



**U.S. General Services Administration  
Alliant 3 - Sources Sought Government Response  
(Release 1)**

The Alliant 3 program has reviewed the questions and comments submitted by industry regarding Request for Information (RFI) # 1, Sources Sought, 47QTCK22N001, publicized on SAM.gov. First and foremost, thank you for providing your valuable feedback. Through this RFI process, the public provided a substantial volume of comments, questions, recommendations, and the identification of administrative errors. Subsequently, there were many duplicate questions provided in this process, and for the sake of efficiency, GSA has consolidated the duplicate questions to provide a concise response to the public. Regarding the comments that involve recommendations, administrative corrections, and the inclusion of corresponding documents and forms, GSA plans to issue a comprehensive Draft RFP in Q1, FY24. Due to the variety and differing levels of complexity of questions received, GSA will be releasing responses in phases. The questions and responses associated with this response have been reviewed and verified. Other questions requiring additional time in order to provide a complete response will be answered in a future publication.

We thank you, once again, for your participation in the RFI process. We look forward to continuing our engagement with the public on the development and solicitation of the Alliant 3 GWAC. If you haven't already, please join the [Alliant 3 Community of Interest GSA Interact Site](https://buy.gsa.gov/interact/community/193/activity-feed) for the latest updates and public notices.

<https://buy.gsa.gov/interact/community/193/activity-feed>

---

**Q1:** Will the Government provide rationale for the Pool of 60 contractors?

**A1:** GSA has a rational basis for awarding 60 contracts on Alliant 3 based on, amongst multiple other data points (such as customer input and extensive market research), a historical analysis of both the Alliant 2 and Alliant 1 contracts, which shows the top 60 highest rated offers provide the most reasonable expectation of adequate competition based on the anticipated task orders (TO) per year.

---

**Q2:** We understand that GSA is awarding an Alliant 3 contract to the 60 highest technically rated offers, as opposed to a basic minimum award score cutoff. What was the lowest score on Alliant 2 to receive an award?

**A2:** Alliant 2 had a maximum available score of 83,100 points. The lowest score that resulted in an Alliant 2 award was 73,600 points (88.6 percentile).

---

**Q3:** What is the significance of the Government allowing three (3) separate projects under each emerging technology area to be scored as experience under the self-scoring worksheet?

**A3:** The number of emerging technology projects directly reflects the Government's desire to have a contractor pool of highly-qualified offerors with the breadth and depth of experience in completing a variety of emerging technology projects.

---

**Q4:** What is considered a foreign location?

**A4:** We are working on an updated draft RFP, where under section L.5.2.2.6 Location, a Foreign Location is defined as any country or nation outside of the United States of America (USA). The USA includes Contiguous United States (CONUS) locations, the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia, plus the overseas states (Alaska and Hawaii), and all Territories and Possessions of the USA, (e.g., Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands).

---

**Q5:** What is the Government's definition of a Federal Government Customer?

**A5:** "Federal agency" means any department, independent establishment, Government corporation, or other agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government, including the United States Postal Service, but shall not include the American National Red Cross. (Source: 42 U.S. Code § 5122)

---

**Q6:** Can CPARS be used to demonstrate Relevant Experience under L.5.2? (Master / TO level)

**A6:** No, CPARS demonstrates a contractor's Past Performance, but does not provide sufficient information about the offeror's Relevant Experience from the project. CPARS does not provide sufficient information about the work on the project in order for the Technical Evaluation Team to qualify the Relevant Experience from the project. (See L.5.2.2. et. seq. for acceptable verification of Relevant Experience.)

---

**Q7:** What is the primary NAICS code for the Alliant 3 master contract solicitation?

**A7:** The Government has designated North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code 541512, Computer Systems Design Service, for Alliant 3 contract award.

---

**Q8:** Does the NAICS code for projects have to cover all NAICS codes allowed to be considered responsive?

**A8:** Offerors do not have to submit a project under each primary and/or secondary NAICS code to be responsive. The projects submitted for experience under the NAICS code can all be under one NAICS code or a combination of the Primary and/or Secondary NAICS codes.

---

**Q9:** Can the Government reduce the contract value thresholds for experience?

**A9:** After thoughtful consideration, we have reduced the values as requested, and the following changes will be made to Section M.6, Alliant 3 Scoring Table, Section L.5.2.2.2, Project Size & Complexity.

L.5.2.2.2	Project Size & Complexity	Point Value	Max. Number of Potential Occurrences	Total Max Points (Per Element)	Max Point Value
	Project with a value equal to or greater than \$7.5 Million (But less than \$35 Million)	500	7	3,500	10,500
	Project with a value equal to or greater than \$35 Million (But less than \$100 Million)	1,000	7	7,000	
	Project value equal to or greater than \$100 Million	1,500	7	10,500	

This update will be included in the next draft RFP, which we anticipate will be released in Q1 FY24.

---

**Q10:** Will the Government allow relevant experience projects under NAICS codes not listed?

**A10:** NAICS Group Relevant Experience may be claimed for projects completed under the primary NAICS code 541512, or the additional NAICS codes listed under section L.5.2.2 NAICS Group Relevant Experience, 518210, 541511, 541513 and 541519. Additionally, offerors must satisfy all verification requirements under L.5.2.2.1.1 Verification of Primary Relevant Experience Submission (Federal Government Contracts). Section L.5.2.2.1.1 lists the verification requirements for Federal Government Contracts, including those with a different NAICS code assigned in FPDS.

---

**Q11:** What is the timeframe allowed for a project to be considered relevant?

**A11:** The five years of relevant experience is based on the solicitation release date.

---

**Q12:** What qualifies as an Emerging Technology (ET) Project? (Quantum Computing/ duration of project/subcontracts)

**A12:** ET will be listed in Section L.5.2.3.1 of the next draft RFP.

---

**Q13:** Can a project be used more than once within ET?

**A13:** No, an ET project cannot be used more than once. Further clarification is being added to the draft RFP in regard to task orders combined under the criteria in L.5.2.1, for use in section L.5.2.2, as a single project for a Primary Relevant Experience Project. If projects are combined for use in section L.5.2.2, as a single project for a Primary Relevant Experience Project, the combined tasks may NOT be submitted individually under section L.5.2.3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience and may only be used as a single project in L.5.2.3. Once combined for use under L.5.2.2 they must stay combined under L.5.2.3.

---

**Q14:** Will the Government accept ET not listed?

**A14:** No, the Government will not consider other ETs that are not listed.

---

**Q15:** Will GSA be providing a Meaningful Relationships Commitment Letter Template?

**A15:** Yes, a template will be provided.

---

**Q16:** Is the Government going to provide open seasons in order to allow industry the opportunity to receive a contract award during the Master Contract period of performance? If so, how often will they be offered?

**A16:** Open seasons will be made available in contract year three and contract year six of Alliant 3.

---

**Q17:** Will there be any set-asides for Mid-tier, Small Business and/or Socioeconomic Categories on Alliant 3?

**A17:** No, a set-aside will not be utilized. Alliant 3 will be solicited as an unrestricted GWAC using Full and Open Competition. All eligible businesses may participate in the solicitation. The top 60 scorers, regardless of size, will be awarded a contract. Please see section L.2.2, FAR 52.216-27 Single or Multiple Awards (OCT 1995).

---

**Q18:** Is there going to be an industry day/pre-proposal conference?

**A18:** Yes, the date is yet to be determined.

---

**Q19:** Does a Joint Venture, IDIQ award win count as relevant experience?

**A19:** No, the award of an IDIQ does not constitute relevant experience, but task orders performed under an IDIQ might contain relevant experience. Please see section L.5.2.1.

---

**Q20:** Will there be an Alliant 3 Small Business GWAC?

**A20:** Alliant 3 is an unrestricted offering and is part of a larger portfolio of GWACs that address socioeconomic programs per the FAR.

---

**Q21:** Please confirm that projects put forth as past performance examples in Volume 3 should be the same as the relevant experience projects in Volume 2?

**A21:** Past performance evidence must be for the same primary relevant experience projects the offer includes for scoring credit.

---

**Q22:** Regarding the Small Business Subcontracting plan, will the government explain further the statement "Offeror must adapt the model to fit their situation"?

**A22:** The Individual Subcontracting Plan model template reflects objectives GSA encourages contractors to adopt, and is offered as a tool that contractors may choose to use when preparing their Individual subcontracting plans. The template is not a fill-in-the-blank form, and does not replace or remove compliance with the requirements listed in FAR clause 52.219-9 and FAR Section 19.704's Subcontracting Plan requirements.

---

**Q23:** Within ATTACHMENT J-5.B, how will the Government determine an OTSB (Contractor) has completed a "good faith effort" to comply with their required subcontracting plan?

**A23:** FAR Subsection 19.705-7, Compliance with the subcontracting plan, provides guidance on how a good faith effort is determined.

---

**Q24:** This Section states that "The Contractor shall abide by all contract cybersecurity requirements located in Sections H.6, H.7, Attachment J-4, and related federal policy, and other contract security requirements in Sections H.8 and H.9." For example, the CMMC 2.0 Framework is not yet finalized and apparently is currently intended only for task orders where DoD is the end customer. There is also the inclusion of CMMC Accreditation Body, which is the entity that conducts accreditation of assessor organizations that conduct inspections on contractors. This would only appear to apply to a contractor that was issued an order for performing as a CMMC assessor organization. Given the broad nature of the Sections H.6, H.7, Attachment J-4, and related federal policy, and other contract security requirements, we recommend that Section C.6 state that these apply as included at the task order level.

**A24:** Changes will be reflected in the next Draft RFP release. The requirement will be included at the task order level, when applicable.

---

**Q25:** Please confirm that the Quality Control Plan will be due after award and not with the proposal.

**A25:** This is confirmed.

---

**Q26:** For an individual company offering as itself, please confirm that the points for Organizational Risk Assessment will be earned with no action required from the Offeror on this element.

**A26:** Offerors identifying as "self" under section L.5.6.1, Organizational Risk Assessment, should select "yes" to gain 7,500 points for projects previously performed by the offering entity, if applicable. No additional verification is required under this section for an offering entity claiming its own previous performance.

---

**Q27: Small Business Engagement, Section L.5.2.3.3.** Can the Government confirm that an OTSB submitting a proposal claiming a Small Business Engagement need not have previously worked in a Prime / Sub business arrangement with that small business in order to earn the 1,000 points for Engaging Small Business with Emerging Technology Experience?

**A27:** The Government confirms that previous history as a Prime/Sub arrangement is not required for L.5.2.3.3 Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement, and will not affect the 1,000 points for Engaging Small Business with Emerging Technology Experience.

---

**Q28:** Would the Government consider accepting Past Performance Questionnaires submitted for Task Orders (TO) even if they have Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) ratings available as additional information? (868)

**A28:** When a past performance report is not available in CPARS for an offeror's project (government, commercial, prime, subcontract, ongoing, etc.), Past Performance Ratings may be submitted on the Attachment J.P.4. Past Performance Rating Form. The Past Performance Rating Form submissions will be submitted and evaluated according to M.6, Section L.5.3, Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects.

---

(End)