

**Bid Inquiry Contractor Report
All Inquiries**

Project: RPSS III **Review:** RPSS III (00001)
(sorted by CommentID)
Displaying 171 inquiries.

Id	Discipline	Sheet	Detail	Spec
11737895	General	Pre-Solicitation		
Comment Classification: N/A				
Can the government share a DRAFT version of the solicitation requirements?				
On: Mar 06 2026.				
	Government Response. . Solicitation Draft was posted on 14 April 2026 and Final RFP was issued 5 June 2026. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11737904	General	Pre-Solicitation		
Comment Classification: N/A				
For past performance, will a subcontractor's experience be considered for evaluation, or will it be limited to experience from the prime contractor?				
On: Mar 06 2026.				
	Government Response. . Subcontractor experience will be considered as a part of the evaluation. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11748616	Program Management	PWS		Performance Objectives
Comment Classification: N/A				
Under draft PWS 2.0 – Performance Objectives, it states "The Contractor shall comply with all applicable Federal, State and Local laws, regulations, agreements, Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) and Memorandums of Agreement (MOA), Status of Forces Agreements (SOFA), and policies" but it really doesn't focus on Army Real Property regulations, publications, guidance, SOPs, manuals, policies and procedures. Will the Government be requiring adherence and standards compliance?				
On: Mar 13 2026.				
	Government Response. . Each task order will contain specific language concerning pertinent Army regulations and guidance to which the contractor will be required to adhere in completion of any defined work product. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11748623	Program Management	PWS		Contractor Key Personnel
Comment Classification: N/A				
At the end of draft PWS section 5.0 – Contractor Key Personnel, it states time should be allocated for obtaining a government imaged computer. If personnel move from installation to installation upon task order issuance, will the personnel need to get a new government imaged computer each time, or will they be able to use the same computer? How will provisioning delays be handed in task order schedules?				
On: Mar 13 2026.				
	Government Response. . The task order language will address this need as it pertains to the need for a Government imaged computer to complete specific work products within the task order scope of work. In passing, the Government only envisions this being a requirement when dealing with GFEBS data entry. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11748627	Other	PWS		OPSEC Training
Comment Classification: N/A				

Under the draft PWS section 7.4 - Operational Security (OPSEC) Training it states, "Personnel shall maintain security clearances as registered and approved...". Please clarify if this is a classified or unclassified contract, what level of security clearances contractor personnel will require, if a contractor facility clearance is required, and if such requirements will be at the contract level or task order level.

On: Mar 13 2026.

Government Response. . The task order language will address the need for security clearances, the need for a facility clearance, etc. As an aside, most of the work performed under this contract will be at the CUI level. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11748633	Engineering Support	PWS		
----------	---------------------	-----	--	--

Comment Classification: N/A

Can the Government clarify the distinction between engineering support allowed under this contract and prohibited design services?

On: Mar 13 2026.

Government Response. . This contract may be utilized to complete work under the designation of engineering support services. Examples include building assessments against new building code requirements with the end goal of defining a solution set to bring that building up to code. This contract will not be used for any work which end product includes any design beyond a 15% design effort, requires an engineer or architect stamp, or supports construction. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11748635	Geographic Information System	PWS		
----------	-------------------------------	-----	--	--

Comment Classification: N/A

Is the Government considering adding Real Property GIS data development and maintenance support to the final PWS, as Army guidance states they should be aligned?

On: Mar 13 2026.

Government Response. . Real Property GIS data development is included within the scope of work. See PWS section 3.2 Real Property Systems of Record. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11748637	General	PWS		
----------	---------	-----	--	--

Comment Classification: N/A

Will contractors be required to reconcile discrepancies between systems?

On: Mar 13 2026.

Government Response. . Reconciliation of real property data sets between systems may be required. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11748639	General	PWS		
----------	---------	-----	--	--

Comment Classification: N/A

Will the government require rapid surge support for physical inspections, ePRISMS surveys, or other services?

On: Mar 13 2026.

Government Response. . The Government expects any and all work to be completed within the task order requirements of the scope of work. If the task order scope of work requires completion of work at an accelerated timeline; the awardee will be expected to meet the timeline stated therein. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11748641	General	Customer		
Comment Classification: N/A				
Who will be able to use this MATOC IDIQ? Army-only or other than Army?				
On: Mar 13 2026.				
	Government Response. . See Section A.10 of the Solicitation. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11748643	General	PWS		
Comment Classification: N/A				
How many task orders are anticipated post award?				
On: Mar 13 2026.				
	Government Response. . The Government is unable to determine a specific number of task orders at this time. Task orders will be issued based on recurring mission needs and requirements. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11748646	General	PWS		
Comment Classification: N/A				
What percentage of work is expected to be on-site versus deskside?				
On: Mar 13 2026.				
	Government Response. . The details requested are governed by the specific PWS of individual task orders. As such, this inquiry is outside the scope of the base MATOC solicitation and should be submitted during the Q&A period for the relevant task order solicitation. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11748652	General	Incumbent		
Comment Classification: N/A				
Who Is the incumbent(s) as alluded to in draft PWS 8.5.9 – Transition (Phase In/Phase Out)? How many Task Orders were issued to them and what is their contract number? What percentage of work historically has been Real Property data management and/or SME staff augmentation? What percentage of the task orders were OCONUS versus CONUS?				
On: Mar 13 2026.				
	Government Response. . The incumbent contractor is KFS, LLC under Contract Number W912DY22D0102. Specific details regarding the exact number of issued task orders, the historical percentage breakdown of Real Property data management and SME staff augmentation, and the proportion of OCONUS versus CONUS task orders are not publicly available. Offerors are advised to formulate their transition and staffing approaches based on the current requirements and workloads defined within this active solicitation. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11748656	General	Pre-Sol Notice		
Comment Classification: N/A				
The Pre-Solicitation Synopsis on SAM.Gov states "potentially award to all technical qualified offerors" and with the estimated capacity for this procurement at \$60M shared amongst MATOC pool holders, is the Government considering setting an upper limit on the number of awards or raising the capacity?				
On: Mar 13 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 8(a) qualifying offerors. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11748659	General	General		
Comment Classification: N/A				

Will the Government consider allowing other socio-economic contractors to bid?

On: Mar 13 2026.

Government Response. . This is an 8(a) set-aside acquisition; therefore, no other socio-economic categories will be able to submit a proposal. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11748661 General General

Comment Classification: N/A

When does the Government intend to release the RFP?

On: Mar 13 2026.

Government Response. . The RFP was issued 5 June 2026. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11748663 General General

Comment Classification: N/A

What will be the task order competition process (best value, LPTA, etc.)?

On: Mar 13 2026.

Government Response. . The specific evaluation criteria and selection methodology (e.g., Best Value Tradeoff, Lowest Price Technically Acceptable) will be tailored to the unique requirements of each effort and clearly defined at the individual task order level. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11748665 General Past Performance

Comment Classification: N/A

When the RFP is released, will the Government consider past performance citations from proposed subcontractors/team members?

On: Mar 13 2026.

Government Response. . The RFP was released on 5 June 2026. For specific guidance regarding the consideration of past performance citations from proposed subcontractors or team members, please refer to Section L, Volume II, Factor 2 – Past Performance (Page 8). On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11748667 General General

Comment Classification: N/A

What is the target date for award?

On: Mar 13 2026.

Government Response. . The target date of award is 30 November 2026. Please note this date is subject to change. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11748683 General General

Comment Classification: N/A

We recommend that if the customer chooses to issue this requirement as an 8(a) Set-Aside, it should be issued according to FAR 8.104, which states that buyers "must use the existing government-wide contract or blanket purchase agreement to buy the supply or service if the contract has been designated by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy as best-in-class." This means the customer would receive credit for both using a best-in-class vehicle and fulfilling a set-aside requirement.

On: Mar 13 2026.

Government Response. . The Government acknowledges your recommendation to issue this requirement as an 8a set-aside utilizing a Best-in-Class vehicle in accordance with FAR 8.104. However, after reviewing the acquisition

	strategy, the Government has determined it will not pursue this approach and declines to issue the requirement as an 8a set-aside on a Best-in-Class vehicle at this time. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11750671	General	PWS		
Comment Classification: N/A				
In the Draft PWS Section 2.3 Field Validation & Assessment includes performance objectives for "Field Validation & Assessment" and "Space Management Support". Question: Is Space Management Support a separate performance objective?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . Yes, Space Management Support is a separate performance objective. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751107	Other			W912DY26RA026: Real Property Support Services III
Comment Classification: N/A				
1) Is the proposed RFP issue date still March 30th? When is the anticipated award date?				
2) Who evaluates the MATOC proposals for award and furthermore, who will evaluate the individual task orders for award?				
3) Are there task orders currently in the pipeline for issuance? And how soon after the MATOC award, do we expect the first task order?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . 1) The Final RFP was issued 5 June 2026. The anticipated award date is 30 September 2026. Please note this date is subject to change.			
	2). The Government is unable to provide specific, identifiable information regarding the personnel serving on the evaluation teams. Selection evaluations for the MATOC award, as well as subsequent evaluations for individual task orders, are strictly conducted by authorized members of the Government's selection evaluation board in accordance with acquisition regulations.			
	3). The Government is unable to determine or commit to a specific number of task orders in the pipeline at this time. Task orders will be identified and issued based on recurring mission needs and project requirements. Additionally, the exact timeline for issuing the first task order following the MATOC will be determined once the MATOC is awarded.			
	On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751218	Other	PWS	Pages 1-3	Purpose and 2 Performance Objectives
Comment Classification: N/A				
Paragraph 2 under 1.0 identifies onsite & deskside support.				
Are the planned resources in support of these objectives 2.1 thru 2.11 required to be locally deployed on site on a full time basis?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . The PWS establishes the overall framework for onsite and deskside support under Section 1.0. However, whether resources for tasks 2.1 through 2.11 must be physically deployed onsite on a full-time basis will be explicitly defined at the individual task order level, matching the specific operational requirements of that requirement. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751220	Other	PWS	Page 3	2 Performance Objectives, 2.6 Env Support and 2.7 Engineering Support
Comment Classification: N/A				
Can the Govt provide the exact types of engineers other than Environmental Engineers that will be needed to complete the effort?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . No. At this time, the Government cannot specify the exact types of engineers required to support this contract. The exact discipline of engineer will not be evident until the work to be completed on individual			

task orders has been defined. On: Jun 18 2026				
Current Request Status: Request Closed				
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751223	Other	PWS	Page 3	2 Performance Objectives, 2.9 Utility Analyses
Comment Classification: N/A				
Is the government open to the use of AI enabled processing tools to create and sustain monitoring actions and reporting?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . Yes, but only through government-approved systems. Please note that all information generated during the execution of this task order is designated as Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI). Consequently, entering or processing this data in any system or AI tool that has not been explicitly authorized to handle CUI is strictly prohibited. On: Jun 18 2026			
Current Request Status: Request Closed				
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751225	Other	PWS	Page 4	3 Scope, 3.1 Geographic Systems
Comment Classification: N/A				
Does the USACE US Army have standardized geospatial data conventions, or architecture requirements for GIS development, including data layering standards, geospatial schemas, and enterprise data environments?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . Yes, USACE US Army has standardized geospatial data conventions, or architecture requirements for GIS development, including data layering standards, geospatial schemas, and enterprise data environments. On: Jun 18 2026			
Current Request Status: Request Closed				
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751229	Other	PWS	Page 4	3 Scope, 3.1 Geographic Systems
Comment Classification: N/A				
Does the Government maintain formal system documentation and configuration management processes governing platform updates, version control, and change management for geospatial or real property data environments supporting this contract?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . Yes. The Government maintains formal system documentation and configuration management processes for the applicable geospatial and real property data environments. These materials and guidelines will be provided to the successful offeror following the base contract award On: Jun 18 2026			
Current Request Status: Request Closed				
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751230	Other	PWS	Page 4-5	3 Scope, 3.2 Real Property Systems
Comment Classification: N/A				
Does system documentation exist for change control and platform updates, versioning, etc?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . Yes. System documentation exists for change control, platform updates, and versioning. On: Jun 18 2026			
Current Request Status: Request Closed				
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751232	Other	PWS	Page 4	3 Scope, 3.2 Real Property Systems: BUILDER
Comment Classification: N/A				
There are many stages of supporting BUILDER and the data sustainment workflows.				
Can the Govt please define the BUILDER scope of services that are defined as "strictly data entry and data integrity only"?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				

	Government Response. . This limitation is in reference to the assessment of building systems by an engineer. Assessment of a building system by an engineer is judged to be engineering work and is therefore relegated to award under an A&E contract. This contract will not be utilized to support A&E work as stated in PWS section 2. However, if the need is for entry of already collected data into BUILDER, this contract can be utilized to that end. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751235	Other	PWS	Page 4	3 Scope, 3.2 Real Property Systems: BUILDER
Comment Classification: N/A				
BUILDER SMS is currently being replaced by with ESMS. Does the Govt plan to be migrating to the new BUILDER version, ESMS, during this contract period of performance? On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . At this time, it is not known whether the Government plans to migrate to the new ESMS version during this contract's period of performance. We will provide updates and further directions if a definitive timeline is established. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751237	Other	PWS	Page 5	4 Contract Requirements, 4.4 OnSite Logistics Information
Comment Classification: N/A				
Can the Govt identify the current timeline and process for site access and security logistics, including potential onsite escorting? On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . Such timelines and requirements will be delineated within the task order language. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751239	Other	PWS	Page 6	5 Contractor Personnel, 5.2 Program Analyst
Comment Classification: N/A				
Can the Govt confirm a program analyst is required for each of the eleven (11) identified systems of record? On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . See section 5.2 of the revised PWS. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751240	Other	PWS	Page 6	5 Contractor Personnel, 5.2 Program Analyst
Comment Classification: N/A				
Could a qualified program analyst perform functions across multiple systems of record? On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11751239. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751243	Other	Industry Day	Industry Day	DD1391 Development Requirements Analysis
Comment Classification: N/A				
Is the government open to the use of AI enabled processing tools to create and enhance DD1391s? On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11751223. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751245	Other	Synopsis	Page 1	MATOC Structure
Comment Classification: N/A				
Can the Government provide an estimate of the anticipated number of MATOC awardees expected for RPSS III?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11748656. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751246	Other	Synopsis	Page 1	Task Order Execution under MATOC
Comment Classification: N/A				
Can the Government provide insight into the anticipated average size and frequency of task orders expected under the RPSS III MATOC?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . At this time, the Government cannot provide specific insight into the anticipated average size or frequency of task orders expected to be issued under the RPSS III MATOC. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751248	Other	PWS	Pages 4-5	3 Scope, 3.2 Real Property Systems
Comment Classification: N/A				
Among the real property systems of record identified in Section 3.2 (e.g., GFEBS, ePRISMs, ISR-I, RPLANS, HQIIS, PRIDE, BUILDER, ASIP), does the Government anticipate that certain systems will represent the majority of task order work under this contract?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . The contractor should be prepared to support any of the systems identified as outlined in the PWS. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751249	Other	PWS	Pages 42-4	3 Scope, Field Validation & Data Support Activities
Comment Classification: N/A				
For task orders involving field validation and data verification activities, does the Government anticipate that contractors will be responsible for performing physical facility inspections, or will support primarily focus on validating and reconciling existing real property data within the systems of record?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . The contractor should be prepared to perform both physical inspections and field verification activities. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751250	Other	PWS	Pages 4-5	3 Scope and 4 Contract Requirements
Comment Classification: N/A				
Will task orders issued under the RPSS III MATOC primarily support individual installations, or will some task orders require enterprise-level support across multiple installations or geographic regions?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . The contractor should be prepared to provide support both at the individual installation level and the enterprise level. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				

11751251	Other	PWS	Pages 4-5	3 Scope and 4 Contract Requirements
Comment Classification: N/A				
Can the Government provide insight into the typical duration of task orders anticipated under this contract (e.g., short-term studies versus longer-term staff augmentation support)?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . Typical duration is between 12 and 18 months. However, the Government may require task orders of longer or shorter duration, depending on the requirement at the task order level. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751531	Geographic Information System			Synopsis_Attachment_RPSS_III_PWS_Draft.p df
Comment Classification: N/A				
Does the government anticipate the initial task orders to be short duration / project based or long-term / staff augmentation based? Is there any additional information you can share? The more information the government can provide, as early as possible, regarding anticipated initial task orders, the better offerors will be able to prepare.				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11751251. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751532	Geographic Information System	1, 2		Synopsis_Attachment_RPSS_III_PWS_Draft.p df
Comment Classification: N/A				
Based on the breadth of the draft PWS (i.e., size, scope, locations, etc.) our team recommends allowing the use of subcontractor past performance to be considered in the solicitation evaluation criteria in addition to any required prime contractor experience.				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11748665. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751543	Geographic Information System	1, 2		Synopsis__Pre__Sol icitation_Notice__R PSS_III.pdf
Comment Classification: N/A				
Does the government anticipate including an initial task order as part of the multiple award IDIQ onboarding solicitation? If so, can the government provide details, as early as possible, including incumbent task order number, scope, key personnel requirements, etc. to provide bidders with the best opportunity to provide a competitive response?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . No, the Government does not anticipate including an initial task order as part of the base IDIQ onboarding solicitation. Therefore, we will not be providing details such as incumbent task order numbers, scope, or key personnel requirements at this time. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751563	Geographic Information System			Synopsis_Attachment_RPSS_III_PWS_Draft.p df
Comment Classification: N/A				
Would task orders be firm-fixed price (FFP) or time and material (T&M) based?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . Task orders will be issued as Firm Fixed Price. On: Jun 18 2026			

Current Request Status: Request Closed				
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751567	Geographic Information System			Synopsis_Attachment_RPSS_III_PWS_Draft.p df
<p>Comment Classification: N/A</p> <p>Can the government clarify and provide an estimate on anticipated on-site staff augmentation work along with anticipated locations that will require full-time staff on-site to support?</p> <p>On: Mar 16 2026.</p>				
Government Response. . The Government is unable to provide an estimate for anticipated on-site staff augmentation work or specific locations at this time. On: Jun 18 2026				
Current Request Status: Request Closed				
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751577	Geographic Information System		2.3	Synopsis_Attachment_RPSS_III_PWS_Draft.p df
<p>Comment Classification: N/A</p> <p>Can the government provide a listing of anticipated types of field validation and assessment studies (e.g. FUS, Asset Evaluations, SUE studies, etc.)?</p> <p>On: Mar 16 2026.</p>				
Government Response. . The contractor should be prepared to support any type of field study/analysis/assessment which focuses on real property on an installation. On: Jun 18 2026				
Current Request Status: Request Closed				
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751587	Geographic Information System		5.4	Synopsis_Attachment_RPSS_III_PWS_Draft.p df
<p>Comment Classification: N/A</p> <p>The draft PWS describes specific Key Personnel as Program Manager and Program Analyst (specifically GFEBS) along with task order based SMEs. Can the government elaborate on anticipated SMEs and/or additional Key Personnel that offerors will be evaluated on?</p> <p>On: Mar 16 2026.</p>				
Government Response. . BUILDER support is strictly data entry and data integrity only. See Section 3.2 of the PWS. On: Jun 18 2026				
Current Request Status: Request Closed				
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751603	Geographic Information System		3.2	Synopsis_Attachment_RPSS_III_PWS_Draft.p df
<p>Comment Classification: N/A</p> <p>The draft PWS states that no BUILDER data collection will be required. Will the anticipated BUILDER work preclude consultants from pursuing BUILDER FCA data collection contracts due to potential OCI?</p> <p>On: Mar 16 2026.</p>				
Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11751587. On: Jun 18 2026				
Current Request Status: Request Closed				
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751609	Geographic Information System		3.2	Synopsis_Attachment_RPSS_III_PWS_Draft.p df
<p>Comment Classification: N/A</p> <p>Does the government anticipate consultants needing security clearances to perform anticipated work? If so, which level of clearances may be required?</p>				

On: Mar 16 2026.

Government Response. . Individual requirements beyond the CUI level will be specified within the language of the task order award. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11751628	Geographic Information System		5.4	Synopsis_Attachment_RPSS_III_PWS_Draft.p df
----------	-------------------------------	--	-----	---

Comment Classification: N/A

Can the government clarify whether all staff will be required to possess IAT Level 1 certification or only the Key Personnel described (Program Manager and Program Analyst)

On: Mar 16 2026.

Government Response. . Only personnel providing systems architecture support must have IAT Level 1 certification. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11751712	Contracting	Real Property Support Services Questions		
----------	-------------	--	--	--

Comment Classification: N/A

1. Will task orders be issued as single-discipline efforts (e.g., only GFEBS support) or as multi-discipline, bundled requirements combining data maintenance, SME support, and analyses?
2. The PWS states OCONUS travel is "highly unusual," yet lists 12+ OCONUS countries. Can the Government quantify expected OCONUS travel frequency (e.g., percentage of task orders or estimated annual trips)?
3. The PWS notes that GFEBS access and government-imaged computers may take "several months." Will the Government allow phased staffing or schedule adjustments when system access delays are outside the contractor's control?
4. The PWS states systems may change over the life of the contract. If new systems are added, will the Government fund or provide required training, or is the contractor expected to absorb all training costs?
5. Do all the mandatory trainings permit remote completion, if not, which do not?
6. Will subcontractor manpower be reported by the prime, or will subcontractors report directly in SAM.gov?
7. Is the requirement for IAT Level I certification for key personnel only?
8. The PWS requires a 30-day transition with key personnel on board. Will the Government fund transition labor under the base contract, or must vendors include transition costs in their indirect rates?
9. Section 8.5.10 states that "the Contractor must provide a fully qualified workforce on the first day of the contract period." For a MATOC with unknown task order timing and scope, this could result in significant idle labor costs. Does this requirement apply only to the base IDIQ award?
10. Will the Government provide expected timelines for task order issuance so contractors can plan recruitment and onboarding accordingly, and will task orders include a phase-in period to allow for hiring and access provisioning?

(Attachment: Questions_to_the_Government_-_Real_Property.pdf) On: Mar 16 2026.

Government Response. . 1. See response to question ID number 11751251.
2. Information will be specified at the Task Order Level.
3. An anticipated schedule of events for this type of work will be included within the task order language.
4. No, the Government does not provide training in new systems.
5. All mandatory training is offered remotely.
6. The Prime is responsible for reporting subcontractor manpower. The Prime is responsible for ensuring they maintain at least 51% work split IAW 8(a) SBA requirements.
7. See response to question ID number 11751628.
8. See Revised PWS
9. It is expectation of the Government that the contractor is available to respond to task order work requests within a very short period of time. The contractor is generally afforded a maximum of 30 days after task order award to mobilize its workforce and engage in project execution. Any anticipated delays beyond the 30 day mobilization period should be noted within the contractor's proposal at the task order level.
10. It is expectation of the Government that the contractor is available to respond to task order work requests within a

	very short period of time. The contractor is generally afforded a maximum of 30 days after task order award to mobilize its workforce and engage in project execution. Any anticipated delays beyond the 30 day mobilization period should be noted within the contractor's proposal at the task order level. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751713	Contracting	Real Property Support Services Questions		
Comment Classification: N/A				
Will task orders be issued as single-discipline efforts (e.g., only GFEBS support) or as multi-discipline, bundled requirements combining data maintenance, SME support, and analyses?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . Information will be provided at the Task Order level. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751714	Contracting	Real Property Support Services Questions		
Comment Classification: N/A				
The PWS states OCONUS travel is "highly unusual," yet lists 12+ OCONUS countries. Can the Government quantify expected OCONUS travel frequency (e.g., percentage of task orders or estimated annual trips)?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . While the Performance Work Statement (PWS) includes a comprehensive list of potential OCONUS locations to establish the maximum geographic scope of the contract, the Government cannot quantify the expected frequency of OCONUS travel, estimate annual trips, or provide a set percentage at the base contract level. OCONUS travel will be specified at the task order level for the individual task orders. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751716	Contracting	Real Property Support Services Questions		
Comment Classification: N/A				
The PWS notes that GFEBS access and government-imaged computers may take "several months." Will the Government allow phased staffing or schedule adjustments when system access delays are outside the contractor's control?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . An anticipated schedule of events for this type of work will be included within the task order language. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751718	Contracting	Real Property Support Services Questions		
Comment Classification: N/A				
The PWS states systems may change over the life of the contract. If new systems are added, will the Government fund or provide required training, or is the contractor expected to absorb all training costs?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . See response to question 4 for ID number 11751712. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751719	Contracting	Real Property Support Services Questions		
Comment Classification: N/A				
Do all the mandatory trainings permit remote completion, if not, which do not?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				

	Government Response. . See response to question 5 for ID number 11751712. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751721	Contracting	Real Property Support Services Questions		
<p>Comment Classification: N/A</p> <p>Will subcontractor manpower be reported by the prime, or will subcontractors report directly in SAM.gov?</p> <p>On: Mar 16 2026.</p>				
	Government Response. . See response to question 6 for ID number 11751712. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751723	Contracting	Real Property Support Services Questions		
<p>Comment Classification: N/A</p> <p>Is the requirement for IAT Level I certification for key personnel only?</p> <p>On: Mar 16 2026.</p>				
	Government Response. . See response to question 7 for ID number 11751712. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751725	Contracting	Real Property Support Services Questions		
<p>Comment Classification: N/A</p> <p>The PWS requires a 30-day transition with key personnel on board. Will the Government fund transition labor under the base contract, or must vendors include transition costs in their indirect rates?</p> <p>On: Mar 16 2026.</p>				
	Government Response. . See response to question 8 for ID number 11751712. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751727	Contracting	Real Property Support Services Questions		
<p>Comment Classification: N/A</p> <p>Section 8.5.10 states that "the Contractor must provide a fully qualified workforce on the first day of the contract period." For a MATOC with unknown task order timing and scope, this could result in significant idle labor costs. Does this requirement apply only to the base IDIQ award?</p> <p>On: Mar 16 2026.</p>				
	Government Response. . It is expectation of the Government that the contractor is available to respond to task order work requests within a very short period of time. The contractor is generally afforded a maximum of 30 days after task order award to mobilize its workforce and engage in project execution. Any anticipated delays beyond the 30 day mobilization period should be noted within the contractor's proposal at the task order level. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11751729	Contracting	Real Property Support Services Questions		
<p>Comment Classification: N/A</p> <p>Will the Government provide expected timelines for task order issuance so contractors can plan recruitment and onboarding accordingly, and will task orders include a phase-in period to allow for hiring and access provisioning?</p> <p>On: Mar 16 2026.</p>				
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11751727. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11752027	General			Synopsis_Attachment_ RPSS_III_PWS_Draft.p df
Comment Classification: N/A				
Will the task orders be FFP - deliverable based, or staff augmentation, or a possibility of either?				
On: Mar 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11751563. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11811357	Contracting	.	.	.
Comment Classification: N/A				
Draft PWS requires contractors to have CMMC Level 2 (Self-certified), while Solicitation requires CMMC Level 2 (C3PAO) at time of contract award. Many 8(a)s will not yet have achieved Level 2 3rd party assessed due to the costs involved; this will severely limit the level of competition and potential awards. Can the govt clarify and limit it to CMMC Level 2 self-certified as in the PWS?				
On: Apr 24 2026.				
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11880069. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11813896	Contracting	Attach_2__Section_ L__Instructions_To_ Offerors_Draft	Page 8	Tab 2 , Element 2- Key Personnel
Comment Classification: N/A				
Will the government please clarify the number and type of key personnel required and the number of key personnel resumes required (minimum and maximum) at time of submission? For example, does the government require only two key personnel as indicated in PWS section 5.1 and 5.2.1 (Program Manager and Program Analyst for GFEBs), with a minimum and maximum of one resume for each position (i.e., two resumes)? In addition to those two key personnel, does the government also require two key personnel for each of the eleven (11) performance objectives listed (2.1 - 2.11), for a total of twenty-two (22) designated key personnel? If the additional 22 are required, does the government expect/require 22 unique key personnel or will some lesser combination suffice? For example, a minimum of "less than 22 resumes" and a maximum of twenty-two (22) resumes? In summary, is the government expecting up to 24 key personnel resumes on this small business set-aside procurement?				
On: Apr 27 2026.				
	Government Response. . The contractor need only provide one resume for a Program Manager and one resume for a Program Analyst. Minimum of two, maximum of four individual resumes who will function as technical managers shall be submitted and must exhibit experiences in one or more property systems of record. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11813897	Contracting	Attach_2__Section_ L__Instructions_To_ Offerors_Draft	Page 7	Page limitations
Comment Classification: N/A				
Are resumes excluded from the maximum page count?				
On: Apr 27 2026.				
	Government Response. . Yes. Resumes are excluded from the maximum page count. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11828861	General	Attach_2__Section_ L__Instructions_To_ Offerors_Draft	Page 8	
Comment Classification: N/A				
The instructions state: "The Offeror shall provide resumes for a minimum of two individuals who will function as Technical Managers in each of the fields listed in the PWS paragraph 2, Performance Objectives." - Can a single individual be a Technical Manager in multiple Performance Objective areas?				
On: May 07 2026.				

	Government Response. . Yes, a single individual can be proposed for multiple performance objectives. The contractor is reminded that the Government has not requested that each of the individual performance objectives be addressed within the resumes of the technical managers. Within the resumes, the contractor is only required to address the five areas listed within the solicitation as requiring subject matter experts. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11828864	General	Attach_1___Performan ce_Work_Statement_Dr aft	Section 2.3	Page 2
Comment Classification: N/A				
It looks like both Field Validation & Assessment as well as Space Management Support are listed in 2.3. Are those meant to be addressed as individual Performance Objectives?				
On: May 07 2026.				
	Government Response. . Those work products are listed under the section titled 'Performance Objectives'. The solicitation does not contain a requirement for the contractor to address individual performance objectives within it's response. It is advisable but not required. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11828870	General	Attach__3__Section_M _Basis_for_Award_Dra ft		
Comment Classification: N/A				
With all qualified Offerors receiving a MATOC, how will individual task orders on the MATOC be awarded? How will the government determine which Offeror receives each task order?				
On: May 07 2026.				
	Government Response. . Task Order's evaluation criteria will be identified at the TO solicitation which will be provided to all MATOC awardees. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11828877	General	Attach__2__Section_ L___Instructions_To_ Offerors_Draft		Tab 2, Element 2 - Key Personnel
Comment Classification: N/A				
Are resumes required for any key personnel identified in the PWS (Program Manager, Program Analysts, SMEs) or only Technical Managers for each of the disciplines IAW paragraph 2 of the PWS, as indicated in Section L.				
On: May 07 2026.				
	Government Response. . This question has been addressed within the revisions to the PWS and the revised solicitation. Contractors are required to submit resumes for both the Program Manager and the Program Analyst, and minimum of two resumes or maximum 4 for technical managers for disciplines outlined in the solicitation. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11830160	Contracting	Attach__1___Performa nce_Work_Statement_D raf	Page 12	8.2 Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) Requirements.
Comment Classification: N/A				
Attach__1___Performance_Work_Statement_Draf Section 8.2 states, "The Contractor shall have and maintain for the duration of this contract, order, or agreement a current CMMC status at the following CMMC level, or higher: CMMC Level 2 (Self) for all information systems used in performance of the contract, task order, or delivery order that process, store, or transmit FCI or CUI....The Government does not, at the time of award, expect that handling of sensitive CUI critical to national security will be conducted under this MATOC. The Government maintains that handling of such information may be required. The need to process sensitive CUI critical to national security will be established at the task order level. In support of such projects and task orders, the contractor will be required to achieve and maintain a CMMC level 2 C3PAO certification."				
Will the government confirm that at time of submission and for onboarding to the MAC, CMMC Level 2 (Self Certified) is all that is required? If so, we request and recommend retaining this requirement as stated.				
To fulfill this requirement at the task order level by offerors submitting as a joint venture (JV), will the government confirm that as				

long as one member of the JV is CMMC Level 2 (Self) certified and one member is CMMC Level 2 C3PAO certified, the JV will meet the CMMC requirements, as stated, at the task order level?

On: May 07 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11811357. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11832149	Other		Pg. 2	PROPOSAL SUBMISSION VIA PIEE
----------	-------	--	-------	---------------------------------

Comment Classification: N/A

The Offeror shall provide resumes for a minimum of two individuals who will function as Technical Managers in each of the fields listed in the PWS paragraph 2, Performance Objectives.

PWS paragraph 2 lists 11 performance objects. Does the Government require 22 key personnel/subject matter experts to provide this support, or was it the Governments intent to reference PWS Section 5. Contractor Key Personnel?

(Attachment: Attach__2__Section_L__Instructions_To_Offerors_Draft.pdf) On: May 08 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11813896. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11832158	Other		Pg. 6	PROPOSAL SUBMISSION VIA PIEE
----------	-------	--	-------	---------------------------------

Comment Classification: N/A

The Offeror shall provide resumes for a minimum of two individuals who will function as Technical Managers in each of the fields listed in the PWS paragraph 2, Performance Objectives.

PWS section 5. Contractor Key Personnel indicates a Program Manager and a Program Analyst are key personnel. Are two resumes required for each?

(Attachment: Attach__2__Section_L__Instructions_To_Offerors_Draft1.pdf) On: May 08 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11813896. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11832160	Other		Pg. 3	Tab 2, Element 2 - Key Personnel
----------	-------	--	-------	-------------------------------------

Comment Classification: N/A

The Government will evaluate up to two resumes of individuals who will function as Technical Managers in each of the disciplines IAW paragraph 2 of the PWS.

How will proposals be evaluated where the offeror proposed less than two resumes for Technical Managers in one or more disciplines?

(Attachment: Attach__3__Section_M_Basis_for_Award_Draft.pdf) On: May 08 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11813896. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11832170	Other		Pg. 3	Tab 2, Element 2 - Key Personnel
----------	-------	--	-------	-------------------------------------

Comment Classification: N/A

Each resume will be evaluated based on the total cumulative years of relative work experience, years of experience with real property systems of record, educational background, and degree level.

How will proposals be evaluated where the offeror resumes for Technical Managers that exceed the years of relative work experience, education, and degree level, but simply meet the real property systems of record experience? Is one criteria weighted greater than another?

(Attachment: Attach__3__Section_M_Basis_for_Award_Draft1.pdf) On: May 08 2026.

	Government Response. . No, the evaluation criteria are weighted equally. Resumes will be evaluated based on the criteria as stated in the solicitation. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11832183	Other		Pg. 3	VOLUME II, FACTOR 2- PAST PERFORMANCE
Comment Classification: N/A				
Can you provide clarification on whether both interim and final CPARS evaluations are acceptable for past performance submissions, or if only final CPARS evaluations will be considered?				
(Attachment: Attach__3__Section_M_Basis_for_Award_Draft2.pdf) On: May 08 2026.				
	Government Response. . Yes, a completed interim CPARS evaluation will be acceptable. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11832191	Other		Pg. 6	
Comment Classification: N/A				
Confirming if base year is 24 months, option period 1 is 36 months and option period 3 is 24 months?				
(Attachment: W912DY26RA026_RPSS_III__Solicitation_Draft.pdf) On: May 08 2026.				
	Government Response. . Section A.4 of the Solicitation states, the anticipated total ordering period will consist of one sixty-month ordering period. The MATOC will also include FAR 52.217-8, Option to Extend Services exercised, can extend the ordering period up to an additional six months. that the optional period will be exercised. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11832200	Other		Pg. 11	
Comment Classification: N/A				
In reference to the inspection and acceptance location being Redstone Arsenal in Huntsville, AL, will this require annual onsite deliverable review?				
(Attachment: W912DY26RA026_RPSS_III__Solicitation_Draft1.pdf) On: May 08 2026.				
	Government Response. . No, there is no requirement for annual on-site delivery unless specified within the task order language. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11832208	Security		Pg. 21	
Comment Classification: N/A				
Can you please identify the potential CUI banner tag levels requiring DFARS 252.204-2020 compliance?				
(Attachment: W912DY26RA026_RPSS_III__Solicitation_Draft2.pdf) On: May 08 2026.				
	Government Response. . This information will be addressed at the task order level. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11832215	Security		Pg. 9	
Comment Classification: N/A				
Will the designated secret level clearance be sufficient to access the various Army cloud and network environments?				
(Attachment: Synopsis_Attachment_RPSS_III_PWS_Draft.pdf) On: May 08 2026.				
	Government Response. . This information will be addressed at the task order level. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11832228	Other			Volume I – Factor 1: Technical Capabilities, Tab 2 – Element 2 – Key Personnel

Comment Classification: N/A

Based on the current evaluation language, could the Government clarify what specific qualifications, experience levels, or educational requirements will distinguish an "Acceptable" rating from an "Unacceptable" rating for key personnel? For example, are there minimum years of relevant work experience, particular degree fields, or other measurable criteria that must be met to receive an "Acceptable" assessment?

(Attachment: Attach__3__Section_M_Basis_for_Award_Draft3.pdf) On: May 08 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 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11874255 General Section L

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

Section L instructions state that "A minimum of one project shall be identified as self-performed by the Prime Contractor." Does the Prime contractor have to have self-performed 100% of the project to qualify?

On: Jun 10 2026.

Government Response. . A 'self-performed' project as used here is defined as a project under which the Prime Contractor has performed 51% or more of the work as a percentage of the total contract value. The Prime contractor does not need to have performed 100% of the project to qualify. On: Jun 18 2026

Government Response. . A 'self-performed' project as used here is defined as a project under which the Prime Contractor has performed 51% or more of the work as a percentage of the total contract value. The Prime contractor does not need to have performed 100% of the project to qualify. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11874257 General Section L Instructions Tab 3 - Key Personnel

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

Section L instructions state that each resume must exhibit "experience with each of the fields listed in the PWS paragraph 2." Please clarify which paragraph 2 in the PWS the instructions are referring to.

On: Jun 10 2026.

Government Response. . Section L, Tab 3 (Pg. 8) requires resumes to exhibit experience with "each of the fields listed in the PWS paragraph 2." This refers to Sections 2.1 through 2.11 of the PWS, which list the Performance Objectives, including Audit Readiness, IT Systems Support, Master Planning, etc. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11874261 General Section L Instructions Volume III Tab 3

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

Volume III - Tab 3 requests "Joint Venture/Mentor Protege/ Team Agreements" - please confirm if teaming agreements for a prime/subcontractor relationship are required to be included, or if this tab is only for JV/Mentor Protégé agreements.

On: Jun 10 2026.

Government Response. . Section L, Volume III, Tab 3 is for formal Joint Venture or Mentor-Protégé agreements and approvals. Standard Teaming Agreements between a prime and subcontractor are not required for this tab. However, Letters of Commitment for Key Subcontractors are required under Volume III, Tab 2. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11874263 General Section L Instructions Volume I Tab 3

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

Section L instructions notes to provide 1 resume for the Program Analyst. However, the PWS states "the contractor will provide a Program Analyst lead for the following systems: GFEBS, INFADS, BUILDER and GIS." Are we to provide 1 total resume for the

Program Analyst position, or 1 for each of the 4 systems.

On: Jun 10 2026.

Government Response. . The PWS (Para 5.2) establishes a single Program Analyst lead position to cover the four specified systems. Section L (Pg. 8) requires one resume for this position. Therefore, only one resume for a single Program Analyst is required. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11874353	General	Section L & Attachment 6		Vol I Tab 3 Key Personnel Resumes
----------	---------	--------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

Attachment 2, Section L instructs offerors to provide resumes for one (1) Program Manager, one (1) Program Analyst, and a minimum of two (2) to a maximum of four (4) Technical Managers. Additionally, Attachment 6 (Q&A response to IDs #11828861) states "Within the resumes, the contractor is only required to address the five areas listed within the solicitation as requiring subject matter experts." Please confirm whether the Technical Manager resumes are expected to collectively demonstrate experience in the five SME areas identified in the solicitation (Master Planning, Environmental Engineering, Engineering Support, Utilities, and Economics); or if the Government expects offerors to submit separate SME resumes for those five areas in addition to the required Program Manager, Program Analyst, and Technical Manager resumes.

On: Jun 10 2026.

Government Response. . Section L, Tab 3 (Pg. 8) states the Offeror shall submit a minimum of two to a maximum of four resumes for Technical Managers. It further states, "The Offeror shall document its ability to provide subject matter expertise in the following areas: master planning, environmental engineer, engineering support, utilities and economics." This implies the proposed Technical Managers must collectively demonstrate expertise across these areas. Separate SME resumes are not required at the proposal stage. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11875845	General	Section L	L.2	OFFEROR'S QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS
----------	---------	-----------	-----	----------------------------------

Comment Classification: **Unclassified (U)**

Section L.2 states that All questions regarding this solicitation shall be submitted in writing via ProjNet no later than Monday, 16 June 2026, 2PM Central Time. June 16 is a Tuesday. Is the deadline for questions on Monday 15 June or Tuesday 16 June?

On: Jun 11 2026.

Government Response. . See Amendment 1 of the Solicitation. All questions regarding this solicitation shall be submitted...no later than Tuesday, 16 June 2026, 2PM Central Time. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11875855	General	PWS		3 - Scope
----------	---------	-----	--	-----------

Comment Classification: **Unclassified (U)**

How many buildings are included in the scope of this contract? What is the total square feet of building space?

On: Jun 11 2026.

Government Response. . The PWS is not for a specific project. Project specifics to include building square footage or number of buildings will be defined at the task order level. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11877832	Specifications			Solicitation A.9 Requirement for CMMC L2 (C3PAO)
----------	----------------	--	--	--

Comment Classification: **Unclassified (U)**

What volume does the government want us to place our required CMMC L2 (C3PAO) certificate?

On: Jun 12 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. On: Jun 18 2026

	Current Request Status: Request Closed		
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.			
11877836	Specifications		Solicitation page 133-137
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)			
Solicitation page 133-137 What volume is the vendor to put the DFAR 252.215-7009 - Proposal Adequacy Checklist liste don page 133-137 of the solicitation document?			
On: Jun 12 2026.			
	Government Response. . As price is not evaluated at the MATOC level, the Proposal Adequacy Checklist is not applicable at this stage and is not required to be submitted with the proposal. The checklist is included for reference for future task order submissions where price will be a factor. On: Jun 18 2026		
	Current Request Status: Request Closed		
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.			
11877837	Specifications		Solicitation vs. Section L
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)			
Solicitation vs. Section L The SF1449 lists the solicitation due date as 01 JUL 2026 at 2:00 pm, while Section L lists the solicitation due date as Wednesday, 08 Jul 2026, 2 pm. Can the government clarify?			
On: Jun 12 2026.			
	Government Response. . See Amendment 1 of the Solicitation. Proposals are due Wednesday, 8 July 2026. On: Jun 18 2026		
	Current Request Status: Request Closed		
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.			
11877840	Specifications		Section M, page 3
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)			
Section M, page 3 Can the government clarify the number of resumes listed in the evaluation factors? It only speaks to the technical managers, and does not include the PM or Progam Analst as part of the factor.			
On: Jun 12 2026.			
	Government Response. . Section L, Tab 3, Page 8 of "Attach.2-Section L Instructions To Offerors.pdf" states: "The Offeror shall provide one resume for the Program Manager and Program analyst; and Offeror shall provide a minimum of two to a maximum of four individual resumes who will function as Technical Managers." The Offeror shall provide a minimum of four to a maximum of six resumes. On: Jun 18 2026		
	Current Request Status: Request Closed		
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.			
11878773	General	Detail	Detail
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)			
Attachment 2. Section L – Instructions to Offerors, Page 8 of 10, Tab 3 Key Personnel: Can the Government clarify whether the experience of the proposed two (2) to four (4) Technical Managers must collectively demonstrate coverage of all Performance Objectives (Master Planning, Environmental Engineer, Engineering Support, Utilities and Economics), in addition to meeting the requirement for experience supporting at least one of the systems of records listed in Section 3.2 of the PWS?			
On: Jun 15 2026.			
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11874353. On: Jun 18 2026		
	Current Request Status: Request Closed		
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.			
11878776	General	Detail	Detail
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)			
Attachment 2. Section L – Instructions to Offerors, Page 8 of 10, Tab 3 Key Personnel: Can the Government clarify if collective coverage of the proposed two (2) to four (4) Technical Managers of Performance Objectives is required (Master Planning, Environmental Engineer, Engineering Support, Utilities and Economics), may that coverage be distributed across the proposed Technical Managers, or must each Technical Manager individually demonstrate experience across all applicable Performance Objectives?			
On: Jun 15 2026.			

	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11874353. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11878780	General	Detail	Detail	Detail
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
Attachment 2. Section L – Instructions to Offerors, Page 8 of 10: The solicitation states, "A minimum of one project shall be identified as self-performed by the Prime Contractor." Can the Government clarify whether this requirement means the offeror must provide at least one past performance reference for a project performed as the Prime Contractor, or whether a project self-performed by the offeror while serving as a subcontractor would satisfy this requirement? On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . The phrase "self-performed by the Prime Contractor" in Section L, page 8, implies that the prime contracting entity for this proposal must have performed the work, not a subcontractor. See response to question ID number 11874255. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11878783	General	Detail	Detail	Detail
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
Attachment 5 – USACE Past Performance, Page 1, 3 & 5 of 6: Can the Government provide a revised PPQ document with the checkboxes and rating circles properly aligned for customer completion, specifically on pages 1, 3, and 5? On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . Yes. Revised PPQ Attachment was provided in the Amendment 1 Solicitation. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11878961	Other	Attachment 2, Section L	L.6, Volume II	Past Performance
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
In accordance with Section L (Instructions to Offerors), Volume II, Factor 2 – Past Performance, Tab 1, offerors must submit a minimum of three (and no more than five) recent and relevant project examples, with "A minimum of one project shall be identified as self-performed by the Prime Contractor." For offerors proposing as a Joint Venture (JV) under this competitive 8(a) set-aside solicitation, please confirm that: The past performance and project experience of the individual JV members (particularly work performed by the managing venturer or a venturer performing a substantial portion of the work in accordance with the JV agreement) is attributed to and considered as past performance of the JV entity itself (the Prime Contractor/offeror); and A project performed by a JV member in its individual capacity (or under a prior JV arrangement) may be identified by the JV offeror as satisfying the requirement for "one project shall be identified as self-performed by the Prime Contractor." This confirmation is requested in light of the regulatory requirement at 13 C.F.R. § 124.513(f), which states in relevant part: "When evaluating the capabilities, past performance, experience, business systems, and certifications of an entity submitting an offer for an 8(a) contract as a joint venture established pursuant to this section, a procuring activity must consider work done and qualifications held individually by each partner to the joint venture as well as any work done by the joint venture itself previously. A procuring activity may not require the 8(a) Participant to individually meet the same evaluation or responsibility criteria as that required of other offerors generally. The partners to the joint venture in the aggregate must demonstrate the past performance, experience, business systems, and certifications necessary to perform the contract." A similar requirement appears at 13 C.F.R. § 125.8(e) for other small business joint ventures. Consistent with these regulations and FAR 15.305(a)(2) (past performance evaluation), the source selection board must evaluate and may not categorically exclude or deny credit for the relevant past performance of JV members when determining whether the JV offeror meets the "self-performed by the Prime Contractor" minimum and overall relevancy/quality criteria. We appreciate the Government's confirmation to ensure compliant proposal preparation. On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . The Government confirms that, for an Offeror proposing as a Joint Venture (JV), the past performance and experience of the individual JV members will be considered and evaluated in accordance with 13 C.F.R. § 124.513(f) and 13 C.F.R. § 125.8(e), as referenced in Section L, Volume III, Tab 3 (Page 10) of the solicitation. Accordingly, the past performance of the individual members of the joint venture (such as the managing venturer or other partners) will be considered as past performance of the JV entity itself (the Prime Contractor). Consequently, a recent and relevant project performed by an individual member of the joint venture in its individual			

	capacity (or under a prior joint venture arrangement) may be submitted and will satisfy the Section L (Page 8) and Section M (Page 4) requirement that 'a minimum of one project shall be identified as self-performed by the Prime Contractor.' All submitted projects remain subject to the recency, relevancy, and quality evaluation criteria outlined in Section M. On: Jun 18 2026		
	Current Request Status: Request Closed		
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.			
11879003	Specifications		PIEE Showing RFP Closed
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)			
PIEE is showing this RFP notice as closed - also includes draft documents. Please open/update so we may submit against it per section L instruction.			
(Attachment: PIEE_Showing_Solicitation_Closed.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.			
	Government Response. . The official solicitation will be posted in PIEE within the next week. Please continue to monitor SAM.gov for the official posting and any further updates regarding submission instructions or PIEE accessibility. On: Jun 18 2026		
	Current Request Status: Request Closed		
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.			
11879152	Contracting	.	.
Comment Classification: Public (P)			
In Section 3.2, the PWS references DART (DPW Analysis & Reporting Tool); however, DART has been obsolete for over five years. Please clarify whether the Government requires offerors to address DART in their proposals for technical acceptability.			
On: Jun 15 2026.			
	Government Response. . Language was removed from the PWS. On: Jun 18 2026		
	Current Request Status: Request Closed		
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.			
11879153	Contracting	.	.
Comment Classification: Public (P)			
Sections L and SAM.gov list July 8 as the proposal due date, while the SF1449 lists July 1; please confirm the official submission deadline and identify which date governs.			
On: Jun 15 2026.			
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11877837. On: Jun 18 2026		
	Current Request Status: Request Closed		
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.			
11879295	Contracting	PWS	FAR 52.219-14
Comment Classification: Public (P)			
Please confirm whether the limitation on subcontracting under FAR 52.219-14 is measured at the base MATOC level or at the individual task-order level. Please also confirm that work performed by similarly situated entities (other 8(a) concerns) counts toward the prime contractor's self-performance requirement and provide an example of what constitutes the approximately 20% threshold above which a subcontractor is treated as a key subcontractor for compliance purposes.			
On: Jun 15 2026.			
	Government Response. . Limitation on Subcontracting will be measured at the base MATOC level unless the Contracting Officer directs otherwise. IAW Section L, a key subcontractor is defined as any subcontractor proposed to perform at least 20% of the total contract effort. On: Jun 18 2026		
	Current Request Status: Request Closed		
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.			
11879314	General	PWS	Section L & M
Comment Classification: Public (P)			
Will DoD real-property data-management and audit-readiness projects that do not include facilities-engineering scope be considered "Relevant" past performance? If so, what dollar value or contract size band is considered comparable for relevancy purposes? Please also confirm whether past performance that is similar but not identical in scope or customer will receive relevancy credit.			
On: Jun 15 2026.			

	Government Response. . Past performance of projects which are similar in scope but not exact will be accepted as relevant to include projects which focus on real property data management and audit readiness but include an engineering component. There is no dollar limit or threshold to establish relevancy. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879316	General	PWS	Section M	
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
Because a proposal assessed with a "deficiency" is ineligible for award, please provide examples of common deficiencies identified in prior similar procurements so that offerors can avoid them.				
On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . Section M of "Attach.3-Section M Basis for Award.pdf" defines a deficiency as a "material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level." Offerors should focus on thoroughly addressing all requirements in the Solicitation to avoid deficiencies. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879319	Contracting	Submission	PIEE	
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
In the event of a PIEE system outage or submission failure at or near the proposal deadline, what constitutes acceptable evidence of the outage or failure, and who is the Government point of contact for urgent submission-related technical issues?				
On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . See pg. 3 of Attach.2 - Section L Instructions to Offerors. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879321	General	Attachment 3	Section M	
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
Within an "Acceptable" rating under the Technical factor, will demonstrated depth in data quality, audit readiness, and systems-of-record support be credited comparably to facilities-engineering subject-matter-expert breadth?				
On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . Yes, the Government has not given any instruction or described an order of precedence where one type of expertise is preferable to any other. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879324	General	Attachment 2	Section L	Page Limitations
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
Please confirm how charts, tables, graphics, and appendices count toward the stated page limits, particularly where such exhibits contain narrative explanation rather than purely tabular or graphic data.				
On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . According to "Attach.2-Section L Instructions To Offerors.pdf", page 6, "Page Size spreadsheets, table, charts, etc. may be 11" x 17" but counts as 2 pages". Page 7 clarifies, "Offerors may only include narrative in the chart, table, etc. that explains the chart, table, etc. Information in the chart, table, etc. that goes beyond this purpose may be deemed to count as regular text subject to the page restrictions. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879325	General	Attachment 2	Section L	Key Personnel
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
For the required key-personnel resumes, may offerors propose contingent hires supported by signed letters of intent or contingent-offer letters, rather than only current employees? Please confirm that such resumes will be evaluated on the same basis as those of current employees.				
On: Jun 15 2026.				

	Government Response. . Yes, the Government will accept contingent hires supported by letters of intent or other documentation. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879327	General	PWS	Section 4	OCONUS
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
For offerors with limited OCONUS experience, what pre-positioned resources or personnel clearances, if any, does the Government expect to be in place at the base MATOC award stage, versus established on a task-order basis when an OCONUS requirement arises?				
On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . The "Attach.1-Performance Work Statement.pdf" (PWS) states that the vast majority of the work will be completed at the contractor's office or a CONUS location, and it is a "highly unusual requirement which requires travel to an OCONUS location" (Page 1). If applicable, information will be specified at the task order level. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879328	Other	PWS	Section 3.2	BUILDER
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
Given that BUILDER SMS is being replaced by ESMS, does the Government anticipate migrating to ESMS during the period of performance? If so, will offerors be evaluated on demonstrated capability to support that transition within the "data entry and data integrity" scope described in the PWS?				
On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11751235. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879356	Other	Section L.6, Volume III Tab 2 (Key Subcontractor Letters of Commitment)	Pg. 10	
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
Tab 2 (Key Subcontractor Letters of Commitment) references "Attachment 6 – Key Subcontractor Letter of Commitment." However, the solicitation package includes "Attachment 4 – Letter of Commitment – Key SubContractor" as a numbered attachment. Please confirm attachment number 4 is the correct attachment number?				
(Attachment: Attach.+2+--+Section+L+--+Instructions+To+Offerors.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . See Amendment 1 of the Solicitation. Section L was updated to correct this discrepancy. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879357	Other	Section L3 and L.5 Proposal Format	Pgs. 5 & 11	
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
Section L.5 states page setup parameters require "Font type: Times New Roman; font size: 12, including font size for headers and footers." L.3 also states "Footnotes on text pages shall also be in 12-point font." Given that 12-point font for headers, footers, and footnotes will consume significant space in a 25-page technical volume, please confirm: (a) Are headers, footers, and footnotes required to be 12-point, or may they be reduced? (b) Does this requirement apply uniformly to all volumes, including administrative documents?				
(Attachment: Attach1.+2+--+Section+L+--+Instructions+To+Offerors.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . Attach.2-Section L Instructions To Offerors.pdf" page 7, specifies "Font type: Times New Roman; font size:12, including font size for headers and footers. Font size for spreadsheets, tables, charts, etc. may be reduced to font size 10". This requirement applies uniformly to all volumes. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879358	Other	Section L.6, Volume I, Tab 1; and SectionM, Tab 1 Evaluation		
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				

The Offeror shall identify the number of data points, the number of buildings that is capable of assessing under audit conditions." Section M evaluates "the total volume of data points analyzed, the total number of buildings assessed or the total square footage audited." The PWS does not define minimum thresholds for data points, buildings, or square footage. Please clarify: (a) Are there minimum quantitative thresholds for data points, buildings assessed, or square footage that would constitute an "Acceptable" rating? (b) How will the Government differentiate between proposals with varying quantities when all proposals are rated Acceptable or Unacceptable (binary rating)?

On: Jun 15 2026.

Government Response. . There are no minimum thresholds for the number of data points, square footage, or number of buildings. All responses are acceptable and will be evaluated. The Government will provide a rating of 'Acceptable' vs 'Unacceptable' based on the written requirements as specified withing Section H. For those contractors ascribed a rating of 'Acceptable', the Government will rank each contractor by the relative number of data points included within their proposal. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11879363	Other	Section 1.6, Tab 1Technical Approach	Pg. 7
-----------------	-------	--------------------------------------	-------

Comment Classification: **Unclassified (U)**

The offeror shall also provide the types of audits the offeror is technically capable of supporting....capability to support DOD audits will be considered most significant. Is the Government referring to supporting audit compliance through internal DOD criteria such as the ability to support compliance with DOD Instruction #4165.14 addressing Real Property Inventory & Reporting, or DOD Instruction #8130.01 addressing Installation Geospatial Information & Services, or DoD Manual 8400.01 for Accessibility ICT, or are the audits driven from GAO reports such as GAO-2-215 Records Reliability?

(Attachment: Attach2.+2+--+Section+L+--+Instructions+To+Offerors.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.

Government Response. . No, the Government is stating that audits performed in support of DoD agencies will be preferable to audits performed for Federal Agencies outside of the DoD. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11879366	Other	Tab 3 - Key Personnel	Pg. 8
-----------------	-------	-----------------------	-------

Comment Classification: **Unclassified (U)**

The government has requested a single Program Analyst resume for Key Personnel. In the Attachment 1 - PWS Section 5.2, the government references four systems. Is the expectation at the resumed submitted as part of this solicitation will have demonstrated experience with all four systems and all of that experience has been in the last 24 months? If that is not the government's intention and only experience with a minimum of one system is required, will experience in one system over another be assessed more favorably?

(Attachment: Attach3.+2+--+Section+L+--+Instructions+To+Offerors.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11751239. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11879370	Other	Section 1.6, Tab 1Technical Approach	Pg. 7
-----------------	-------	--------------------------------------	-------

Comment Classification: **Unclassified (U)**

Can the Government identify and distribute the specific audit criteria, or identify the specific compliance statutes that impact the US Army Real Property Systems of Record from an audit compliance?

(Attachment: Attach4.+2+--+Section+L+--+Instructions+To+Offerors.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.

Government Response. . No, specific audit criteria will be established at the point of task order award. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11879372	Other	Section L.6, Volume I, Tab 1; and SectionM, Tab 1 Evaluation
-----------------	-------	---

Comment Classification: **Unclassified (U)**

Can the Government provide definitions or standard interpretations for 'data points,' 'buildings assessed' and 'square footage audited' that will used for the purposes of the proposal evaluation? These different quantitative measures can vary significantly across different systems.

(Attachment: Attach.+3+-Section+M+Basis+for+Award.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.

	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11879358. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879377	Other	Section L.6, Volume I, Tab 1; and SectionM, Tab 1 Evaluation		
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
In evaluating the Technical Approach, how will the Government balance narrative quality experience vs demonstrated quantitative experience including data volume, facilities assessed, etc.?				
(Attachment: Attach1.+3+-Section+M+Basis+for+Award.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . The Government will not balance or trade off narrative quality against demonstrated quantitative experience. In accordance with Section L (Page 5) and Section M (Page 2) of the solicitation, this procurement is conducted using a Qualifying Offer approach under Revolutionary FAR Overhaul (RFO) 15.104(b)(1)(ii)(A)(3), under which the base MATOC awards are made on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879380	Other	Sec 3.2 Systems of Record		
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
In the industry day transcript from June 2025, when addresssing slide 13, Mr. Bushnell references the support of DMLSS and acknowledged that DMLSS was not on the list of systems. Will the Government be including DMLSS as a required Real Property System of Record?				
(Attachment: Attach.+1+--+Performance+Work+Statement.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . No, the Government will not be including DMLSS as a required Real Property System of Record. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879384	Other	(PWS Sections 2.1-2.11, Pages 2-3; PWS Section 3	Pg. 5	
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
What is the anticipated mix of task order types (data maintenance vs. SME support vs. standalone studies)? Understanding the likely distribution would significantly affect staffing models and pricing strategies at the task order level.				
(Attachment: Attach1.+1+--+Performance+Work+Statement.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . There is no anticipated mix. The actual work to be completed will not be defined until the point of task order award. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879387	Other	(Section M, Page 2; PWS Section 4.1, Page 5)	Pg. 5	
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
Price is not evaluated at the MATOC level, only at the task order level. What pricing structure will the Government use at task order level -- firm fixed price labor categories, time and materials, or something else? This is critical for proposal preparation and is not addressed in Section M.				
(Attachment: Attach2.+1+--+Performance+Work+Statement.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11751563. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879389	Other	(PWS Section 5.2, Page 6; PWS Section 5.2.1, Pages 6-7)	Pgs. 6 & 7	
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
The Program Analyst experience must not be "older than 24 months." Does this clock start from the date of proposal submission, contract award, or task order execution? Given GFEBS access can take several months to obtain, this is a significant compliance risk.				

(Attachment: Attach3.+1+--+Performance+Work+Statement.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . The clock starts from the date of proposal submission. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879392	Other	(PWS Section 22, Pages 21-23)	Pgs. 21-23	
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
The performance metrics table references "construction schedule" delays in the Timeliness section, which appears copied from a construction contract template and does not fit a services/data management contract. How will timeliness actually be measured for data entry or SME support task orders?				
(Attachment: Attach4.+1+--+Performance+Work+Statement.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . The word 'construction' has been deleted from the Timeliness section of the table. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879395	Other	(Section M, Page 4)	Pg. 4	
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
Projects need "at least twelve months of performance completed within three years from the closing date." The closing date has not been publicly announced in these documents. Will the Government confirm the solicitation close date to allow offerors to assess whether their references qualify?				
On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . The closing date of the Solicitation is 8 July 2026. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879397	Other	(PWS Section 5.2, Page 6)	Pg. 6	
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
How will the Government handle the Program Analyst requirement if no single individual has current experience across all four required systems (GFEBS, INFADS, BUILDER, GIS)? Can separate individuals cover separate systems, or must one person cover all four?				
(Attachment: Attach5.+1+--+Performance+Work+Statement.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . One person must cover all four systems. See response to question ID number 11879366. The Program Analyst is to function as a technical lead for all the Technical Managers, a single point of contact in support of all task orders currently being executed at any given time. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879411	Other	Solicitation___W912D Y26RA026		
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
Does the Government anticipate performance within the AFRICOM Area of Responsibility, making DFARS 252.225-7980 applicable?				
(Attachment: Solicitation+--+W912DY26RA026+Real+Property+Support+Services.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . No, the Government does not anticipate performance with the AFRICOM Area of Responsibility. See Amendment 2 of the Solicitation. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879414	Other	Does the Government anticipate performance within the AFRICOM Area of Responsibility, making DFARS 252.225-7980 applicable?		
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
Is DFARS 252.225-7026 applicable to this requirement, and if so, how?				
(Attachment: Solicitation+--+W912DY26RA026+Real+Property+Support+Services1.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.				

	Government Response. . Afghanistan is not supported by this MATOC. DFARS 252.225-7026 was removed from the Solicitation. See Amendment 2 of the Solicitation. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879415	Other	Section L		
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
For purposes of Section L, Volume III, Tab 2, Is the 20% threshold for subcontractors based on total contract value, total labor hours, or another measure of contract effort?				
(Attachment: Attach5.+2+--+Section+L+--+Instructions+To+Offerors.pdf) On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . Attach.2-Section L Instructions To Offerors.pdf" on page 10 states, "For the purposes of this solicitation, a key subcontractor is defined as any subcontractor proposed to perform at least 20% of the total contract effort. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879437	General	Solicitation		Pages 133-137
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
Please confirm if the Proposal Adequacy Checklist on pages 133-137 of the solicitation are required to be included in the proposal. As much of the checklist concerns cost/price data, and price will not be evaluated at the base MATOC level, much of the checklist is not applicable at this stage.				
On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11877836. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879855	General	PWS		Key Personnel
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
PWS Section 5 identifies Program Manager and Program Analyst as Key Personnel, with SME support defined at the task order level. Section L, however, requires a minimum of two individuals functioning as "Technical Managers" in each of the functional areas listed in PWS Paragraph 2. Could the Government please clarify whether "Technical Managers" are considered Key Personnel?				
On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . See section 5.3 of the PWS. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879860	General	PWS		Key Personnel
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
PWS Section 5 identifies Program Manager and Program Analyst as Key Personnel, with SME support defined at the task order level. Section L, however, requires a minimum of two individuals functioning as "Technical Managers" in each of the functional areas listed in PWS Paragraph 2. Can the Government please clarify the total number of resumes required?				
On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11879860. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879870	General	Section L		CPARS
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
Section L, Volume II, Tab 2 requires the Offeror to provide CPARS narratives for submitted projects with CPARS ratings. For projects with multiple CPARS records covering different performance periods, may the Offeror submit only the most recent CPARS for each submitted project?				
On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . To ensure a comprehensive and accurate evaluation of the quality of past performance, Offerors are strongly encouraged to submit CPARS reports covering all performance periods (e.g., interim, annual, and			

	final) for each submitted project.			
	Please note that in accordance with Section L, Page 4, there is no page limitation for Volume II, Tab 2 (CPARS/Past Performance Questionnaires). Furthermore, as stated in Section M, Page 5, the Government reserves the right to retrieve and evaluate any available past performance information from independent sources--including the official CPARS database, FAPIIS, and SAM--covering any and all performance periods of the submitted projects, regardless of the specific reports included in the proposal. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879876	General	Section M		Evaluation Criteria
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
Section M states "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, contract type) and in the magnitude of effort and complexities of the work outlined in this solicitation."				
Can the government clarify whether relevancy, including size and value, is being determined relative to the IDIQ level, or the Task Order level?				
On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . Attach.3-Section M Basis for Award.pdf" (page 4) states that relevancy is defined as projects similar in scope, magnitude, and complexity to "this solicitation." "Attach.2-Section L Instructions To Offerors.pdf" (page 9) further defines a "project" as a "single, discrete contract action such as a task order... not... an entire IDIQ contract, MATOC, or basic ordering agreement. Thus, relevancy is determined relative to the type of work in the overall solicitation, but demonstrated at the task order or equivalent level. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879878	General	Section M		Evaluation Criteria
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
Section M states "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, contract type) and in the magnitude of effort and complexities of the work outlined in this solicitation."				
If at the task order level, can the government provide information on estimated task order parameters (size, scope, complexity) so that offerors can adequately assess which projects would meet the government's criteria?				
On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . If applicable, information on estimated task order parameters will provided at the task order level. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879880	General	Section L		Past Performance
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
Section L, Tab 1 states "A "project" refers to a single, discrete contract action such as a task order, delivery order, stand-alone contract, or other individually awarded effort. A project does not refer to an entire IDIQ contract, MATOC, or basic ordering agreement." Given that the solicitation is for an IDIQ vehicle, and to aide in having a more direct comparison for evaluation purposes, can the government amend the requirement to allow an IDIQ award and task orders that fall under the IDIQ to count as one "project"?				
On: Jun 15 2026.				
	Government Response. . The Government declines the request to amend the definition of a "project" as established in Section L, Tab 1. For the purposes of this evaluation, a project remains strictly defined as a single, discrete contract action, which includes individual task orders, delivery orders, stand-alone contracts, or other individually awarded efforts. An entire Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract, Multiple Award Task Order Contract (MATOC), or basic ordering agreement, along with its associated subordinate task orders, will not be considered or evaluated collectively as a single, consolidated project. Offerors must continue to submit individual, discrete contract actions that meet the solicitation criteria. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11879915	General	Section M		Technical Approach
Comment Classification: Public (P)				

Section M states the Government will evaluate the total volume of data points analyzed. Can the Government provide additional guidance regarding what constitutes a "data point" for evaluation purposes?

On: Jun 15 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11879358. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11879927	General	SF1449		Due Date
-----------------	---------	--------	--	----------

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

The SAM.Gov Solicitation Notice lists 8 July as the response due date however the downloadable Solicitation labeled "Solicitation - W912DY26RA026 Real Property Support Services" lists the Offeror Due Date as 1 July. Please advise on which is the correct response/proposal due date.

On: Jun 15 2026.

Government Response. . The closing date of the Solicitation is 8 July 2026. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11879931	General	PWS		Program Analyst
-----------------	---------	-----	--	-----------------

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

PWS Section 5.2 establishes a minimum qualification of two years of demonstrated experience with the applicable System of Record for the Program Analyst position. Given that the Program Analyst serves as the technical focal point for Real Property System of Record support and Section L requires evaluation of cumulative years of experience and subject matter expertise, can the Government clarify whether Offerors will be evaluated solely on meeting the minimum two-year requirement or whether additional years of relevant Real Property, audit readiness, planning, facility management, and enterprise systems experience will be considered advantageous in demonstrating technical capability?

On: Jun 15 2026.

Government Response. . Attach.3-Section M Basis for Award.pdf (page 3), under Key Personnel, states: Each resume will be evaluated based on the total cumulative years of relative work experience with real property systems of record, educational background, and areas of responsibility. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880063	Real Estate		A2.	Solicitation
-----------------	-------------	--	-----	--------------

Comment Classification: **Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI)**

"IAW RFO 15.104(b)(1)(ii)(A), the Government intends to make an award to each and all 8(a) qualifying Offerors. Multiple awards are appropriate for this effort due to the volume, scope, complexity, geographic locations, and frequency of anticipated task orders, as well as the need to maintain competition throughout the ordering period IAW RFO 16.506 Postaward procedures for placement of task and delivery orders." Awarding to "each and all" may result in a very large number of submissions for the MATOC, and subsequently, very large submissions for each Task Order such that it creates a significant burden on the Government to evaluate and make determinations. Would the Government consider limiting the awards to 5 or 10 of the best rated submissions?

On: Jun 15 2026.

Government Response. . The Government does not anticipate establishing a maximum number of MATOC awards. See Section A.2 of the Solicitation. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880069	Real Estate		A3	Solicitation
-----------------	-------------	--	----	--------------

Comment Classification: **Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI)**

"The CMMC level required by this solicitation is: CMMC Level 2 (C3PAO). " Given that the overall number of contractors who have received their C3PAO assessment and earned CMMC Level 2 is extraordinarily low, and that the assumption can therefore be made that the number of 8a Contractors already certified is also extremely low, will the Government accept a self-certification for CMMC Level 2 at the time of proposal submission?

On: Jun 15 2026.

Government Response. . No. Section A.9, states that "CMMC Level 2 (C3PAO)... is required prior to award. See Amendment 2 to the Solicitation. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: Request Closed				
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11880072	Real Estate		5	Performance Work Statement
<p>Comment Classification: Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI)</p> <p>Are Key Personnel associated with the MATOC award and expected to be available following the MATOC award but prior to a Task Order award?</p> <p>On: Jun 15 2026.</p>				
<p>Government Response. . No, key personnel do not need to be available for work until after the award of the first task order. On: Jun 18 2026</p>				
Current Request Status: Request Closed				
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11880078	Real Estate		5	Performance Work Statement
<p>Comment Classification: Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI)</p> <p>Are Key Personnel associated with first Task Order award, and any thereafter, and expected to be available following the first Task Order Award?</p> <p>On: Jun 15 2026.</p>				
<p>Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11880072. On: Jun 18 2026</p>				
Current Request Status: Request Closed				
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11880084	Real Estate		5 and 5.2.1	Performance Work Statement
<p>Comment Classification: Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI)</p> <p>If Key Personnel are associated with the MATOC award and expected to be available following the MATOC award but prior to a Task Order award, this places significant costs on a Contractor with no guarantee of revenue. Can the Government please allow contractors to make the PM and any other Key Personnel available immediately following the first Task Order award?</p> <p>On: Jun 15 2026.</p>				
<p>Government Response. . See response to question 11880072. On: Jun 18 2026</p>				
Current Request Status: Request Closed				
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11880088	Real Estate		5.5	Performance Work Statement
<p>Comment Classification: Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI)</p> <p>Please confirm that all personnel performing work under this contract must possess and maintain current Information Assurance Technician (IAT) Level I professional certification during the execution of this contract.</p> <p>On: Jun 15 2026.</p>				
<p>Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11751628. On: Jun 18 2026</p>				
Current Request Status: Request Closed				
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11880090	Real Estate		14.1	Performance Work Statement
<p>Comment Classification: Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI)</p> <p>Please confirm that the Contractor must provide any laptops and associated hardware for this contract.</p> <p>On: Jun 15 2026.</p>				
<p>Government Response. . Confirmed, the contractor must provide laptops and associated hardware for use by it's personnel in the execution of work. Deviation from this requirement may be changed at the task order level as some systems require Government imaged computers to gain access. The need for Government imaged computers will be established at the task order level. On: Jun 18 2026</p>				
Current Request Status: Request Closed				
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11880095	Real Estate		14.1	Performance Work Statement
<p>Comment Classification: Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI)</p>				

Typically, when Contractors access Government systems, either the Government provides the laptops, or the Contractor must purchase specific makes and models to meet Government requirements. If the Contractor must provide any laptops and associated hardware for this contract, please provide product specifications so that appropriate versions may be priced and obtained.

On: Jun 15 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11880090. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880099	Real Estate		PROPOSAL ADEQUACY CHECKLIST, Page 133	Solicitation
----------	-------------	--	---------------------------------------	--------------

Comment Classification: **Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI)**

Given that the BPA level solicitation excludes any pricing information, will the Government waive the requirement for the Proposal Adequacy Checklist (page 133 of the solicitation), as 90% of the questions relate to pricing calculations and data?

On: Jun 15 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11877836. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880105	Real Estate		PROPOSAL ADEQUACY CHECKLIST, Page 133	Solicitation
----------	-------------	--	---------------------------------------	--------------

Comment Classification: **Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI)**

If the Government keeps the requirement for a Proposal Adequacy Checklist (page 133 of the solicitation), where in the proposal should offerors include this information?

On: Jun 15 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11877836. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880766	Other	n/a	n/a	n/a
----------	-------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

Solicitation §A.4 states the anticipated total ordering period will consist of one sixty-month ordering period. PWS §4.1 and Q&A #12 in the Attachment 6 dated June 2026 state the ordering period is a 24-month base ordering period plus one 36-month optional ordering period. Please confirm which structure controls and clarify how FAR 52.217-9 will be applied.

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . Section A.4 of the Solicitation states, the anticipated total ordering period will consist of one sixty-month ordering period. The MATOC will also include FAR 52.217-8, Option to Extend Services exercised, which can extend the ordering period up to an additional six months. FAR 52.217-9 has been removed from the Solicitation and will not be applied. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880770	Other	n/a	n/a	n/a
----------	-------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

SF1449 Block 8 states the Offer Due Date as 01 JUL 2026 at 2:00 PM, while Section L.4 states proposals are due 8 JUL 2026 at 2:00 PM Central Time. Please confirm in writing which date controls.

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11877837. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880771	Other	n/a	n/a	n/a
----------	-------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

Solicitation §A.9 states that CMMC Level 2 (C3PAO) is required prior to award for each contractor information system that will process, store, or transmit FCI or CUI. PWS §8.2 and Q&A #1 in the Attachment 6 dated June 2026 state that the CMMC

certification level required will be identified within the PWS of individual task orders at the point of award. Please confirm whether CMMC Level 2 (C3PAO) is required prior to MATOC award, or whether CMMC certification is required only at the task-order level.

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11880069. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880772	Other	n/a	n/a	n/a
----------	-------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

PWS §8.7 incorporates the Executive Order of 26 March 2026 (Addressing DEI Discrimination by Federal Contractors). Please confirm whether compliance with SBA mandates under 13 CFR Part 124 (8(a)), Part 125 (SDVOSB), Part 126 (HUBZone), or Part 127 (WOSB), or compliance with the SBA Mentor-Protégé Program, constitutes a "racially discriminatory DEI activity" as defined in section 2 of the Executive Order for purposes of §8.7.

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . No, compliance with SBA mandates under 13 CFR Parts 124, 125, 126, or 127, or participation in the SBA Mentor-Protégé Program, does not constitute a "racially discriminatory DEI activity" under Section 2 of Executive Order 14398. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880773	Other	n/a	n/a	n/a
----------	-------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

Volume I Tab 1 requires the Offeror to identify "the number of data points" the Offeror is capable of analyzing. Please define a "data point" for evaluation purposes -- for example, is it a single field-level record in a system of record (such as one GFEBS asset attribute), a complete real-property asset record, a building, or a different unit of measure?

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11879358. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880774	Other	n/a	n/a	n/a
----------	-------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

Volume I Tab 1 also requires the number of buildings the Offeror is capable of assessing under audit conditions. Please define "audit conditions" -- for example, Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS), the OSD Real Property Audit Readiness Implementation Plan, the Army Audit Readiness Strategy, or another framework.

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . The exact nature of the audit requirements will be established at task order award. It is possible that individual commands will have audit requirements which are specific only to that command. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880775	Other	n/a	n/a	n/a
----------	-------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

Section M Tab 1 states that capability to support DoD audits will be considered most significant, followed by non-DoD Federal audits and then all other audits. Will an offeror that demonstrates only non-DoD Federal and commercial audit capability still be eligible for an Acceptable rating, or is documented DoD-audit capability a threshold requirement?

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11880776. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880779	Other	n/a	n/a	n/a
----------	-------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

Q&A #16 in the Attachment 6 dated June 2026 states that the Government will not define the differentiation between an Acceptable and Unacceptable rating for a key personnel position. In the absence of a defined threshold, by what criteria will Government evaluators determine that a Program Manager's, Program Analyst's, or Technical Manager's resume falls short of the requirements?

On: Jun 16 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 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880780	Other	n/a	n/a	n/a
----------	-------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

PWS §5.1 states the Program Manager shall have more than ten years of experience performing work in support of multiple real property systems of record. Please confirm whether "support" means direct hands-on user experience in the systems or whether program-level management experience overseeing teams that use those systems also qualifies.

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . The Government will accept any applicable work experience as evidence against the ten year minimum. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880781	Other	n/a	n/a	n/a
----------	-------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

PWS §5.3 and Section L Volume I Tab 3 require Technical Manager resumes to document the ability to provide subject matter expertise in five areas: master planning, environmental engineer, engineering support, utilities, and economics. Must each Technical Manager resume cover all five SME areas individually, or must the suite of two-to-four Technical Manager resumes collectively cover the five areas?

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11880780. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880784	Other	n/a	n/a	n/a
----------	-------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

Q&A #14 in the Attachment 6 dated June 2026 references "DFARS 252.204-2020 compliance." Please confirm whether the correct citation is DFARS 252.204-7012, 252.204-7020, or 252.204-7021.

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . Correct citation is DFARS 252.204-7012 and 252.204-7021. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880788	Other	n/a	n/a	n/a
----------	-------	-----	-----	-----

Comment Classification: **Public (P)**

Section L Volume III Tab 2 states that the Offeror shall submit Attachment 6 – Key Subcontractor Letter of Commitment. The actual Letter of Commitment template included in the solicitation package is Attachment 4, and Section L.5 excludes "Attachment 04, Letters of Commitment for Key Subcontractor" from the page count. Please confirm which attachment number controls.

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11879356. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11880789	Other	n/a	n/a	n/a
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
PWS §5.4 requires all personnel performing work under the contract to maintain current Information Assurance Technician (IAT) Level I certification during execution of the contract. Q&A round 1 #36 and #42 in the original Attachment 6 stated that IAT Level I is required only for personnel providing systems architecture support. Which language controls for the Program Manager and Program Analyst Key Personnel?				
On: Jun 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 1188088. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11881085	Contracting	Attachment 3 - Section M	VOLUME I - FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL CAPABILITIES Tab 1– Technical Approach	
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
Section M states the Government will evaluate the total volume of data points analyzed. Can the Government provide additional guidance regarding what constitutes a "data point" for evaluation purposes?				
On: Jun 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11879358. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11881088	Contracting	Attachment 3 - Section M	VOLUME I - FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL CAPABILITIES Tab 1– Technical Approach	
Comment Classification: Unclassified (U)				
May Offerors aggregate quantitative accomplishments across multiple projects when presenting the total number of facilities assessed, square footage validated, and data points analyzed, or should these metrics be presented separately by project?				
On: Jun 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . It is up to the individual contractor how they choose to present the information requested. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11881091	Contracting	SAM.Gov Solicitation Notice vs Downloadable Solicitation - W912DY26RA026 Real Property Support Services	Solicitation Response Due Date AND SF1449 Offeror Due Date	
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
The SAM.Gov Solicitation Notice lists 8 July as the response due date however the downloadable Solicitation labeled "Solicitation - W912DY26RA026 Real Property Support Services" lists the Offeror Due Date as 1 July. We would like to request July 8th as the due date.				
On: Jun 16 2026.				
	Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11877837. On: Jun 18 2026			
	Current Request Status: Request Closed			
Information for this report is procurement sensitive.				
11881094	Contracting	Attach. 1 - Performance Work Statement AND Attach. 2 - Section L - Instructions To Offerors	PWS Section 5.2 AND Attach.2 - Section L - Tab 3 – Key Personnel	
Comment Classification: Public (P)				
PWS Section 5.2 establishes a minimum qualification of two years of demonstrated experience with the applicable System of Record for the Program Analyst position. Given that the Program Analyst serves as the technical focal point for Real Property System of Record support and Section L requires evaluation of cumulative years of experience and subject matter expertise, can the Government clarify whether Offerors will be evaluated solely on meeting the minimum two-year requirement or whether				

additional years of relevant Real Property, audit readiness, planning, facility management, and enterprise systems experience will be considered advantageous in demonstrating technical capability?

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11879931. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11881143	Engineering Support	Section L, Volume I	(Factor 1), Tab 3	Key Personnel.
----------	---------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------

Comment Classification: **Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI)**

Reference: Section L, Volume I (Factor 1), Tab 3 – Key Personnel. Tab 3 requires resumes for named key personnel (Program Manager, Program Analyst, and two to four Technical Managers) as part of a technically acceptable proposal. Because RPSS III is a Multiple Award Task Order Contract awarded under the qualifying-offer approach in RFO 15.104 -- with no guaranteed work and task orders issued at the Government's discretion at an indeterminate future date -- the specific individuals named at the base award may no longer be available when the first task order is issued. Will the Government consider evaluating Tab 3 on the basis of required qualifications, experience, and labor-category capability rather than named individuals, and allow named key personnel to be proposed and committed at the task order level?

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . No, the Government will only accept resumes of individuals proposed for key positions as evidence. The contractor is free to propose individuals not currently in its employ so long as those resumes are accompanied by a letter of intent or other such documentation. If the contractor experiences a change in personnel post MATOC award, they must submit a request to change out key personnel to the contracting officer. This request must be accompanied by the resume of the replacement personnel. The contractor will wait for acceptance from the contracting officer before permanently installing the replacement into the vacated key position. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11881267	Real Estate			PWS Section 5.2
----------	-------------	--	--	-----------------

Comment Classification: **Unclassified (U)**

PWS Sections 5.2 and 5.3 both state that system of record experience "may not be older than 24 months." Does this 24-month recency requirement apply equally to Technical Managers as it does to the Program Analyst, or will Technical Manager experience older than 24 months still be considered acceptable?

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . Sections of the PWS which discuss relevancy for all three key positions include a requirement for experience which is less than 24 months old. Sections 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 contain this requirement. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11881273	Real Estate			PWS Section 5.2
----------	-------------	--	--	-----------------

Comment Classification: **Unclassified (U)**

PWS Section 5.2 identifies four systems the Program Analyst must lead: GFEBs, INFADS, BUILDER, and GIS. The Q&A confirmed only one Program Analyst resume is required. Must that single resume show experience across all four systems within the last 24 months, or is experience in one or more of the four systems sufficient to receive an Acceptable rating?

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . The Program Analyst must have experience in all four systems occurring in the last 24 months. Remember that the program analyst is a technical lead for all work being performed. The program analyst must have knowledge and experience occurring in the last 24 months but does not need to have significant in-depth knowledge or experience with all four systems over the last 24 months. What the Government is requesting via the Program Analyst is an individual who can manage technical work on multiple systems at one time should work on multiple systems be awarded via task order. The contractor must decide how best to meet the requirement. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11881277	Engineering Support	Attachment 2, Section L	Attachment 2, Section L	Attachment 2, Section L
----------	---------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------

Comment Classification: **Unclassified (U)**

Q1: Attachment 2, Section L - Instruction to Offerors appears to contain two attachment references that may be inconsistent with the solicitation package:
Volume II, Factor 2, Tab 2 (CPARS/Past Performance Questionnaires) references the Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) as "Attachment 03." However, the solicitation package identifies the PPQ as Attachment 5.
Volume III, Tab 2 (Key Subcontractor Letters of Commitment) references the Key Subcontractor Letter of Commitment as "Attachment 6." However, the solicitation package identifies the Letter of Commitment as Attachment 4.

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11879356. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11881278	Engineering Support	: Attachment 1 - PWS, Section 5.2	: Attachment 1 - PWS, Section 5.2	: Attachment 1 - PWS, Section 5.2
----------	---------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Comment Classification: **Unclassified (U)**

Can the Government please confirm the correct attachment numbers associated with the Past Performance Questionnaire and Key Subcontractor Letter of Commitment for proposal submission purposes?
Q2: Attachment 1 - PWS, Section 5.2 identifies Program Analyst support for GFEBS, INFADS, BUILDER, and GIS. For MATOC proposal purposes, should the single Program Analyst resume demonstrate expertise in all four systems, or is expertise in one or more of the identified systems sufficient?

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11879356. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11881279	Engineering Support	Attachment 1 - PWS, Section 5.2	Attachment 1 - PWS, Section 5.2	Attachment 1 - PWS, Section 5.2
----------	---------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

Comment Classification: **Unclassified (U)**

Attachment 1 - PWS, Section 5.2 identifies Program Analyst support for GFEBS, INFADS, BUILDER, and GIS. For MATOC proposal purposes, should the single Program Analyst resume demonstrate expertise in all four systems, or is expertise in one or more of the identified systems sufficient?

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11874263. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11881280	Engineering Support	Q3: Attachment 2, Section L, Volume I	Q3: Attachment 2, Section L, Volume I	Q3: Attachment 2, Section L, Volume I
----------	---------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Comment Classification: **Unclassified (U)**

Q3: Attachment 2, Section L, Volume I, Factor I, Tab 3 – Key Personnel requires Offerors to submit a minimum of two (2) and a maximum of four (4) Technical Manager resumes. Section L further states that the Offeror shall document its ability to provide subject matter expertise in the areas of Master Planning, Environmental Engineering, Engineering Support, Utilities, and Economics. Additionally, the Government's response to Question 3 in Attachment 6 states that "the contractor is only required to address the five areas listed within the solicitation as requiring subject matter experts."

Can the Government please clarify whether:

(a) each proposed Technical Manager resume must individually demonstrate qualifications and experience in one or more of the five subject matter expert areas (Master Planning, Environmental Engineering, Engineering Support, Utilities, and Economics); or
(b) the Offeror may demonstrate these five subject matter expert areas collectively across the proposed team, with individual Technical Managers possessing expertise in different areas?

Further, does the Government intend to evaluate the proposed Technical Managers primarily on their experience with the Real Property Systems of Record identified in PWS Section 3.2, or on their qualifications within the five subject matter expert areas identified in Section L?

On: Jun 16 2026.

Government Response. . See response to question ID number 11874263. On: Jun 18 2026

Current Request Status: **Request Closed**

Information for this report is procurement sensitive.

11881281	Real Estate	Section L		Section L
----------	-------------	-----------	--	-----------

Comment Classification: **Unclassified (U)**

2. Section L and Section M define a recent project as one with "at least 12 months of performance completed within three years from the closing date." Would the government consider revising the recency requirement to 10-years from the closing date?

On: Jun 16 2026.

	Government Response. . The Government has reviewed your request to extend the recency requirement for past performance projects. After careful consideration, the Government has decided not to revise the recency requirement. The current definition of a recent project--requiring at least 12 months of performance completed within three years from the closing date of the solicitation--will remain unchanged. On: Jun 18 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.
