026.				
	Government Response. . For unsuccessful proposals at the base Multiple Award Task Order Contract (MATOC) level, pre-award and post-award debriefings will be held in accordance with RFO 15.206. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11864365	Contracting	0		0
Comment Classification: N/A Would the government please consider allowing the past performance to be within seven years from the closing date of this solicitation? On: Jun 02 2026.				
	Government Response. . The Government has taken this request under consideration; however, all submitted projects must meet the original solicitation criteria: at least 12 months of performance completed within three years of the closing date. On: Jun 04 2026			
	Current Request Status: **Request Closed**			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				

Report Complete

Classified information is NOT permitted on this site.
Patent 11/892,984 ProjNet property of ERDC since 2004.