1. Section L, para 3.2 of the Draft Solicitation (dated 13 May 2026) stipulates "…Offerors shall provide three past performance references, if available, which shall reflect recent experience performed within the last ***three years*** [emphasis added] of the solicitation release date…In addition to these three past performance references, Offeror shall submit one additional past performance reference for each subcontractor proposed to perform more than **10%** of the total labor hours, if available."

   Will the Government consider revising the experience currency requirement from three years to five years in order to increase the number of qualified offerors?

   Answer: At this time the Government is not considering revising the past performance recency definition from three to five years. Please note that this solicitation includes recent changes to NAVSEA's approach to Past Performance for SeaPort RFPs, where Past Performance will be rated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis. An Offeror will not be considered unacceptable based on a lack of recent/relevant Past Performance.

2. Upon review of the B50 recompete solicitation in PIEE, we realized there was no final SOW included. Will that be provided as an update?

   Answer: All documents posted in PIEE are in their final versions.

3. There was an FCL requirement listed in the previous solicitation. Does the government wish to have this same requirement on the current RFP?
4.

   Answer: The facility clearance requirement is specified in the Statement of Work, which is Attachment 01 of the RFP.

5. SOW Section C.3.6 was omitted from the Technical Approach response requirements on Page 66 of the RFP. Was C.3.6 omitted intentionally?

   Answer: This is correct. It is intentional to list specific SOW requirements rather than all.

6. I have been reading into the subject opportunity and see that the effort is planned to be competed as a full and open task order through SeaPort NxG under the NAICS 541330 with a five year period of performance. Is this an accurate understanding of the

requirement? Additionally, I see that the effort is planned to be a follow-on to a contract held by Amentum Services (N0017822F3012.) Is this the correct incumbent contract?

Answer: The answer is yes to both questions.