

**Combined Q & A  
SOFSGD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

Duplicate questions in any form have not been included.

**NOTE ON CPARS**

CPARS will ONLY affect your Matrix score if you have ratings that are Marginal or Unsatisfactory. Individuals without CPARS will not be negatively affected.

**NOTE ON SPECIALTY POOLS**

The separate Specialty Pools have been removed and will not be included as part of the evaluation or resultant award.  
All questions related to the Specialty Pools were not included or answered.

Number	Document Reference	Paragraph/Section	Questions/Comments
1	<b>Gen</b>	N/A	Q: Can an Offeror's Teammate/Subcontractor be a large business in NAICS 541611?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	As long as the Prime is a Small Business under NAICS 541611, it does not matter what their Sub-contractors identify as under that NAICS.	
2	<b>Section L</b>	<b>Pg 1, L.4.2.4</b>	Q: Will the Government please clarify if the cross-teaming limitation in L.4.2.4 prevents a subcontractor from participating in multiple bids as a subcontractor? The final sentence in the paragraph defines the scope of the limitation for over-unders: a prime bid and a sub bid.
	<b>Government Response:</b>	The Government is not interested in whether a sub-contractor participates in multiple teams with multiple Primes. Rather, we encourage this practise. The Government is only limiting the ability of an awarded Prime participating as a sub-contractor under another awarded Prime.	
3	<b>Attachment 2 Section L</b>	<b>L.5.1.7</b>	Q: Are we going to be limited to a specific size standard for our teammates/subcontractors as it relates to their size standard related to the NAICS code? (example – if we team with a large business, will we be able to use their tier 3 work samples to score against in our team submission?)
	<b>Government Response:</b>	No, you are not limited on size standards for subcontractors/teammates. You can use a large business work sample.	
4	<b>Attachment 2 Section L</b>	<b>L.5.1.7</b>	Q: If we are using a teaming partner's tier 3 work sample, is that same teaming partner allowed to use the same tier 3 work sample on another teams scoring or does that work sample have to be exclusive to one proposal?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Yes, that teaming partner will be allowed to use that same work sample on another teams scoring. The Government is not restricting teaming arrangements. If a teaming partner is participating as a sub-contractor under multiple Primes, then the same work sample may be used across all teams.	
5	<b>Atch+2+Section+L</b>	<b>L5.1.3</b>	Q: Please confirm the process for offerors to submit substantiating documents for classified Work Samples.
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See Section L3.1.6. All elements of the proposal must be Unclassified, except for Work Samples. Submitted Work Samples may only be classified at the Secret/NOFORN level. If submitted, you may submit as an Unclassified Redacted document or via SIPR to the email addresses included in Section L3.1.6.	
6	<b>Atch+4+- +HTRO+Self+Score+Matrix+DRAFT</b>	<b>Scoring Summary Tab</b>	Q: Is the General Tab score on the HRT0 the only measure being used to make IDIQ awards? If not, please explain how this works as it is not clear from the HRT0 and sections L and M.
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Yes. Section M2.0 identifies the basis for award.	

**Combined Q & A**  
**SOFGSD DRAFT RFP**  
**13 June 2025**

7	Attch+3_Section+M	M5.1.5, M5.2.2, M5.3.2, M5.4.2	Q: Please clarify how Category 5 on the HTRO, for both the General, Education, Intelligence and Exercise tabs will be evaluated. For example, if you have 10 employees on a singular work sample that align against a single Labor Category would this be scores as 10 points, or 1 point? On a similar HTRO acquisition, MSOFS 2.0, the government evaluated this example as 10 points, and allowed offerors to receive credit for managing multiple employees, while allowing the government to have confidence the offeror can manage multiple employees.
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised Matrix Instruction Tab.	
8	Gen	N/A	Q: It seems to be clear from your document H1 that cross-teaming is not permitted on GSD, that is being a Prime contractor and Sub-contractor on another team.  If so, would you be allowing Prime contract awardees to add sub-contractors after award that were failed Prime offerors?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Yes. Additional sub-contractors maybe added after award, to include offerors who were not provided an award. Offerors will be required to follow the requirements of FAR Clause 52.244-2 when adding new sub-contractors to their team after award.	
9	Atch 4 – HTRO Self-Score Matrix	Category 2	Q: Since the criteria (M.5.1.2) is designed to determine offeror capability of managing concurrent performance at various geographic sites, for the purposes of evaluation, can the WS cited for this be distinct WS from the remaining categories? E.g. the CONUS work could be one set of five, the OCONUS work could be a second set, and the DE/KOR could be a third set? Precedent for this exists from GSA OASIS+ when evaluating federal contracting experience that may not have been demonstrable under the Qualifying Projects category.
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised Matrix General Score Sheet tab. Offerors are limited to submitting five total Work Samples. It is the Offerors decision on how to best to maximize their score.	
10	Atch 4 – HTRO Self-Score Matrix	Category 5	Q: The instructions for Category 5 indicate that 75 points are available for this category, but the scoring tab only reflects 50 available points. Will the Government please clarify if the maximum available points for Category 5?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised Matrix General Scoring Sheet tab. 75 points is correct.	

**Combined Q & A  
SOFGSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

11	M2.0 Basis for Contract Award		<p>M2.0 Basis for Contract Award:</p> <p>“The source selection process under this Solicitation will not be based on the Lowest Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA) or Tradeoff process. Award will be made to the Offerors whose proposals are the best value to the Government based upon a Highest Technically Rated (HTRO) approach.”</p> <p>The government’s use of HTRO with a Fair and Reasonable Price evaluation implies the government values innovation, performance, and mission-critical expertise. If task orders are then competed and awarded solely on price (LPTA), it may undermine the very purpose of selecting highly rated technical offerors. This shift in strategy brings a risk of protest and could have regulatory implications.</p> <p>Many of the highest-rated offerors awarded under the IDIQ may be disincentivized from bidding on task orders competed under an LPTA evaluation method, due to the increased risk and reduced emphasis on technical merit. This approach may ultimately degrade mission performance and undermine the value of selecting offerors based on an HTRO standard at the IDIQ level. SOF support demands security, reliability, and advanced capability in high-risk, integrated missions. Contractors must recruit and retain high-skill labor with intensive training pipelines. The focus is on outcomes and mission assurance. This work is more than the cheapest acceptable solution and interchangeable labor.</p> <p>Applying LPTA at the task order level would be fundamentally inconsistent with the original intent of the IDIQ, which prioritizes technical excellence. If the Government intends to utilize LPTA for task order evaluations, even selectively, we strongly recommend that this approach be clearly communicated—either publicly via SAM.gov or within the forthcoming final RFP—to ensure transparency and alignment with industry expectations.</p>
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Market research is conducted for each task order requirement that will be placed on SOFGSD. Part of market research is a determination of the best source selection approach. LPTA is part of the Best Value Continuum and a viable process for some requirements. The Government will use the most appropriate process for the requirement.	
12	RFP Atch 2 - Section L	Section L4.0 Volume I	<p>Q: Volume I is identified as “Executive Summary/Contract.” The instructions that follow address a table of contents (L4.1) and administrative documentation (L4.2). Section L4.0 does not contain instructions on preparing an Executive Summary.</p> <p>Can the Government kindly clarify if a stand-alone Executive Summary is part of Volume I, and if so, what the summary should cover (such as introduction of the prime offeror and subs, capability summary, page limit, etc.)?</p>
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised Section L4.0.	

**Combined Q & A  
SOFGSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

13	RFP Atch 2 - Section L	Section L4.2 Volume I (a)	<p>Q: Section L4.2 Volume I (a) contains 6 bullets of the documentation that offerors should include in Volume I. Immediately after the bullets, Sections L4.2.1 through L4.2.4 address some, <i>but not all</i>, of the items contained in the 6 bullets.</p> <p>To provide comprehensive instructions to offerors that cover the entire 6 bullets, does the Government need to share instructions on the following 3 requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Documentation/Certification pertinent to TS Facility Clearance and Secret Safeguarding</li> <li>2.OCI Mitigation Plan</li> <li>3.Signed SF33, including acknowledgement of any amendments</li> </ol>
	<b>Government Response:</b> See revised Section L4.2.		
14	RFP Atch 1 – IDIQ Draft SOW	4.0 Scope of Support	<p>Q: To help offerors anticipate the possible demand, task order size, scope of support, location of global services delivered, etc., under SOFGSD, can the Government share the following information about the SOF Core Services IDIQ as a benchmark:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.How many task orders has the Government awarded to date?</li> <li>2.What is the total dollar value of task orders awarded to date?</li> <li>3.What percentage of task orders have an OCONUS vs. CONUS place of performance?</li> <li>4.What is the dollar value range of task orders issued (that is, smallest / largest)?</li> <li>5.What is the period of performance range of task orders issued (that is, shortest / longest)?</li> </ol>
	<b>Government Response:</b> The following SCS IDIQ statistics are provided: 1) Approximately, 220 Task Order awarded during the 1st five year option period. Of these, 5 were Programs that include a mix of both long term and short term PoPs. 2) The first option period has utilized ~\$887M 3) Approximately 10 Task Orders require OCONUS support 4) SOFGSD Task Orders will range from \$2,000 to \$65M 5) Performance ranges from 1 day to a base year plus 3 option years		
15	RFP Atch 1 – IDIQ Draft SOW	5.2 Management Support Services; 5.6 Administrative and Other Services	<p>Q: Two service sub-bullets are duplicative under Sections 5.2 Management Support Services and 5.6 Administrative and Other Services: (1) Position and Concept Papers; and (2) Reports. Both services have similar descriptions.</p> <p>Can the Government clarify if these two sub-bullets are applicable to both Management and Administrative Support and should continue to be included under Sections 5.2 and 5.6, or if they should be aligned only with one overarching service? If they should only be under one, can the Government clarify if they fall under 5.2 or 5.6?</p>
	<b>Government Response:</b> The Government is using the DoD layout of Knowledge Based Services, which separates "Management Support Services" and "Administrative and Other Services" into two different avenues and their own sub-bullets. We do not intend on revising the layout, or the suggested sub-bullets under each one.		

**Combined Q & A  
SOFGSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

16	RFP Atch 3 – Section M	M.5.1.2 Category 2	<p>Q: Category 2 addresses “Concurrent Performance at Various Geographic Sites.” Can the Government clarify what qualifies as a “site.” For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Does the offer need to have rented an office, owned property, or set up a base of operations to be considered a “site”?</li> <li>•Does a “site” include a Government-run facility where the offeror provided staff?</li> <li>•Does a “site” require a long-term staff presence (six months or more) at an office, base, etc.?</li> <li>•Can a “site” be considered a temporary “work site” or “operational location” where short-term work occurred (less than six months)?</li> <li>•If an offeror operated at two qualifying sites but both were in the same city, can the offeror claim one or two sites on Category 2?</li> </ul>
	<b>Government Response:</b>	A "site" is defined as a distinct geographic location where contracted personnel are providing support under an awarded contract - whether at a Government-run or Contractor-run facility. Company personnel not directly billable to the contract do not count as performance at a site. Various geographic sites does not include performance in the same state.	
17	Atch 4 HTRO Self Score Matrix	General Score Sheet, L.X.X.X Category 3	<p>Q: There may be a formula calculation error in Row 8 of the General Score Sheet for Category 3. Unlike the rest of the spreadsheet, if the offeror enters the Maximum Count number (100 for Category 3) under the Offeror’s Count column, the resulting Offeror’s Score column calculates a score of “100” and not the Max Possible Points of 2,000 (100 count x 20 weight factor = 2,000 Max Possible Points). Can the Government kindly correct the formula for offerors. (Note: an illustration follows with the potential error highlighted by a red arrow.)</p>
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised HTRO Matrix General Score Sheet Tab.	
18	Atch 4 HTRO Self Score Matrix	Instructions – Category 8 (CPARS)	<p>Q: The instructions for Category 8 address the CPARS reporting on the General Score Sheet. They state that a “fully completed CPARS report means that the Government is able to verify that the Assessing Official has signed it, and the Contractor has concurred on the CPARS.” If an offeror has received a CPARS but NOT concurred with the Government and has an active dispute over a CPARS rating,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the Government consider that CPARS “fully completed” for purposes of SOFGSD self-scoring?</li> <li>2. If not, how should the Offer score the disputed rating on the General Score Sheet (given that a low score may generate a point reduction, and the solicitation states that the Government will only adjust self-scores downwards but not upwards)?</li> <li>3. In the case of a dispute, should the offeror include its response to the Government’s CPARS rating in its proposal?</li> <li>4. Also, if a marginal score was obtained once in an interim CPARS during the period of performance but the subsequent CPARS demonstrated the marginal score was no longer applicable, will it be acceptable for the Offeror to disregard the previous marginal rating and refrain from including this deduction on the Self Score Matrix?</li> </ol>
	<b>Government Response:</b>	The Government will only accept fully completed CPARS. Please see "Note on CPARS" at the top of this list of questions.	

**Combined Q & A  
SOFGSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

19	RFP Atch 1 – IDIQ Draft SOW	11.0 Security Requirements. 11.2 The prime contractor shall possess and maintain a minimum Top Secret Facility Clearance at the time of proposal submission.	Q: The Security requirements stated in Section 11.2 clearly state the requirements for the prime contractor. However, it will be prohibitively expensive and difficult for otherwise competitive small businesses to make these investments prior to award and achieve this requirement by the time of proposal submission. This will unfairly limit competition. Can the Government kindly consider: •Offering sponsorship to achieve TS FCL to otherwise competitive small business offerors upon award? •Allowing a partnership with a cleared subcontractor to manage security requirements while the prime contractor pursues an FCL? This would be a temporary solution while the FCL is being processed, but it would not replace the prime contractor's requirement to ultimately hold the TS FCL. •Allowing a Prime to be an unpopulated Joint Venture between two firms in which one already holds a TS FCL while the other pursues an FCL? Again, this would be a temporary solution while the FCL is being processed, but it would not replace the prime contractor's requirement to ultimately hold the TS FCL.
	Government Response:	The Government requirement is for the Prime to have a TS FCL. Unpopulated Joint Ventures require that both managing partners must hold a TS FCL to be eligible for award.	
20	17	5.1 – Education and Training Services	Will USSOCOM provide Government Furnished Equipment (GFE), facilities, or online infrastructure to support in-person and virtual training delivery?
	Government Response:	This is requirement dependent. In most cases, in-person training will be accomplished at Government facilities where space and equipment will be available for instructor use. The same applies to most virtual training where a Government owned or managed online infrastructure will be available for instructor use. When this is not the case, it will be clearly explained in the requirements documents what the contractor will be responsible for providing.	
21	17	5.1 – Education and Training Services	Will USSCOM provide a list of priority languages that a contractor may be required to provide instruction, regional expertise, and culture instruction and culture emersion in foreign host nations? If a list is not available, can you provide at least a geographic area of operation?
	Government Response:	This is requirement dependent. However, languages in Indo-PACOM and the Middle East are required.	
22	24	5.3 – Irregular Warfare Support	Can the Government clarify whether MILDEC and OPSEC planning tasks require specific certifications or previous Government experience to qualify personnel?
	Government Response:	This is requirement dependent and is determined at the task order level.	
23	28	5.5 – Multimedia & Strategic Communications Support	Can contractors provide original physical and digital content for Strategic Communication or Multimedia Support deliverables, including videos and wellness materials?
	Government Response:	This is requirement dependent and is determined at the task order level.	
24	33	6.0 – IDIQ and Task Order Administration	Will the KO accept a candidate for IDIQ PM who lacks PMP certification but has 10+ years USSOCOM experience and meets all other requirements?
	Government Response:	As stated in SOW Table 6.1, the requirement is "Project Management Professional (PMP) <i>or</i> DAWIA Level III PM certification – <i>OR</i> – an additional 5 years' (total of 10 years') Program Management experience on a DoD Contract" ( <i>emphasis added</i> ). "10+ years' USSOCOM experience", as stated in the question, must be in Program Management to meet this qualification.	

**Combined Q & A  
SOFGSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

25	42	<b>11.5 – Security Requirements</b>	Can the Government provide estimated lead times for TOs requiring SAP/SAR access to ensure contractor clearance sponsorship can be accomplished on time?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	In most cases, Offerors can expect a minimum of 14 days of transition time from notice of award to performance start. In the event of short turn requirements, transition time can be significantly reduced. When additional read-on are required, the time for this to be accomplished is not included in transition timelines, as it is solely dependent upon the Government to provide this. Offerors will be responsible for primarily providing Secret or Top Secret cleared personnel, with "able to obtain SCI on Day 1 of performance" caveats when required.	
26	18	<b>5.1 – Translation Services</b>	Will USSOCOM allow the use of remote interpretation and AI-assisted translation tools for low-volume or non-sensitive engagements, or is in-person interpretation required?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	This is requirement dependent. Translation services are primarily written - translation of Government training material into another language - rather than interpretation services. In all previous requirements, AI-assisted translation was not allowed, based on the nature of the material, or the need for nuanced translation based on the language required.	
27	23	<b>5.2 – Management Support Services</b>	Will a contractor's expertise in performance coaching and resilience training be acceptable for use in developing Position and Concept Papers related to human optimization?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	This is requirement dependent and is determined at the task order level.	
28	25	<b>5.3 – Acquisition Program Management</b>	Does the Government intend to allow contractor access to DoD acquisition systems (e.g., DAVE, DISS, EDA) or will all documentation flow through the COR?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	All documentation will flow through the COR.	
29	30	<b>5.6 – Administrative and Other Services</b>	Will the Government provide software access for administrative support tasks (e.g., Microsoft Teams, Outlook, SharePoint) or is the contractor responsible for acquiring licenses?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	When contract performance is required onsite, the Government will provide all software required to perform the services contracted for.	
30	34	<b>6.2 – Business Relations</b>	Are there any established KPIs or metrics the contractor will be expected to meet under Business Relations, or should offerors propose their own performance measures?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	This is requirement dependent and is determined at the task order level.	
31	43	<b>11.12 – Polygraph Examinations</b>	Will polygraph requirements be disclosed in the base task order or communicated later at the TO level, and can substitute personnel be proposed if timelines conflict?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	This is a task order level requirement that will be communicated at the time of task order RFP.	
32	44	<b>11.14 – Security Training</b>	Will contractor personnel be granted access to DoD or SOCOM learning portals to complete required training (e.g., cyber awareness, OPSEC), or must training be conducted externally?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Yes.	
33	<b>General</b>	<b>N/A</b>	Q: Will the Government allow PPQs instead of CPARS for projects where CPARS are not yet available or where the work is performed as a subcontractor?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	No. Only fully completed CPARS will be allowed. Please see "Note on CPARS" located at the top of this list.	

**Combined Q & A  
SOFGSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

34	<b>General</b>	<b>N/A</b>	Q: The current draft RFP evaluation structure favors large businesses through MPJVs, allowing them to circumvent small business size restrictions while gaining Tier One credit for work not done by small business protégés. In contrast, small businesses with relevant experience supporting SOCOM as a subcontractor are only considered Tier Two, and subcontractor teammates are categorized as Tier Three (without the MPJV, the large business work sample would fall in this category). This creates a competitive disadvantage for small businesses and undermines the intent of participation goals. Would SOCOM consider eliminating the tier structure for work samples and requiring the prime contractor or small business to submit a minimum of three of the five work samples?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised Section L3.1.8. The SB Prime or the Joint Venture Protege are required to submit at least one Tier 1 work sample.	
35	<b>Atch 4 HTRO Self Score Matrix</b>	<b>Category 8 CPARS</b>	Q: Will the government accept customer performance evaluations, other than CPARS, in situations where customers provide their own evaluations in lieu of CPARS (e.g. DIA)?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	No. Only fully completed CPARS will be allowed. Please see "Note on CPARS" located at the top of this list.	
36	<b>Atch 3 Section M</b>	<b>L.5.1.6</b>	In Section M5.1.6 it states: M5.1.6 Category 7: Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) EVALUATION BASIS: To validate the Offeror's self-score, the Government will review the narrative and rating of the fully completed CPARS report submitted by the Offeror and compare it with the Offeror's total percent entry for the past performance scoring categories that were rated "Exceptional", "Very Good", "Satisfactory", "Marginal", or "Unsatisfactory." The Government reserves the right to retrieve past performance data from government repositories to validate the past performance data submitted by the Offeror. Q: CPARS are subjective. Some Government raters will only provide satisfactory or below ratings. Which is their prerogative. Will the Government change this evaluation to include 3 levels, Marginal, unsatisfactory and satisfactory and above.
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised HTRO Matrix General Score Sheet Tab. Please see "Note on CPARS" located at the top of this list.	
37	<b>Atch 4 HTRO Self Score Matrix</b>	<b>Instructions</b>	Q: For OCONUS sites- Please clarify if these sites include rotational deployment sites, where work performed can be up to 179 days.
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Yes, rotational deployment sites may be included at the task order level.	
38	<b>Atch 2 Section L</b>	<b>L5.1.3</b>	Para L5.1.3 states, "An IDIQ contract with a specified scope of work, including all task orders, is acceptable as one work sample". Q: Please confirm that an offeror can submit a multiple-award IDIQ with all task orders that have been awarded to the vendor as one work sample. For example, the USSOCOM Core Support IDIQ with the specific task orders that have been awarded to the submitting vendor counts as one work sample.
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Yes. A multiple award IDIQ with all task orders that were awarded to the submitting Offeror may be used as one work sample. However, individual task orders issued under that same IDIQ may not then be used as a second work sample.	
39	<b>Atch 4 – HTRO and Atch -6</b>	<b>Atch4- Cell C-10 LCAT List; Atch6 SOFGSD LCAT</b>	LCAT 2 on Atch 4 is Intelligence Linguist LCAT 2 on Atch 6 is Foreign Disclosure Officer Q: Which LCAT does the government want offerors to score against?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised HTRO Matrix General Score Sheet Tab. Foreign Disclosure Officer is correct.	



**Combined Q & A  
SOFGSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

40	Atch 3 Section M	M5.1.3	Most work sample documentation (PWS, SOW, CDRL, DD254, etc) does not identify the “Percentage of Awarded Billets (Minimum Of 25 Billets) Hired or Transitioned Onto a Contract Within 30 Days of Award”. Q: How does the government propose vendors provide proof of transitioned workforce without creating documentation?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Offerors should use business records (such as payroll information, hiring date, timecards, etc.) to demonstrate this.	
41	HTRO Self Score Matrix	N/A	Q: For the Max Counts, if the Offeror’s score is above the max count, should the Offeror just cap the score at the max count or put what the actual count/score is even if it is over the Max?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Offerors shall cap their score at the max count.	
42	HTRO Self Score Matrix	General Score Sheet	Q: For the “Work Samples that contain the following 15 LCATs”, is the scoring 1 point for each number of FTEs for that LCAT across the 5 work samples so if one WS had 2 Intelligence Linguist and another WS had 3, the count for that is 5?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Yes, that is correct. However, the total is capped at 5 across all WS.	
43	Attachment M	Pg 2, First Paragraph	Q: The paragraph labeled Step two states, “For those proposals which have passed Steps one and two...” is this meant to read passed Step one since this is step two?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised Section M.	
44	Section L	Pg 2, L5.1.3	Q: It states if the offeror is submitting as a JV and submits a work sample conducted under their JV, the copy of the SBA approved JV agreement must be included in Volume 1(a).  Is the agreement still required to be submitted even if the JV is not submitting work that was conducted by its JV?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See Section L2.8, "Mentor-protégé Joint Venture Agreement" are required to be submitted as part of Administrative Documentation	
45	HTRO Matrix	Tabs: Scoring Summary & General	Q: Will the government make the following calculation/equation corrections in the HTRO Matrix?  •General – Category 3 •General – Categories 1-5 does not add value to the “Scoring Summary” nor to the Total Score in “General” •General – Category 8 does not add value to the “Scoring Summary” nor to the Total Score in “General”
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised HTRO Matrix General Score Sheet Tab	
46	Section L	Pg 2, L5.1.5	Q: The government allows offerors to submit substantiating data with redacted PII such as names, social security, or any other personal information that would identify the individual. Will the government accept names to be replaced with “Employee 001” or a similar employee ID number?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Yes, so long as the Government can also see that each position is a separate and distinct individual.	

**Combined Q & A  
SOFGSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

47	HTRO Matrix & Section L	Instructions – Cat 4 & Pg 2, L5.1.5	<p>Q: The HTRO instructions state the offeror is to verify the standings of TS/SCI clearances within 5 days of the proposal submission.</p> <p>Section L instructs offerors to redact PII info.</p> <p>How does the government want offerors to submit substantiating documentation for proof of the TS/SCI clearance-holding employees if PII is to be redacted?</p>
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised HTRO Matrix General Score Sheet Tab. Verification of TS/SCI clearances is no longer required.	
48	Section L	Pg 2, L5.1.4	<p>Q: Section L5.1.4 requires work samples to be within the last 5 years but does not require a minimum performance duration. As written, an offeror could use a contract that ended just one day into the 5-year window (e.g., June 1, 2020), despite most of the work being outdated.</p> <p>Will the Government consider requiring a minimum of 6 consecutive months of performance within the 5-year period to ensure submitted work samples demonstrate relevant and recent capabilities?</p>
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised Sec L5.1.4. A minimum of six consecutive months of performance within the 5-year period is required.	
49	General	General	Q: Will the government confirm only a CMMC Level 1 with a SPRS score of 110 is what is required by the prime offeror only?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	<p>IAW 32 CFR 170 and the 15 Jan 2025 DoD CIO, USD(R&amp;E), and USD(A&amp;S) signed memo, “<i>Implementing the Cybersecurity maturity Model Certification (CMMC) Program: Guidance for Determining Appropriate CMMC Compliance Assessment Levels and Process for Waiving CMMC Assessment Requirements.</i>” the requirement for a CMMC Level 1 has been removed.</p> <p>Only Prime offerors are required to hold an SPRS score of 110. If part of an Unpopulated JV, then BOTH managing partners are required to hold an SPRS score of 110.</p>	
50	HTRO Matrix & Section L	Instructions – Cat 4 & Pg 1, L5.1.5	<p>Q: Offerors can submit subcontractor-led work samples and score equally. This could dilute the scoring relevance.</p> <p>Will the government consider awarding additional weighting or priority to Tier 1 prime-led work samples to better assess the offeror’s ability to lead and manage the contract?</p>
	<b>Government Response:</b>	The Government has implemented this through the Work Sample Tier requirements found in Column H of the HTRO Matrix General Score Sheet tab, and as outlined in Section L5.1.7.	

**Combined Q & A  
SOFGSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

51	General	Current Acceptable Accounting System	<p>Q: Will the government consider requiring an "Acceptable" accounting system with the option of an SF-1408 for those entities who do not currently have evidence of a recent DCMA, DCAA or other Federal Agency audit at time of proposal submission. Example below:</p> <p>Acceptable Accounting System. The Prime Offeror (to include all members of a Joint Venture) shall provide valid documentation at the time of initial proposal submission from DCMA, DCAA, other Federal Audit Agency, or other information that allows the Contracting Officer to determine that the contractor's accounting system will permit timely development of all necessary cost data for the cost type CLINs and the negotiation of cost in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulations and applicable supplements in order to be considered for award.</p> <p>If valid documentation is outside of the last 5 years from date of the issuance of this RFP, a letter from the Chief Financial Officer must accompany the valid documentation that states the company has not had any material changes to the accounting system since the date of the accounting system adequacy determination.</p> <p>If the Offeror does not have current documentation regarding an acceptable accounting system, the Offeror shall complete Attachment J-4A, SF 1408 Pre-award Survey of Prospective Accounting System Checklist with supporting documentation. An advanced copy of the Offeror's SF 1408 Pre-award Survey of Prospective Accounting System Checklist with supporting documentation shall be forwarded to the cognizant DCAA and to the Contracting Officer office no later than Industry Day. Offerors are cautioned that determination of the acceptability of the accounting system must be accomplished to be eligible for contract award. Therefore, Offerors shall be prepared to support DCAA upon the initiation of the audit. (Reference USSOCOM ISSJ III)</p>
	Government Response:	See revised Sec L2.6. Yes. An offeror without documentation regarding an acceptable accounting system must submit an SF 1408 Pre-Award Survey.	
52	DRAFT SOW	Para 11.2	<p>Q: The contractor shall be required to safeguard information at the level specified in the DD Form 254 for this contract and the DD 254 specific to any resulting task order.</p> <p>Do the safeguarding requirements flow down to subcontractors? Are all teammates required to already possess an approved safeguarding DD Form 254, or will the Government sponsor eligible teammates with an active Top Secret Facility Clearance who do not yet have one in place?</p>
	Government Response:	Safeguarding requirements for the IDIQ are specific to the Prime awardees. Task order safeguarding requirements must be met by all teammates that will be providing performance under that specific task order. IDIQ awardees are required to ensure teammates meet the requirements at the task order level prior to task order award by sponsoring teammates through the SOCOM Industrial Security Office.	
53	DRAFT SOW	Table 6.1	Q: IDIQ Program Manager shall possess a Top Secret clearance and 10 years of SOF experience. Q: Would the Government consider allowing Secret-cleared candidates with eligibility for TS/SCI? A recently retired servicemember may simply need to renew the TS/SCI clearance at time of proposal submission.
	Government Response:	See revised SOW Table 6.1. No. A Top Secret clearance is required. SCI eligible on day 1 of award is permissible, as the Government maintains control of read-ons.	

**Combined Q & A  
SOFGSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

54	<b>DRAFT SOW</b>	<b>Table 6.1</b>	Q:What documentation will the Government require to validate that the proposed IDIQ Program Manager is currently employed or committed to the Offeror? Will a Letter of Intent suffice, or will the Government require a fully executed or redacted employment contract to verify that the PM is an active employee or will be on-boarded upon award?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	A redacted employment contract that shows the individual's name and signature will meet this requirement.	
55	<b>General RFP Compliance</b>	<b>FAR 9.104-1 and FAR Subpart 4.8</b>	Q:The RFP and SOW do not address how the Government will evaluate contractor responsibility beyond proposal submission as compared to the Market Research stage of this acquisition. Will the Government detail and require Offerors to submit an acceptable accounting system verification, line of credit evidence, and establish procedures for not yet audited or inspected accounting systems to compete fairly?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised Section L2 for revised list of qualifying criteria	
56	<b>General</b>	<b>N/A</b>	Q: Is the PM required to be onsite at MacDill AFB or can the work be performed remotely?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	No. The PM is a company asset not directly billed to the contract, so onsite work is not required.	
57	<b>ITO/RFP</b>	<b>Pg 2, Submission Instructions</b>	Q:For the work samples, must the OGA be a defense-related agency or is any federal agency acceptable?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Any federal agency is acceptable.	
58	<b>Atch 1 – IDIQ Draft SOW</b>	<b>5.1</b>	Q:The Special Operations Forces General Services Delivery (SOFGSD) IDIQ Level Statement of Work (SOW) specifies that the contractor provide highly specialized support in the following areas: Education and Training Services, Management Support Services, Program Management, Engineering, Technical and Professional Services, and Administrative & Other Services. Does USSOCOM envision development of comprehensive programs for all subordinate commands? At what levels of command will the contractor be expected to develop/conduct training?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	SOFGSD is a SOCOM enterprise IDIQ. Requirements are identified and specified to provide support to SOCOM mission globally. The task order may support any level of the command.	
59	<b>Atch 1 – IDIQ Draft SOW</b>	<b>5.1</b>	Q:The Special Operations Forces General Services Delivery (SOFGSD) IDIQ Level Statement of Work (SOW) details that the contractor may be required to provide foreign language instruction, regional expertise, and culture instruction and culture emersion in foreign host nations. Target Languages include but are not limited to all dialects of the following languages: Arabic, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Indonesian, Thai, Korean, Chinese, Urdu, Farsi, UK English, Swahili, Filipino, Hindi, Pashtu, Russian, and German. - What level of proficiency is required for each of the target languages? - What verification credentials will USSOCOM accept as proof of meeting the requirement? - Will the contractor be responsible for providing or developing multimedia language and cultural training software, or will this be provided in support of execution?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	All requirements will be specified at the task order level, and are too varied to provide in this forum.	

**Combined Q & A  
SOF GSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

60	Atch 1 – IDIQ Draft SOW	5.2	<p>Q: The Special Operations Forces General Services Delivery (SOF GSD) IDIQ Level Statement of Work (SOW) specifies that the contractor provide Management Support Services: These services involve providing advice and assistance with the management and operation SOF organizations that are closely associated with the basic responsibilities and missions of SOF organizations. These services include strategic planning, SOF capability and structuring analysis and advice, with a broad array of deliverables such as data collection, writing services, public relations support and media analysis.</p> <p>- Does USSOCOM anticipate that this support be focused on the services specified in Section 5.1?</p> <p>- Which staff directorates will be involved?</p> <p>- Will the staff directorates expect full-time dedicated personnel be assigned to their offices?</p>
	<b>Government Response:</b>	All requirements will be specified at the task order level, and are too varied to provide in this forum.	
61	General	General Score Sheet/Category 2	<p>Q: How much of the current/past SCS work is either OCONUS or on site in Germany and Korea?</p> <p>Discussion: if very little work is performed overseas on the IDIQ, then the heavier weight may eliminate qualified offerors.</p> <p>Recommendation: OCONUS site performance should be evaluated at the TO level instead of the IDIQ level.</p>
	<b>Government Response:</b>	The Government has determined that OCONUS work in Germany and/or Korea is significant enough to include this requirement.	
62	Sect. L	L5.1.7 Work Sample Tiers	<p>Q: Are the work sample Tiers (1, 2 &amp; 3) weighted differently?</p> <p>Recommendation: If the work sample Tiers (1, 2 &amp; 3) are weighted differently, recommend including an explanation of how they will be evaluated as this will impact sub-k teaming strategies.</p>
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Work samples aren't weighted differently. The categories are weighted differently and work samples provide evidence of the meeting the category.	
63	Sect. L	L5.1.7 Work Sample Tiers	<p>Q: Are Tier 1 and 2 work samples weighted more heavily than subcontractor performance?</p> <p>Discussion: If weighed differently, this may favor selection of Joint Ventures who are controlled by large businesses over independent Small Businesses. Effective Aug 22, 2022, the SBA amended its regulations to implement new provisions of the NDAA FY 2021. The final rule allows for small business contractors to use past performance rating for work performed as a first-tier subcontractor.</p> <p>Recommendation: ensure sub-k past performance is weighted properly to give small business the opportunity to build teams that are competitive and can fill capability and performance gaps where needed.</p>
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Work samples aren't weighted differently. The categories are weighted differently and work samples provide evidence of the meeting the category.	
64	Sect. M	M1.2 & M2.0	<p>Q: how many awards will the government make on this IDIQ?</p> <p>Discussion: the number of awardees is currently listed at 15 in the draft. The Sidebar discussion mentioned that the number has not yet been determined.</p> <p>Recommendation: the government should clarify the number of awards if not 15 as mentioned in the SOF GSD Sidebar discussion at SOF Week.</p>

**Combined Q & A  
SOFGSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised Section M2.01. The Government intends to award between 10-15 awardees for this IDIQ. An exact number cannot be given until evaluation begins, as scores will determine this number. For example, if anticipated awardee 10 and 11 hold the same score, both offerors would be given an award. If awardees 15 and 16 hold the same score, then neither will be given an award and only 14 awards will be made.	
65	Atch II – Sect. L	<b>L4.0 Volume I – Executive Summary/ Contract. L4.2 Volume I (a) – Administrative Documentation</b>	Q: Will there be a requirement for SECRET safeguarding at the time of proposal submission? Discussion: during the SOF Week Sidebar, it was mentioned that the safeguarding requirement would be removed at the proposal stage and that DD245 would be provided at the time of award. Recommendation: If not, the government should consider removing this requirement from Section L.
	<b>Government Response:</b>	No. Secret Safeguarding will be an added requirement after award.	
66	Atch Sect. L	<b>L5.1.2</b>	Q: How will you ensure that JVs are not favored and do not dominate the list of awardees? Discussion: The acquisition L.5.1.2 (Atch 4 - HTRO Self Score Matrix DRAFT) approach should foster a level playing field for true small businesses, ensuring they have fair access to contracts in education, training, intelligence, and exercise support services. We have concerns regarding small business joint ventures (JVs) that are essentially propped up by large businesses over the standard size. These JVs, while technically classified as small businesses, often have significant backing from large entities, which can put standalone small businesses at a disadvantage. We worry that the large JV companies, which are not truly independent small businesses, will dominate the re-bid process and secure the majority of contract spots, limiting opportunities for truly independent small businesses.
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised Sec L3.1.8. At least one work sample must be submitted by the JV protégé	
67	Atch Sect. L	<b>L5.1.2</b>	Q: How will the government evaluate Technical and Management by utilizing the Cross Reference Matrix (attachment XX) (not included in the draft documents). Recommendation: the government should release the Cross Reference Matrix for evaluation prior to the final draft or explain this at the Industry Day event (TBD).
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised Sec L3.3.4 for instructions concerning Attachment 03 HTRO Cross Reference Matrix	
68	Atch 3 Section M	<b>M1.1 Source Selection Method</b>	Q: For neutral ratings for contractors with no relevant past performance, and how can the USG rate the top 15 with HTRO scores in such cases? Discussion: The FAR Part 15.305(a)(2)(iv) permits that in the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the offeror may not be assessed favorably or unfavorably on the agency's evaluation criteria. In other words, the contractor should not receive a negative rating for neutral past performance evaluations. Recommendation: the government should make provisions for offerors where past performance evaluations are not available.

**Combined Q & A**  
**SOFGSD DRAFT RFP**  
**13 June 2025**

	<b>Government Response:</b>	CPARS ratings are reflected at the bottom of the General Score Sheet tab in the HTRO matrix. Contractors without CPARS will not be scored in this area and not assessed favorably or unfavorably as a result of not having CPARS.	
69	<b>Sect. L</b>	<b>L.5.1.2</b>	Q: Of the maximum of 5 work samples, how many are required to be from the prime offeror (including JV partners) and how many can be provided by teaming partners/subcontractors?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	At a minimum, one Tier 1 work sample must be provided. See Section L3.1.7 for Work Sample Tier definitions.	
70	<b>Atch 2 Sect. L</b>	<b>L5.1.3</b>	<p>Q: Currently, the draft RFP for SOFGSD allows Work Samples to come from either member of an MPJV, but does not require ANY projects to come from the protégé:</p> <p>Section L5.1.3:</p> <p>“If the Offeror of this solicitation is a Joint Venture (JV) formed under The All-Small Mentor-Protégé Program or the SBA 8(a) Mentor Protégé Program, work samples from either the managing or non-managing venturer are acceptable.”</p> <p>With 20% of the total points coming from the Tier 1 Prime work sample(s), by accepting Work Samples from Large Businesses portion of the JV, in essence, Small Businesses meeting the \$24.5M size standard are competing against Large Businesses.</p> <p>In practice, many agencies have created a “half” standard for proteges. As an example, NASA’s SEWP procurement required proteges submitting in an MPJV arrangement to submit past performance examples that were half the value of the required examples for small businesses submitting on their own. See Section A.3.7.1 of the SEWP RFP, Amendment 14 conformed version:</p> <p>Each Project must have had a minimum of \$4M in total value size of a single order or contract and must be described using the Exhibit 1 REP</p> <p>Template. For offerors submitting as HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, or 8(a) Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, or 8(a) partner, or the Joint Venture itself. The HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, or 8(a) partner project, or Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$2M in total value size of a single order or contract.</p> <p>We recommend that you apply the same standard to ensure consistency with federal regulations and standard procurement practice. A protégé should be required to bring at least one of the five work samples on SOFGSD, but the required value can be half that of other bidders’ examples. (25 FTE instead of 50 FTE for the required Tier 1 example, e.g.).</p>
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised Sec L3.1.8. At least one Tier 1 work sample must be submitted by the JV protégé.	
71	<b>Atch 4 -HTRO Self Score Matrix</b>	<b>General Tab, Excel row 4, Education Score Sheet, Excel rows 12 &amp; 14</b>	<p>Q: “Concurrent performance at various geographic sites”</p> <p>“Number of Work Samples providing concurrent Professional Military Education at multiple locations (e.g. undergraduate or graduate level instruction) (as referenced in SOW paragraph 5.1).”</p> <p>“Number of Work Samples providing concurrent foreign language, regional expertise, or cultural training in multiple locations (as referenced in SOW paragraph 5.1).”</p> <p>Please define the word “concurrent” in each of these 3 cases.</p>
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Based on the definition provided by Webster's Online Dictionary, the word "concurrent" means "happening or operating at the same time."	

**Combined Q & A  
SOFGSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

72	Atch 2 Sect. L	<b>L5.2 Format and Specific Work Sample Content</b>	Q: "Unofficial contract-related documentation, such as a Memorandum from a Contracting Officer may be used for substantiation but must be clearly labeled and cross-referenced with the corresponding work sample." Will the Government allow official email communication from the Contracting Officer /COR of a work sample to be considered for specific evidence?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Yes, as long as it is clearly labeled and cross-referenced	
73	Atch 4 -HTRO Self Score Matrix	<b>Instructions Tab, Category 8</b>	Q: Does the Organizational Change History "Roadmap" apply only to Prime offers?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Yes.	
74	Atch 4 -HTRO Self Score Matrix	<b>Instructions</b>	Q: "Applicable to all Score Sheets. Using a single Tier 1 Work Sample (WS), Offerors shall provide evidence of the number of total positions contracted for at any point in time during the period of performance. Evidence shall identify corporate records documenting continued employment under the work sample over the course of months three through 12 of the base year. Percentages shall be calculated by the number of employed personnel in month three still employed in month 12." The first part references picking the total number of positions at any given point in time during the PoP but then goes on to reference only months 3 through 12 of the BASE YEAR. What is the point of the "any point in time" reference? Is the Government allowing industry to choose?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised HTRO Matrix Instructions Tab	
75	Atch 2 Sect. L	<b>L5.2</b>	Q: "Unofficial contract-related documentation, such as a Memorandum from a Contracting Officer may be used for substantiation but must be clearly labeled and cross-referenced with the corresponding work sample." Do Monthly Status Reports, as required in contract deliverables to the Contracting Officer /COR count as "unofficial contract-related documentation," given it is contractually required to be sent to the Contracting Officer/COR?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	No. MSRs are not "unofficial contract-related documents" if they are required deliverables.	
76	Atch 4 -HTRO Self Score Matrix	<b>General Tab, Category 3</b>	Q: "Percentage of awarded billets (minimum of 25 billets) hired or transitioned onto a contract within 30 days of award (enter % as numerals (e.g., .64))" Please note that the formula has an error and the offeror's score does not populate correctly.
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised HTRO Matrix.	
77	Atch 4 -HTRO Self Score Matrix	<b>General Tab, Category 5</b>	Q: LCAT # 14 - "Faculty and staff at the undergraduate or graduate-level (e.g., JSOU) to include such labor categories as: Instructional Systems Design (ISD), Learning Management Systems Specialist (LMS), Academic Instructors, Distance Learning Instructors," Given JSOU is not a degree-granting institution, and therefore not at the undergraduate/graduate level, would an ISD that is not in an undergrad program but are working at the 4-star level count in this LCAT?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Yes.	



**Combined Q & A  
SOFGSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

78	Atch 4 -HTRO Self Score Matrix	Instructions Tab	Q: Please confirm that, based on the General Score Sheet formulas for Category 8, Offerors will not gain points for positive CPAR ratings but will lose points for negative (i.e., Marginal, Unsatisfactory) CPAR ratings.
	Government Response:	This is correct.	
79	Atch 4 -HTRO Self Score Matrix	Instructions Tab	Q: Please note that, while the General Score Sheet does contain formulas in Offeror's Self Score cells (K28–K30) as well as USG Evaluated Score cells (M28–M30) for Exceptional, Very Good, and Satisfactory CPAR ratings, it does not contain formulas in Offeror's Self Score cells (K31 and K32) or USG Evaluated Score cells (M31 and M32) for Marginal and Unsatisfactory CPAR ratings.
	Government Response:	See revised HTRO Matrix	
80	Atch 4 -HTRO Self Score Matrix	Instructions Tab	Q: Please note that, on the General Score Sheet, the formulas related to Category 8 in general but particularly in row 34 are such that any inputs will result in scores of 0.0.
	Government Response:	See revised HTRO Matrix	
81	Atch 4 -HTRO Self Score Matrix	Score Sheet Tabs	Q: Please note the following formula omissions: (1)On the General Score Sheet, the Sum formulas in K25 and M25 omit K24 and M24, respectively
	Government Response:	See revised HTRO Matrix	
82	Atch 4 -HTRO Self Score Matrix	Instructions Tab	Q: To aid in evaluation, we recommend the government allow Offerors to use Adobe's Comment feature to "tag" the substantiating information found in the work sample verification document packets with associated keywords. Offerors would then indicate the applicable keywords in the appropriate cell in columns O–S of the appropriate Score Sheet. This verification method allows Government evaluators to search the Adobe Comment sidebar and jump immediately to the indicated tag and applicable substantiating information, which is much faster than interpreting and manually navigating to a cited page and paragraph/line number.
	Government Response:	Offerors may use any tools available to them to point the Government to substantiating information within their proposal.	
83	Atch 4 -HTRO Self Score Matrix	Instructions Tab	Q: On the Instructions tab of the Self-Score Matrix, the Government acknowledges that this criterion "may be difficult to substantiate with contract documents or business records."  With this understanding, will the Government please allow Offerors to submit a Statement of Fact document, signed by a Government official with cognizance of the project (e.g., CO, COR), as verification of the provided/required data?
	Government Response:	See revised HTRO Matrix Instructions Tab. The Government will NOT allow the submission of a Statement of Facts.	

**Combined Q & A  
SOFGSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

84	Atch 4 -HTRO Self Score Matrix	General Score Sheet Tab	Q: The Category 7 criterion "Retention: Provide retention rate for months 3 - 12 of the base year of the PoP for a Tier 1 work sample as a Percentage.*" found on the General Score Sheet is not reflected in Section M of the draft solicitation, which names the CPARS criterion as "Category 7." Please either: (1)Add the retention criterion to Section M and correct the Category numbering, or (2)Remove the retention criterion from the Instructions and General Score Sheet and correct the Category numbering.
	Government Response:	See revised Section M4.1.6	
85	Attachment 4, HTRO Self Score Matrix & Attachment 3 Section M	Instruction Tab and General Score Sheet Tabs	Q: The Instructions tab specifies "total number of contract personnel," and the General Tab and Section M specify "FTE Positions".  Please clarify whether Offerors should provide the total number of contract personnel or the total number of FTE positions. If Offerors are to provide the number of FTE positions with TS/SCI clearances, please confirm how many work hours are considered "full-time."
	Government Response:	See revised Section M4.1.1 and HTRO Self Score Matrix Instructions and General tabs Offerors will provide the total number of contract personnel.	
86	Attachment 4, HTRO Self Score Matrix & Attachment 3 Section M	Instructions Tab	Q: Section M states, "points will be validated based on the percentage of awarded billets hired or transitioned." However, the Matrix Instructions tab states, "The total number of positions shall be entered," and the General Score Sheet tab states, "(enter % as numerals (e.g., .64))."  •Please clarify whether Offerors should enter the total number of positions hired/transitioned or the percentage of positions hired/transitioned within 30 days. •Also, please clarify how this criterion will be scored. Will it be by: (1)Using the total number/percentage of positions hired (0–100) multiplied by the weight factor of 20 for a potential total of 2000 points, or (2)Assigning a set number of points based on the total percentage of positions hired and not applying a weight factor for a potential total of 100 points (i.e., per the Excel formulas in K8 and M8, <75% = 0 points, >75% and <85% = 75 points, >85% = 100 points).
	Government Response:	See revised HTRO Matrix	
87	Atch 4 -HTRO Self Score Matrix	General Score Sheet Tab	Q: Please verify if Alaska, Hawaii and U.S. Territories (such as Guam and Samoa) are considered CONUS or OCONUS?
	Government Response:	These locations are all considered OCONUS.	
88	Atch 4 -HTRO Self Score Matrix	General Score Sheet Tab	Q: Can different work samples claim the same site for points (e.g., Wiesbaden, Germany)?
	Government Response:	Yes.	

**Combined Q & A  
SOF GSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

89	Attachment 4, HTRO Self Score Matrix	Score Sheet Tabs	Q: Certain Training and Exercise Support LCAT names are very specific to certain task orders (for example, LREC).  Will the government provide offerors credit for an LCAT if the job description proof (PWS, SOW etc.) shows that a role is similar/ identical even if the LCAT names don't match exactly?
	Government Response:	Yes. As long as the Government can clearly see how the descriptions align, alternate LCAT titles will be counted. Offerors are cautioned that providing a single part of LCAT responsibilities will not be considered similar/identical.	
90	Atch 2 Section L; Atch 7 Section H	L4.2.4; H.1©	Q: Language in the first sentence of Section L4.2.4 explicitly states that both Primes and teaming partners/subcontractors cannot participate on another team whatsoever. This language contradicts Section H language and Section L4.2.4 language further down in the same paragraph on cross teaming. Please confirm that cross-teaming is only prohibited for prime offerors and not teaming partners/subcontractors
	Government Response:	See Section L2.10 The Government places no restrictions on teaming partners/subcontractors.	
91	General	N/A	Q: Understanding that small businesses and similarly situated businesses have to maintain 51% of the work on a small set-aside, how does the Government intend to enforce the statutory language?
	Government Response:	Per FAR Clause 52.219-14, limitations on subcontracting will be "By the end of the base term of the contract." A final CPARS will be submitted at the end of the 5-year ordering period that will annotate "Regulatory Compliance". An awardee who has not complied with the requirements of this clause will be appropriately marked in this category.	
92	General	N/A	Q: Understanding that small businesses and similarly situated businesses have to maintain 51% of the work on a small set-aside, will enforcement be at the IDIQ level or at the Task Order level?
	Government Response:	Per FAR Clause 52.219-14, limitations on subcontracting will be "By the end of the base term of the contract and then by the end of each subsequent option period."	
93	Atch 1 - IDIQ Draft SOW; Atch 4 - HTRO Self Score Matrix DRAFT	Section 5; General, Education, Exercise, and Intelligence Score Sheet Tabs	Q: Will IDIQ contracts be awarded for the entire SOW or portions as determined by the Governments evaluation of specific Work Samples?
	Government Response:	IDIQ contracts will be awarded for the entire IDIQ SOW. Task orders, after IDIQ award, will be issued for specific requirements that fit within the scope of the IDIQ SOW.	
94	Atch 2 Section L	L5.1.3	Q: Concerning acceptable Work Samples, what is the formal definition that governs what will and will not qualify as an OGA under the SOF GSD RFQ?
	Government Response:	OGA under this requirement is defined as other Federal Government agencies.	
95	Atch 2 Section L	L5.2	Q: Can a Memorandum summarizing relevant Work Sample details be created, signed by a cognizant official, and used as contract documentation for the purposes of SOF GSD validation of scoring under the HTRO matrix?

**Combined Q & A  
SOFGSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

	<b>Government Response:</b>	No. The Government will not accept created documents.	
96	<b>Atch 2 Section L; Atch 4 - HTRO Self Score Matrix DRAFT</b>	<b>L5.2; General, Education, Exercise, and Intelligence Score Sheet Tabs</b>	Q: Section L5.2 states “The provided official contract documentation must be sufficient for the Government to validate the Offeror’s Self-Score and ability to meet the PWS requirements.” Please confirm that Offeror’s “ability to meet the PWS requirements” is being evaluated by Category 6 scoring in the HTRO matrix (i.e., there isn’t a further additional subjective criteria).
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised HTRO Matrix General Score Sheet Tab. Ability to meet requirements is only being evaluated by Renumbered Category 5.	
97	<b>Atch 2 Section L; Atch 3 Section M</b>	<b>L5.4, L5.2; M5.5</b>	Q: Section L5.4 states “Offerors will score themselves under each criterion and provide evidence (e.g., body of facts, data, proof) to substantiate that score”. In regards to providing evidence that might be characterized as a “body of facts, data, [or] proof”, please confirm that only contract documentation as covered by L5.2 and M5.5 will be acceptable for validating scoring in the HTRO matrix.
	<b>Government Response:</b>	This is correct.	
98	<b>Atch 1 - IDIQ Draft SOW; Atch 6 - SOFGSD LCAT Description</b>	<b>Attachments 1 and 6</b>	Q: Is the SOF GSD labor category description list in Attachment 6 a comprehensive list of all LCATs required to satisfy the entirety of the Statement of Work?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	No. This list is not comprehensive, but does include LCATs that are required most often at the task order level.	
99	<b>Atch 2 Section L</b>	<b>L5.1.3</b>	Q: Section L5.1.3 states “An IDIQ contract with a specified scope of work, including all task orders, is acceptable as one work sample”. What is formally required to demonstrate that an MA-IDIQ contract has a “specified scope of work” for multiple task orders such that the MA-IDIQ will be credited as a single Work Sample (comprising the several task orders)?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	A copy of the MA-IDIQ SOW/PWS which dictates the scope of the MA-IDIQ, or copies of SOW/PWS associated with individual task orders issued under that MA-IDIQ (the later will require a copy of the task order award document showing both the MA-IDIQ and Task Order numbers be submitted as well).	
100	<b>DRFP SOW &amp; L4.2 M4.1</b>	<b>11.2 &amp; Administration Documentation</b>	Q: In the case of an unpopulated Joint Venture, is a Facility Security Clearance required for the JV entity, the managing partner firm only, or both JV Partners? We recommend the following:
	<b>Government Response:</b>	For Unpopulated Joint Ventures, <u><b>BOTH</b></u> managing partners are required to have the TS FCL at time of proposal submission.	

**Combined Q & A**  
**SOFGSD DRAFT RFP**  
**13 June 2025**

101	L4.2 M4.1	DBA Insurance	<p>Q: Respectfully recommend the addition of a Defense Base Act (DBA) insurance requirement as Administrative Documentation. An example of language is below:</p> <p>Offerors are required to provide ‘proof’ that they can obtain Defense Base Act (DBA) insurance in suboptimal locations such as Iraq. This quote will showcase the ability to secure coverage despite the challenging conditions of being in a suboptimal location. The prospective locations for some requirements may encompass declared theaters of active armed conflict, high Department of State hardship areas, and hazardous duty zones. Specific expected locations will be communicated to potential Offerors within the competitive range.</p>
	Government Response:	This is a task order level requirement that will be communicated at the time of task order RFP.	
102	Section M	M5.1.3	<p>Q: The RFP states that the LCAT descriptions provided are intended to support Government validation of an offeror’s self-score and are not performance requirements. Given this, would the Government allow offerors to map their proposed labor categories to different standard LCAT titles—so long as the qualifications and responsibilities clearly align with the descriptions provided in the HTRO Self Score attachment and associated SOW functional areas?</p> <p>Allowing flexibility in mapping could accommodate existing labor category structures while still meeting the intent of the Government’s evaluation.</p>
	Government Response:	Yes. As long as the Government can clearly see how the descriptions align, standard LCAT titles may be used.	
103	RFI / HTRO Self Score Matrix	General	<p>Q: Considering the recent amendment to the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS), which mandates that contracting officers consider relevant past performance information from affiliates of small business offerors, will the government permit offerors to submit work samples from affiliated entities—such as parent companies, sister companies, or subsidiaries—to demonstrate past performance and capability?</p> <p>If so, could the government clarify any specific requirements or restrictions to ensure the relevance and applicability of these work samples? For instance, the government might consider allowing only one proposal per entity to prevent any single entity from being awarded multiple positions on the contract vehicle.</p> <p>This approach would enable offerors to leverage the full scope of their organizational resources to meet SOCOM’s requirements, aligning with the updated DFARS provisions.</p>
	Government Response:	See revised Section L3.1.8. Each Small Business and Joint Venture Protege is required to submit at least one Tier 1 work sample.	

**Combined Q & A  
SOF GSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

104	HTRO Self Score Matrix	General	<p>Q: Would the government consider allowing offerors to provide references and pointers to substantiate data for their self-scoring sheets?</p> <p>This addition could help ensure the government has easy access to relevant supporting documentation for the offeror's self-score, reducing ambiguity and streamlining the evaluation process.</p>
	Government Response:	See Attachment 03 Cross Reference Matrix, which has been provided to allow Offerors to provide references to substantiating data.	
105	HTRO Self Score Matrix		<p>Q: Would the Government consider revising the scoring methodology to allow maximum points for a combination of SOF and other highly relevant work samples—rather than requiring all five to be SOF-specific?</p> <p>While SOF experience is clearly critical, limiting maximum points only to SOF-related efforts may unnecessarily constrain the competitive pool and disadvantage highly qualified offerors with extensive DoD or IC experience in directly analogous missions. A more balanced approach—such as awarding maximum points for three SOF-related examples supplemented by other highly relevant work—would better recognize proven capability, encourage innovation, and still ensure the selection of vendors well-equipped to meet SOF mission needs.</p>
	Government Response:	Offerors are <b>not</b> required to submit five SOF-specific work samples. Offerors are free to submit non-SOF related work samples. However, the Government has determined that experience with SOF-related efforts will be weighted more highly based on the unique requirements inherent in supporting SOF-related efforts. The scoring methodology for this category will not be changed.	
106	HTRO Self Score Matrix		Would the Government consider incorporating a dedicated 8(a) track or on-ramp under the SOF GSD IDIQ to enhance access to agile, mission-ready professional services?
	Government Response:	No. If an 8(a) award is warranted, the Government will utilize an 8(a) track outside of SOFGSD.	
107	Attachment 2 – Section L	L5.1.2 L5.2	Q: Section L5.1.2 and L5.2 require the offeror to submit “Offeror elected substantiating evidence.” In addition to providing the citation in the HRT0, may the offeror highlight selected information in the required documentation (SOWs, PWS, CDRLs, etc.) and/or add comments to assist the Government in identifying the relevant information?
	Government Response:	See revised HTRO Matrix. A CRM Tab has been provided to allow Offerors to provided references to substantiating data. Offerors may highlighted selected information as they see fit to assist the Government in its evaluation.	
108	General	N/A	Q: How does the Government intend for the offeror to submit their proposal as work sample substantiating evidence will include several large PDF files? The size and number of files may require a significant number of emails.
	Government Response:	See revised Section L1.3 Electronic Proposal Submission. The Government will utilize DoD SAFE ( <a href="https://safe.apps.mil">https://safe.apps.mil</a> ) for proposal submission.	
109	Attachment 2 – Section L	L6.0	Q: Section L6.0 states “The Offeror will submit pricing for a kick-off meeting.” Will the Government provide a pricing template and instructions prior to the kick-off meeting?

**Combined Q & A  
SOFGSD DRAFT RFP  
13 June 2025**

	<b>Government Response:</b>	See Attachment 04 Staffing Proposal Pricing template, as well as revised Section L-4 and M-5	
110	<b>Attachment 4 – HTRO</b>		Q: If a contract modification adds billet to an active Task Order, do those personnel count for the General Score Sheet, Category 3?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Yes. As long as the Offeror's substantiating documentation includes the modification showing the addition of the LCAT and/or personnel, it will be counted.	
111	<b>Attachment 4 – HTRO</b>	<b>Category 7</b>	Q: How will the government score retention where multiple repetitive Episodic Task Orders require consistent but intermittent subject matter expert and role player support?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	Retention relies on consistent performance of an individual on contract over a 9 month set period of performance. Role player support or intermittent SME support will not be able to meet the retention requirement.	
112	<b>Atch 4, HTRO</b>	<b>Instruction, Category 3</b>	Q: High incumbent capture rates and retention are a good thing. However, Category 3 awards turnover of potentially 25 of 25 total billets on a contract. Also, the formula in cell K8 doesn't allow any points until turnover of 75 billets and maxes at over 85 billets of turnover. Would the Government consider allowing for "all tiers" to demonstrate success when there might have been successful staffing of turnover of "up to" a maximum of 25 billets? 25 billets is a significant scale of turnover in the small business community.
	<b>Government Response:</b>	See revised HTRO Matrix General Score Sheet Tab. Scoring is based on a retention percentage, rather than tied to a number of billets	
113	<b>Attachment 3 Section M</b>	<b>M 5.1.6</b>	Q: Can the Government confirm whether CPARS reports are required for each work sample in order to remain eligible for award, or if the absence of CPARS merely affects scoring in Category 7?
	<b>Government Response:</b>	CPARS merely affects scoring in Category 7. An offeror without finalized CPARS will not be negatively or favorably impacted.	

SOF Week 2025  
SOFGSD Sidebar Questions

Question text
Are there ever any international opportunities through PEO Services?
Is there interest in commercial services with a long endurance mothership capable of launching and recovering the DCS through a covered moonpool?
Will the slides be made available to conference attendees?
What is the status of SOFETOPS?
Recommendations for non-traditional defense gov contractors who have federal past performance but no defense or FCL to support SOF contracts?
Other Agencies/Departments will release milestone status charts as proposals go through the source selection workflow, showing when key gates have been cleared. Would you consider doing that to help fine tire industry's pre-award planning
To whom should we offer innovative ideas for SOF training and education?
When speaking about implementing new Supply Chain/Cyber Risk Management, What changes exactly will we be making? What implemented changes will lower threat levels and how will they effect day to day workflow?
Will there be a TO forecast associated to the GSD vehicle?
With one of your future considerations being Supply Chain Risk Management, do you plan on taking advantage of the SCRIPTS BPA?
Can you speak to the enterprise training solution offered through SOFWERX?
How will proposals for CUAS Intel Analytics be submitted? Hand carry and/or SIPR?
Is GSA the preferred contract vehicle for PEO Services? What other contract vehicles, especially for smalls are considered?
What are SOF AT&L's thoughts/interests around the concept of classified space-as-a-service to accommodate back-to-work mandates?
Teaming increases costs for primes, understanding the need for a refined pool of vendors, do you predict the TOs generally being LTPA?
Who is the small business liaison?
Thank you for this session. Approximately how many holders do you think will be on GSD?
When will the opportunity for Exercise support be defined/refined and released for industry feedback?
How many smalls are you looking to onboard for this IDIQ?
Hopeful award date?
Where will these Q&As be posted for reference later?
Can you team within and outside of GSD contract holders?
When are you hoping to award this by?
Understand that it is a draft, but can you please clarify the exclusivity paragraph in section L? Is that hard and fast or could it change
If we only meet some criteria, and have great performance in that area, but not the others, will we still be considered? How should we propose in that
Does the prime have to offer work samples in each pool or any pool- or can the sub work samples be used if that increases the score?
Guardian centers is a large training center and large business. Can we be a vendor? How can guardian centers of Georgia support SOCOM in this
Will we be allowed to turn in up to 5 pieces of past performance per mission area, or 5 pieces of past performance total?
Do you plan to limit awards by the three functional areas or plan to allow all IDIQ awardees to complete across all three areas.
Are you encouraging joint ventures to bid



What will the CMMC / SPRS requirements be at the ID/IQ level?
Will you be updating the scorecard to reflect the three major SOW tasks just mentioned? (Education, Intel, and Exercise Support)
Draft docs indicate 15 contract awards. Is this a placeholder or firm number? If placeholder, can you share a range possibilities? What factors are driving the number of awards?
Will there be restrictions on 8a entities from using past performance from across the 8a's portfolio of entities?
Have you considered releasing this in October verses the anticipated milestones for July?
What is the justification for the prohibition on cross teaming? Will this not drastically limit the customer's access to small businesses with unique and critical capabilities but without SOF past performance?
Draft sol states No over/unders. Can govt explain reasoning? Will government require teams to be exclusive and require govt approval to add subs after award?
Do you intend on requiring a certain amount of work share for subcontractors to be able to submit work samples?
Is there a limit to number of teammates on a team?
Do the prime and/or subs need to have the capability to store classified materials, such as the appropriate safe or a DD254 that authorizes secret storage?
What, if any, CMMC requirements do you anticipate will be required for award?
How many current primes are on SOF Core Support? Can you share who those primes are?
Will large businesses be allowed to team non exclusive with numerous SB primes?
Can you elaborate on the cross-teaming for subKs, is it prohibited
Will the gov consider awarding more than 15 should there be smalls who score similarly? How do you intend to "tie break" between prospective
In order to have specialized SB vendors, have you considered awarding 15 vendors in each pool rather than 15 to the four pools? That way you can have true specialized companies.
Does the government have a rough timeline for RFP release, QNA and award?
Hello, within the 100% SB set-aside, do you envision ever going deeper for SDVOSB TO?
Is there a minimum standard or requirement to be considered for 1 of the 3 categories? Will all 15 "general" awardees be accepted into the 3
Given the importance of continuity at task level, the low NAICS threshold may drive a high number of size-based off ramps. Will SOCOM entertain higher NAICS threshold? For instance, SEAPORT uses \$47M NAICS for similarly scoped work.
Has SCS/TOS really seen LPTA reliable with quality on deliverable's to the force that KH warrants to use on GSD/TOS
If we are citing an IDIQ as a work sample, but there is no IDIQ level CPAR, do we have to provide every task order CPAR under the IDIQ?
Will the SOFGSD General Pool awards be a Phase 1 then awardees can compete on the Specialty Pools as Phase 2 or are the Task Orders aligned to specific Specialty Pools?
Per Attachment 7, H.1.(c), Cross-teaming, does government intend to prevent subcontractors from teaming on multiple teams?
If we compliment Pete's impressive height in our response, does that improve our chance of receiving an award?
Will current SOF Core TOs be extended if there isn't a SOF GSD award at the expiration of that TO?
Will TOs continue to be awarded on SCS once GSD is awarded? Or once GSD is awarded, will all subsequent TOs be competed on GSD? ...or will SCS be used until PoP or ceiling is maxed out?
Can you get a spot on the general and then only 1 pool?
In the exercise pool, what is the purpose of having 2 very generic LCATs and then an incredibly niche LCAT of SERE/PR?

When do you expect the final RFP to release?
For LCATs to be counted in the HRT0 matrix, must they be FTE, part time, TDY, etc.?
Some difference between the L&M and the scoresheet, please clarify if PPQS will be an option for contracts that don't do CPARs for relevant work? If PPQs are allowed will you be providing a template?
Do you anticipate a Prime having to select a specialty pool or being confined to a single pool? Can a prime bid on TOs across multiple pools?
Due to the high volume of feedback that will come from the current draft do you anticipate releasing another draft scoring matrix before releasing the final RFP?
Will there be a requirement for how many work samples must come from the prime and how many from the subcontractor(s)? If so how do anticipate that will be broken out?
Will there be anything in place for SBs who are not a part of a JV to be assessed fairly? What (if anything) will be used to prevent this idiq be awarded solely to SBs who are in a JV
How long will the pop be?
To clarify the previous answer, you plan to prohibit anyone from bidding as both a prime and sub. However companies that are exclusively subs on teams can be on as many teams as desired. Accurate?
Section L part describing cross teaming currently seems to limit subcontractors to one team for the bid. Is that the intention or can subcontractors join multiple teams for the bid? If so, can their work samples be used on multiple bids?
Will this be awarded in FY2025?
What happens if you have 30 primes that max out the scoring? Will there be other evaluation criteria to further down select?
Will you consider oral boards as part of the solicitation?
If we are citing an IDIQ as a work sample, but there is no IDIQ level CPAR, do we have to provide every task order CPAR under the IDIQ?
Will SOCOM provide opportunities for "match making" for teaming opportunities so that small businesses can plug in with potential primes? (Much like what SOFWERX often does so that small entities that are highly qualified can be "found")
Will experience offered by a sub on our team be evaluated the same as experience offered by the prime bidder?
Will current SOF Core TOs be extended if there isn't a SOF GSD award at the expiration of that TO?
CPARS is an evaluation criteria on the self-score matrix. How will the USG consider contracts for which the Government has not provided CPARS, and/or classified programs that do not provide CPARS?
Would you consider oral proposals to expedite the selection process?
Does the JV mentee need an FCL or can they use the mentors?
Will cmmc level 2 be a requirement?
Will all task orders be competed or will the contract have the ability to award sole source task orders to holders?
The RFP reads as though a subcontractor can not be on multiple teams. You just stated that a sub that is not a prime can be on multiple teams. Please clarify the intent for subs.
Will this be awarded in FY2025?
Do you have concerns this strategy may favor the super 8(a) companies because they have the ability to reach across an enterprise of their subsidiary companies and have projects evaluated as Tier 1 projects?
What is the incentive for a small team to excel beyond expectations in they're if they don't meet the requirements to get approval?

Any advice on the number of companies that make up one team? For example, does a 3-company team that meets requirements look more or less appealing to a 10-company team that highly exceeds requirements.
Can we use something other than a classified SOW to substantiate a classified work sample?
Are CCMC Lv2 and \$1M LOC still requirements for this award?
Does Prime have to have TS FCL, or can reqt be met by a subcontractor?
Will CMMC Level 2 be a requirement for Prime and Subcontractors?
Will current SOF Core TOs be extended if there isn't a SOF GSD award at the expiration of that TO?
Do all companies/entities have to have TS FCL? Or just one member?
Will you consider USSOCOM past performance (prime or sub) as a higher point value in past performance?
Does the Prime have to have the secret safeguard holding?
Are you considering the add of business certs (ISO, CMMI etc) to the scoring criteria as the prime?
If 15 or less are awarded and Small Business certification is done every year, how often does SOCOM plan on off ramping and on ramping?
If we as a prime don't have work samples to cover the total PWS, will we be allowed to use subcontractor work samples to fulfill those requirements, representing total team capabilities?
Based on your answer, work samples can be from both the prime and subs, correct?
If a JV Primes, does JV have to have TS FCL? Or can reqt be met by only one of the JV members?
Understand IDIQ is small business set aside. Do you anticipate any task orders being further set aside for specific socio economic categories.
Is Government considering a NAICS other than 541519 allowing larger smalls the opportunity to compete (i.e. 541330 with exception pulling)?
Are offerors limited to only 5 worksamples across all pools or can each specialty pool have separate work samples?
Does an award on the SOF GSD IDIQ OCI a company from bidding on the upcoming SOF SEPS opportunity?
Particularly for intelligence community work, some contract offices don't use CPARs but will support PPQs. This can be for very large work. Will you use award fee write ups?
As a prime, we are submitting past performance (PP) and qualifications based on the General Pool. However, are we also submitting subcontractor PP and will our prime and subcontractor PP be what drives L&M for the Speciality Pools?
What should an offeror provide if a WS is referencing new work where a CPAR has not yet been completed.
Regarding the GSD procurement, is it feasible to believe that classified space as-a-service could be considered for inclusion within the scope of future work/task orders?
When are you hoping to release the final RFP?
If not PPQs, would the government consider another alternative for a federal contract example without CPARs? We are a sub to a prime on one of our strong PP contracts and we don't get access to the CPARs.
More of a comment, but some high performing programs awarded as Cost Plus awards and intelligence community programs don't provide CPARS thus restricting viable past performance narratives. PPQs are really the only way to capture that PP.
The government requiring the small business to only leverage prime contracts for various parts of the score sheet seems to favor JVs when you don't require the SB of the JV to use theirs over their large partner. Are you favoring JVs?
For Tier 2 work samples, it is highly unlikely that we will have CPARS, so if you don't use PPQ's, how will that work sample be scored in the CPARS

How much do you think the line of credit requirement will go up if it's more than \$1M. This is critical to know sooner rather than later as it will determine if many Small Businesses can prime.
When will the date for industry day be announced?
Given the importance of continuity at task level, the low NAICS threshold may drive a high number of size-based off ramps. Will SOCOM entertain higher NAICS threshold? For instance, SEAPORT uses \$47M NAICS for similarly scoped work.
In the event of a JV, will work samples from the JV be required, or can both companies involved submit their own work samples?
If we use an IDIQ as a work sample with multiple task orders, and there is no IDIQ level CPAR, do we need to individually submit each task order's CPAR?
If a Prime company is small when proposals are due, but not small at award (if really 6 months this time crosses the FY) is the proposal considered or is the Prime disqualified?
That right there is our first black octopus question
Difference between 800k and 1M LoC is hard. Banks can't offer over 1M in LoC to companies in the NAICS due to revenue requirements. Will the gov consider a combo of LoC, factoring, cash on hand? A TO can trigger LoC Increases
Will the tier 1 sample from a JV have to come from the SB/protégé? If not, aren't you allowing large businesses to compete directly against SB?
Will SOCOM provide opportunities for "match making" for teaming opportunities so that small businesses can plug in with potential primes? (Much like what SOFWERX often does so that small entities that are highly qualified can be "found")
If it's a mentor protegee JV do both teams still have to have an FCL?
Will CTAs be allowed, and will the awards be based on FAR or GSA?
Will SOCOM provide opportunities for "match making" for teaming opportunities so that small businesses can plug in with potential primes? (Much like what SOFWERX often does so that small entities that are highly qualified can be "found")
pls confirm that the 5 x WS that are submitted by the prime are only being used on the General Tab for idiq evaluation. If not, pls explain how they are being applied
For the 5 work samples, is there a minimum requirement for the prime to submit at least 1, 2, or 3 work samples or can a prime use all subK samples?
Affiliate past performance was not specifically addressed in the draft docs - will Affiliate past performance be allowed?
For JVs, if both partners have a TS FCL but only one partner has secret safeguarding, will that comply with the RFP requirements for secret safeguarding?
Will a DCAA-compliant accounting system be required for award?
About contract award being SB and then task orders being possible setaside as a socio-economic, could create an issue. Theoretically, SB could win general contract and then never have a task to bid if all tasks are socio-economic setasides.
Do you anticipate being cmmc level 2 will be a requirement?
Large emphasis on LREC for training pool. Can you please explain the rationale for this. How does a potential prime score well in this pool if they are not the incumbent LREC provider?
Will you consider oral boards as part of the solicitation?
Can the same subcontractor experience/work sample be used on multiple proposal submissions?
Will there be anything in place for SBs who are not a part of a JV to be assessed fairly? What (if anything) will be used to prevent this idiq be awarded solely to SBs who are in a JV
Will the government allow for a mechanism to add/subtract teammates over the life of the contract? Good hygiene to provide new capabilities.
Industry Day?

If looking at 2 Proposals that are similar in capabilities, same self-scores - will the government have a preference between selecting a large team of smalls, or a small team that brings large teammates
If 15 or less are awarded and Small Business certification is done every year, how often does SOCOM plan on off ramping and on ramping?
Since there will be a limited number of prime awards, will there be an off- ramp and on-ramp to ensure active prime participation?
Will there be socio economic category subcontracting requirements for awardees?
Just to understand, TOs will be completed either in the General Pool OR via one of the three specialty pools.
Will the same subcontractor work sample be allowed on multiple prime bids?
Are you using AI to evaluate submissions so that you can have a larger pool of prime contractors. Over 5 years - those smalls could size up - so a larger pool could benefit SOF more.