

# Reverse Industry Day Events Questions With Answers from the SEWP PMO

East Coast Reverse Industry Day 11/15/22

Questions	Answers
<b>Q1.</b> Will the proposal/evaluation be based on "points" on a scoresheet (such as recent solicitations for CIO-SP4 and GSA POLARIS)?	<b>A1.</b> The Government is still considering the format of evaluations. Any thoughts / insights for the Government to consider as to best practices from Industry's point of view is appreciated.
<b>Q2.</b> Any plans of ISO certification requirements?	<b>A2.</b> The Government is still considering requirements. Any thoughts / insights for the Government to consider as to ISO or other standards from Industry's point of view that provide affirmation of quality business processes is appreciated.
<b>Q3.</b> Will CMMI (or CMMC) certification be required?	<b>A3.</b> The Government has not yet determined the requirements. Any thoughts / insights for the Government to consider regarding CMMC or other certifications from Industry's point of view is appreciated.
<b>Q4.</b> Will multiple ISO certifications be required? -	<b>A4.</b> –See the response to Question 2.
<b>Q5.</b> Will there be "minimum mandatory" CLINs that need to be updated annually as with SEWP V? These become challenging to maintain as technologies evolve.	<b>A5.</b> The Government has not yet determined the requirements, but will take into consideration the challenges of maintaining “minimum mandatory” CLINS as technology evolves.
<b>Q6.</b> Will TR submissions continue to be .txt file based?	<b>A6.</b> The use of .txt file base interchange format has proven effective, efficient and flexible; however the Program Office is open for considering other methodologies.
<b>Q7.</b> Will economic set-asides include Minority-Owned Small Business?	<b>A7.</b> Industry insight on this matter is welcomed, as the SEWP PMO is interested in maximizing opportunities for small businesses.
<b>Q8.</b> Create a manufacturer view of the RFP portal so industry can track RFP's for their technology and trends. Currently the only method of viewing information is for contract holders.	<b>A8.</b> Thank you for the suggestion, The Government will take into consideration the addition of a manufacturer view within the SEWP tool.
<b>Q9.</b> Create manufacturer pages where the manufacturer, not the contract holder, can post the most current terms applicable to its technology so there is no confusion created by the use of outdated terms and conditions.	<b>A9.</b> See the response to Question 8.

<p><b>Q10.</b> As noted, there will be an overview of the current intended changes and major points of emphasis for SEWP VI. Will this information be made available at the end of this event? Will this event be made available via the web for those that can't attend in person? If not, can other parties record this? Will the "East Coast NASA SEWP VI Reverse Industry Day" be available on-line as a virtual event or is this an in person event only?</p>	<p><b>A10.</b> NASA will post a summary of all Industry questions and comments along with the Government response on the SEWP VI website after the reverse industry day event. Questions and suggestions can be submitted on a rolling basis through February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2023, with all responses published by NLT March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2023. In terms of attendance, this is an in-person event only.</p>
<p><b>Q11.</b> Will the current Contract Only Holder Page (CHOP) be repurposed for SEWP 6 or will an entirely new interface be created?</p>	<p><b>A11.</b> Considerations are still being made in regard to the post-award tool implementation.</p>
<p><b>Q12.</b> Will SEWP VI have a process for accommodating "participating dealers" as GSA MAS?</p>	<p><b>A12.</b> NASA SEWP has always allowed businesses to find appropriate means to work together for the benefit of both the Government and Industry. The SEWP PMO for SEWP VI will take into consideration GSA MAS process for accommodating "Participating dealers."</p>
<p><b>Q13.</b> Is there a deadline for submitting questions and suggestions?</p>	<p><b>A13.</b> The opportunity for Industry to provide comments and insight through the SEWP VI website will remain open on a rolling basis through February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2023. There will also be another opportunity for Industry input after the draft RFP is released in 2023. The Government will post all questions and the Government responses as related to the Reverse Industry day on a regular basis throughout the process but by NLT March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2023.</p>
<p><b>Q14.</b> Will the scope of SEWP VI be expanded to include cloud services architecture, design, and implementation, and enterprise migration to the Cloud?</p>	<p><b>A14.</b> Cloud Services, architecture, design, implementation, and enterprise migration to the Cloud are currently available on SEWP V and will continue to be provided within scope for SEWP VI.</p>
<p><b>Q15.</b> SEWP has consistently provided an efficient means of procuring IT solutions. Services have expanded in small amounts within this same, methodical approach. I think SEWP would add value for the government and cost savings to look at expanding professional services.</p>	<p><b>A15.</b> The SEWP PMO is taking into consideration expanding the scope to include Information Technology professional services and welcomes any thoughts/insights pertaining to which Information Technology professional services should be considered.</p>
<p><b>Q16.</b> Can you add ability to send shipping updates via API or TR format so it can be updated via automation more often for SEWP users? This will reduce administrative burden to contract holders and increase communication to the SEWP end users.</p>	<p><b>A16.</b> Thank you for the suggestion, we will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q17.</b> Can SEWP add the official government solicitation numbers to the RFQ? This will provide great information for contract holders to tighten their pricing up or other helpful information by using usaspending.gov?</p>	<p><b>A17.</b> Thank you for the suggestion, we will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q18.</b> Please improve the process for 254 forms.</p>	<p><b>A18.</b> The process for forms such as the DD 254 forms are dictated by the Ordering agency, not by the NASA SEWP Program Office.</p>
<p><b>Q19.</b> Are there response expectations for responding to RFQs to supply a bid or no bid? Are contract holders rated or penalized if they do not respond to RFQs?</p>	<p><b>A19.</b> The SEWP PMO is still making a determination as the Government wants to ensure that all contract holders are active participants.</p>

<b>Q20.</b> Does SEWP plan to allow companies to hold multiple contracts for SEWP VI?	<b>A20.</b> The SEWP PMO is still making a determination and exploring how to handle companies with multiple contracts.
<b>Q21.</b> Will you consider a CMMI required level?	<b>A21.</b> SEWP VI requirements are still being evaluated and welcomes the industry's feedback on this subject.
<b>Q22.</b> Will you be requiring a response bid rate on the GWAC?	<b>A22.</b> Please refer to the answer provided in Question 19.
<b>Q23.</b> What are your goals for increasing Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) participation?	<b>A23.</b> The government is still exploring ways to increase SDB participation and welcomes feedback from industry on the subject.
<b>Q24.</b> Currently the Government uses OTAs for research and development. Would SEWP VI consider an R&D Group to help the government find innovating products?	<b>A24.</b> The SEWP PMO currently has no plans for an R&D group.
<b>Q25.</b> Will there be non-product related services allowed? SEWP V currently has only product related offerings.	<b>A25.</b> See the response provided to Question 15.
<b>Q26.</b> Will this procurement move to a scorecard base similar to a CIOSP4 or Polaris?	<b>A26.</b> Please refer to the answer to question 1.
<b>Q27.</b> Will SEWP also have an on-Ramp process that is disclosed as part of DRFP and/or Final RFP?	<b>A27.</b> Considerations are still being made in regard to the on-ramp and off-ramp process.
<b>Q28.</b> Will there be on-ramping after award?	<b>A28.</b> Please refer to question 27.
<b>Q29.</b> Will the SEWP PMO handle/evaluate novations differently in SEWP VI?	<b>A29.</b> Novations will continue to be handled as dictated by the FAR procedures and the term and conditions of the SEWP contract.
<b>Q30.</b> If there is an off-ramp will SEWP VI offer an on ramp option?	<b>A30.</b> Please refer to question 27.
<b>Q31.</b> How can the NASA SEWP PMO and CO make decisions that deviate from whatever the CMMC mandates may be? Seems that industry input re: CMMC may be moot if DoD issues final and definitive CMMC requirements.	<b>A31.</b> The SEWP PMO anticipates the requirement for CMMC being dictated by the Ordering agency at the delivery/task order level.
<b>Q32.</b> Does the SEWP office have a mitigation plan to avoid the protests that delayed awards of recent major vehicles like 2GIT and FirstSource III?	<b>A32.</b> All protests are not avoidable, however, there is a mitigation plan in place to prevent there being a stopgap in contract coverage.
<b>Q33.</b> If protests do delay a May 2025 award, will SEWP V awards be extended to prevent a gap in contract coverage?	<b>A33.</b> Please see question 32.
<b>Q34.</b> Will SEWP consider an Electronic submission of the SEWP VI proposal response documentation in place of a full printed and bound copies?	<b>A34.</b> Yes, the SEWP PMO will consider accepting electronic proposal responses.
<b>Q35.</b> For current contract holders will the program performance of SEWP V affect the SEWP VI award? How many companies will be awarded (Small, Large, Set-asides)?	<b>A35.</b> The evaluation criteria for SEWP VI proposals has not been determined yet.
<b>Q36.</b> What does adding services cover? Does this mean pure labor services like software development?	<b>A36.</b> SEWP has always looked to expand its offering with every iteration of the SEWP contract and The SEWP PMO welcomes any thoughts / insights pertaining to which Information Technology services the Government should consider SEWP

<b>Q37.</b> What level of CMMC is / will be required? Many organizations are just getting around to self-certifying at CMMC Level 1 self-assessment focused on FCI. Anything higher would be a barrier.	<b>A37.</b> Please refer to the answer to Question 3.
<b>Q38.</b> Having an API to interface with SEWP for TR, uploading quotes, etc would be ideal in addition to email and portal to upload quotes.	<b>A38.</b> Thank you for the suggestion, we will take that into consideration.
<b>Q39.</b> What is the onboarding process?	<b>A39.</b> We are in the Market Research phase of SEWP VI and that has not been determined yet.
<b>Q40.</b> Are you considering other contract types in addition to firm-fixed price (FFP), such as T&M, Cost Plus, etc.	<b>A40.</b> Yes, SEWP is considering other contract types but we welcome feedback from industry and possible contract types for SEWP VI and we welcome input and feedback from industry on contract types to use.
<b>Q41.</b> What happens to ESI? Does it rollover or will contract holders have to submit new proposals?	<b>A41.</b> Guidance as it relates to ESI will be provided at a later date by DOD and is not directly related to SEWP VI.
<b>Q42.</b> Given the increase in scope to include more product-based services, will NASA consider different pricing evaluation criteria for Mandatory CLINs to be product OR product-based service instead of only product?	<b>A42.</b> NASA is still evaluating the requirements for evaluating pricing and the requirement for Mandatory CLINs. We welcome additional feedback from the industry on those requirements.
<b>Q43.</b> With the vehicle moving more and more towards services, would you recommend companies that do not provide a specific product, but provides many services still go after the work this go around?	<b>A43.</b> Each company who chooses to submit a proposal for the SEWP VI contracts should evaluate if they will be able to meet the full breadth and depth of the required offerings on SEWP as defined in the SEWP VI RFP when the draft and final RFP are published.
<b>Q44.b</b> Would you consider adding services NAICS (e.g., 541330, 541611) to support business process design/improvement and change management for more effective implementation and lifecycle cost reduction?	<b>A44.</b> The government is considering additional NAICs codes for SEWP VI and we welcome feedback from industry on which NAICs codes to use.
<b>Q45.</b> Will ISO and/or CMMC be a mandatory requirement?	<b>A45.</b> Please refer to the answer question 3.
<b>Q46.</b> What ISO certification(s) are you considering?	<b>A46.</b> Please refer to the answer to question 3.
<b>Q47.</b> What CMMC level?	<b>A47.</b> Please refer to the answer to Question 3.
<b>Q48.</b> What percent of government agencies use NASA SEWP today?	<b>A48.</b> 100% - Every Federal agency utilizes the SEWP Contracts.
<b>Q49.</b> Has SEWP usage by different government agencies increased in the past 5 years?	<b>A49.</b> Yes, SEWP usage has increased by federal government agencies over the past 5 years. (In fact SEWP usage has increased every year since SEWP I in 1993)
<b>Q50.</b> How can my company become a SEWP contract holder?	<b>A50.</b> When the government issues the final requests for proposals, we encourage all capable companies to submit a thorough proposal.
<b>Q51.</b> Will the scope of Services be broadened to allow for professional services?	<b>A51.</b> The SEWP PMO welcomes any thoughts / insights pertaining to which Information Technology professional services the Government should consider SEWP VI.
<b>Q52.</b> Will you allow customers with established Agency Catalogs to add additional option years on their catalogs with PoP date that carry into SEWP VI?	<b>A52.</b> This is not relevant to SEWP VI. The SEWP Program Office works with our customers on current SEWP V issues such as the utilization of Agency Catalogs.

<b>Q53.</b> Have you done outreach to program personnel? I left government in August at the Director level and was always directed away from SEWP and told it was only for products.	<b>A53.</b> The SEWP PMO continuously provides outreach to all government agencies through trainings, trades shows and other forms of outreach.
<b>Q54.</b> Can you provide a breakdown of product vs services? You indicated that SEWP is product based with services applying to the products (breadth of potential scope definition to be inclusive).	<b>A54.</b> At this time, we cannot provide a breakdown of products vs services. The government has yet to determine the potential full scope of SEWP VI.
<b>Q55.</b> Are services (ie labor services) able to be ordered separately? For instance, if Cloud is already utilized, could professional services be a separate task.	<b>A55.</b> In scope services can be ordered separately and do not need to be part of the same delivery order as the cloud solution or product the service will support.
<b>Q56.</b> Meaningful telecom acquisition, with few exceptions, are the province of GSA EIS. notwithstanding, agencies do purchase business Internet and Ethernet circuits on a one-off basis, often using Government Purchase Cards and provider's commercial paper. What are the possibilities for the allowance of Internet and individual Ethernet circuits being offered on SEWP VI?	<b>A56.</b> These are fully in scope for SEWP V.
<b>Q57.</b> How will SEWP VI address/handle CMMC?	<b>A57.</b> Please refer to the answer to question 3.
<b>Q58.</b> Is there a plan to include more professional services? SEWP is a widely used contract with great potential that many agencies could benefit from.	<b>A58.</b> . The SEWP PMO welcomes any thoughts / insights pertaining to which Information Technology professional services the Government should consider SEWP VI.
<b>Q59.</b> Can you include development/software development, cloud, etc. type of work be in the sewp vi scope?	<b>A58.</b> Cloud is within in the scope of the current SEWP V contracts. The government has not made the final determination on the scope of the SEWP VI contracts however; the government welcomes feedback from industry on the potential expansion in scope.
<b>Q60.</b> How will SEWP VI be more oriented toward providing as a Service offerings (managed services)?	<b>A60.</b> The government has not made the final determination on the scope of the SEPW VI contracts however; the government welcomes feedback from industry on the potential expansion in scope.
<b>Q61.</b> For small business goals on unrestricted awards, will NASA please use "percentage of total contract value" instead of "percentage of subcontracted dollars"? This makes a huge difference to small business subs on unrestricted awards.	<b>A61.</b> Thank you for the suggestion, we will take this into consideration.
<b>Q62.</b> Will NASA consider adding a separate Group for OEM's or for full and open competition to address personal end-user IT Equipment such as computers, printers, conference room equipment, and accessories?	<b>A62.</b> If the question is referring to allowing for non-Governmental (personal) purchases off of the SEWP contracts, this is not permitted.
<b>Q63.</b> Will mandatory deliverables still be required for SEWP VI?	<b>A63.</b> The government has not made any decisions on mandatory deliverables but we welcome feedback from industry on this matter.
<b>Q64.</b> Does NASA anticipate the mandatory deliverables to change in scope?	<b>A64.</b> Please refer to the answer to question 63.
<b>Q65.</b> Will NASA consider reducing the number of mandatory deliverables?	<b>A65.</b> Please refer to the answer to question 63.

<b>Q66.</b> As noted, there will be an overview of the current intended changes and major points of emphasis for SEWP VI. Will this information be made available at the end of this event? Will this event be made available via the web for those that can't attend in person? If not, can other parties record this?	<b>A66.</b> The details of SEWP VI will be provided once they are finalized and published in the Draft RFP. We are not allowing recording but the presentation and questions, once answered, will be made available to all interested parties.
<b>Q67.</b> Will the scope of SEWP VI be expanded to include cloud services architecture, design, and implementation, and enterprise migration to the Cloud?	<b>A67.</b> Cloud services architecture, design and implementation and enterprise migration to the cloud currently fall within SEWP's scope.
<b>Q68.</b> Will the current CHOP be repurposed for SEWP 6 or will an entirely new interface be created?	<b>A68.</b> The government has not yet made the determination as to what the web interface will look like for SEWP VI.
<b>Q69.</b> Will SEWP VI have a process for accommodating "participating dealers" like GSA MAS does?	<b>A69.</b> At this time there are no plans to for a process to accommodate participating dealers.
<b>Q70.</b> Is there a deadline for submitting questions and suggestions?	<b>A70.</b> Questions can be submitted up until February 28, 2023. There will be a further opportunity to submit questions when the Draft RFP is published.
<b>Q71.</b> Will this event include Virtual attendance?	<b>A71.</b> There are no plans to allow for virtual attendance.
<b>Q72.</b> Will the "East Coast NASA SEWP VI Reverse Industry Day" be available on-line or is this an in person event only?	<b>A72.</b> This was an in person only event but the presentation and questions and answers will be made available to all interested parties.
<b>Q73.</b> Any plans of ISO certification requirements?	<b>A73.</b> Please refer to the answer to question 3.
<b>Q74.</b> Please consider only making public catalog level pricing versus pricing that may have been added to contract for a specific opportunity. It creates confusion at the customer level seeing the same item listed multiple times at different prices.	<b>A74.</b> Thank you for the suggestion, the government will take that into consideration.
<b>Q75.</b> Requirements for small businesses to have ISO 9001; 2000-1; and 27001. Service providers should have CMMI Level III-Services.	<b>A75.</b> Thank you for the suggestion, the government will take that into consideration.
<b>Q76.</b> Very supportive of creating a category for services providers. Our respective clients are continuing to buy solutions - software AND services bundled - and we anticipate that trend to increase significantly. SEWP VI represents the ideal contracting option for agencies to streamline procurements in that manner.	<b>A76.</b> Thank you for the feedback
<b>Q77.</b> Will sli.do site be continuously updated as more questions and suggestions come in?	<b>A77.</b> The government will collect all questions and suggestions posted on sli.do and answer and post them periodically. All questions and answers will be posted by March 31, 2023.
<b>Q78.</b> Require a sales or transaction privilege tax calculation on every bid so at least everyone knows the potential liability being incurred. Most bidders probably have no idea now. This is a danger to SEWP's supply chain.	<b>A78.</b> Thank you for the feedback. The government will take that into consideration.

<p><b>Q79.</b> On GWACs the government typically asks for past performance for contracts of similar sizes and scope of purchase orders that are likely to be issued under the proposed GWAC, but they never specifically ask for past performance on other GWACs. What seems to be important is whether a value added reseller can perform on the GWAC itself, not just a single purchase order or 3 or 5. To maintain a GWAC requires contract administration, reporting, catalog maintenance, in addition to everything needed on every single purchase order. What is important for SEWP VI is whether a contractor performed on SEWP V, not some particular purchase order.</p>	<p><b>A79.</b> Thank you for the feedback. The government will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q80.</b> How many SEWP V RFIs and RFPs annually?</p>	<p><b>A80.</b> There are on average 60,000 actions on SEWP annually. Approximately 35,000 RFIs and RFQs are posted directly through the SEWP portal with thousands more handled via other methods.</p>
<p><b>Q81.</b> Past performance should focus on federal contract vehicle experience, not just sales to government.</p>	<p><b>A81.</b> Thank you for the feedback. The government will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q82.</b> Please do not have the RFP due the day after a holiday or the week of a holiday. Many of the other contracts have been doing that and it's extremely stressful as well as during peak busy season.</p>	<p><b>A82.</b> The government has no plans to have proposals due on days after holidays or during the peak busy season.</p>
<p><b>Q83.</b> Do not use evaluation scoring like GSA. That process focuses too much on higher scoring for business qualifications / barriers (ISO, audited accounting, CMMI, etc.) that do not relate being an active participant on SEWP. Better to off board poor performing contractor than to add too many barriers.</p>	<p><b>A83.</b> Thank you for the feedback. The government will take that into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q84.</b> Eliminate requirement to upload "OEM Letter" with quotes if contractor has authorization status.</p>	<p><b>A84.</b> The SEWP program does not require "OEM letters" however issuing agencies may have different requirements, but we encourage them to use the authorization status currently in the SEWP database.</p>
<p><b>Q85.</b> Part creation process, is there a way to update that process?</p>	<p><b>A85.</b> The current process for creating Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINS) has proven to be efficient and effective for managing the SEWP contracts. The government welcomes feedback on ways to improve that process.</p>
<p><b>Q86.</b> Will you consider removing the proposal "Groups" once the awards are made using the NAICS code to drive the RFQ process?</p>	<p><b>A86.</b> NAICs codes currently take into consideration during the RFQ process because RFQs only be competed against one NAICs code at a time. The government has not made a determination on how to utilize groups and which NAICs codes will be used in SEWP VI and we welcome feedback and input from industry.</p>
<p><b>Q87.</b> Award date of May 1, 2025 does not allow time for protests and may result in gap in service between SEWP V and VI unless the ordering period is extended on SEWP V. Will NASA consider an earlier award date?</p>	<p><b>A87.</b> The government will put together an acquisition plan to ensure there is no gap between the end of the SEWP V contracts on April 30, 2025 and the awarding of the SEWP VI contracts on May 1, 2025.</p>

<p><b>Q88.</b> With SEWP VI please implement a secure API on CHOP to allow contract holders with appropriate credentials to query solicitations, orders, fees, catalogs, providers etc.? Additionally, please implement an API to submit TRs, quotes, Q&amp;A, and provider information? Allowing companies to connect their sales systems directly to the SEWP systems in a secure manner will increase efficiency and allow us to pass savings along to the government.</p>	<p><b>A88.</b> Thank you for the suggestion of an API. The government will take that into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q89.</b> ISO20000 and ISO27000 certifications should be considered if you are going to incorporate more services at the IDIQ level.</p>	<p><b>A89.</b> Thank you for the suggestion on ISO certifications. The government will take that into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q90.</b> A learning portal with easy to understand resources for those new to SEWP. A guided journey with clear steps to take.</p>	<p><b>A90.</b> The SEWP PMO has numerous training videos and training documents available to both government and industry for educational purposes and will continue to expand on what is currently available.</p>
<p><b>Q91.</b> I have worked with several DOD bases that were frustrated because they did not have a CO and the webpage for assistance from DITCO was rejected because they were too busy or DITCO closed taking projects by July. Is there a way to find more options for these departments?</p>	<p><b>A91.</b> <a href="mailto:help@sewp.nasa.gov">Please have the customer contact us a help@sewp.nasa.gov and we will provide them with links to assisted acquisition resources.</a></p>
<p><b>Q92.</b> Please be careful in using a scorecard. Too rigid tends to take all provider value propositions off the table. Partial scorecard is ok but allow industry to provide value not just certs.</p>	<p><b>A92.</b> Thank you for the feedback. The government will take that into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q93.</b> Allow additional services and technology offerings, i.e. drones for communications and connectivity.</p>	<p><b>A93.</b> Thank you for the feedback. The government will take that into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q94.</b> Ensure that the scope is communicated outside or the contract community, knowing that consolidation at some agencies siloes contracts from everyone else.</p>	<p><b>A94.</b> The SEWP PMO is constantly doing outreach to all federal agencies to educate them on the scope of the contract and how their agencies can best leverage the SEWP contracts.</p>
<p><b>Q95.</b> Suggest putting the “Catalog by request” vs. “request by catalog” explanation on the public SEWP website. This will both help educate providers and reduce the discussions contract holders have where providers come begging, “please put me on SEWP”.</p>	<p><b>A95.</b> Thank you for the feedback. The government will take that into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q96.</b> Have a group for system integration.</p>	<p><b>A96.</b> System Integration is in scope currently for SEWP V.</p>
<p><b>Q97.</b> Include app dev/software dev type of work in the scope.</p>	<p><b>A97.</b> Thank you for the feedback the SEWP PMO welcomes any thoughts / insights pertaining to which Information Technology services the Government should consider SEWP VI.</p>
<p><b>Q98.</b> Set subcontracting goals based on “percentage of total task order value” and not on “percentage of subcontracted dollars”.</p>	<p><b>A98.</b> Please see the response provided to Question 61.</p>
<p><b>Q99.</b> Add Professional Services.</p>	<p><b>A99.</b>The SEWP PMO welcomes any thoughts/insights pertaining to which Information Technology professional services the Government should consider SEWP VI.</p>



<p><b>Q100.</b> SEWP has consistently provided an efficient means of procuring IT solutions. Services has expanding in small amounts within this same, methodical approach. I think SEWP would add value for the government and cost savings to look at expanding professional services. Perhaps in a better means than CIO-SP4??</p>	<p><b>A100.</b> The SEWP PMO welcomes any thoughts / insights pertaining to which Information Technology professional services the Government should consider SEWP VI.</p>
<p><b>Q101.</b> Can you add ability to send shipping updates via API or TR format so it can be updated via automation more often for SEWP users? This will reduce administrative burden to contract holders and increase communication to the SEWP end users.</p>	<p><b>A101.</b> The government will take the use of an API into consideration. Thank you for the feedback.</p>
<p><b>Q102.</b> Can SEWP add the official government solicitation numbers to the RFQ? This will provide great information for contract holders to tighten their pricing up or other helpful information by using usaspending.gov?</p>	<p><b>A102.</b> Adding the official solicitation number from the issuing agency to the RFQ is at that agency's discretion.</p>
<p><b>Q103.</b> Will economic set-asides include Minority-Owned Small Business?</p>	<p><b>A103.</b> The government is still reviewing all possible set-aside options for SEWP VI and welcomes feedback/input from industry on this matter.</p>
<p><b>Q104.</b> Please improve the process for 254 forms.</p>	<p><b>A104.</b> The process for forms such as the DD 254 forms are dictated by the issuing agency not by the NASA SEWP Program Office</p>
<p><b>Q105.</b> Create a manufacturer view of the RFP portal so industry can track RFP's for their technology and trends. Currently the only method of viewing information is for contract holders.</p>	<p><b>A105.</b> Thank you for the suggestion. The SEWP PMO will take that into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q106.</b> Create manufacturer pages where the manufacturer, not the contract holder, can post its most current terms applicable to its technology so there is no confusion created by the use of out dated terms and conditions</p>	<p><b>A106.</b> Thank you for the suggestion. The SEWP PMO will take that into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q107.</b> Any plans of ISO certification requirements?</p>	<p><b>A107.</b> The Government is still considering requirements. Any thoughts / insights for the Government to consider as to ISO or other standards from Industry's point of view that provide affirmation of quality business processes is appreciated.</p>
<p><b>Q108.</b> Please consider a CMMI certification of level III and above to guarantee high quality processes at offeror companies.</p>	<p><b>A108.</b> Thank you for the suggestion. The government will take that into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q109.</b> You should consider self-scoring evaluation to set a minimum standard for contract holders and to help streamline your own proposal evaluation and award process.</p>	<p><b>A109.</b> Thank you for the suggestion. The government will take that into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q110.</b> Have the government pay these taxes to relieve the small business of the burden.</p>	<p><b>A110.</b> The US federal government is exempt from most taxes, however will take into consideration any additional fees or taxes the government must pay.</p>
<p><b>Q111.</b> Require government to indicate unfunded RFQ / order will be used.</p>	<p><b>A111.</b> Thank you for the suggestion and the government will take that into consideration.</p>

<p><b>Q112.</b> Require government to indicate credit card / government card purchase for RFQs. Or allow two prices to be uploaded (CC and invoice).</p>	<p><b>A112.</b> Thank you for the suggestion and the government will take that into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q113.</b> Allow authorization from a distributor. The number of providers that are going through distribution is increasing and having this option would be ideal.</p>	<p><b>A113.</b> Thank you for the suggestion. The SEWP PMO will take that into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q114.</b> Is there a way for large business can work with small business to increase their ability to bid?</p>	<p><b>A114.</b> We encourage large businesses to partner with small business when appropriate in order to respond to an opportunity.</p>
<p><b>Q115.</b> Is there a way to improve the Groups being divided between two NAICS codes? As a Contract Holder under 334111, we do our best to educate the customer and 9 out of 10 times it works; however, there are situations where the customer gets confused and releases under the other NAICS.</p>	<p><b>A115.</b> The SEWP PMO is still considering which NAICS codes to use for SEWP VI. When that determination is made we will do our best to educate customer on SEWP's NAICS. Until that time we welcome any feedback/input from industry on which NAICS codes to use for SEWP VI.</p>
<p><b>Q116.</b> Will TR submissions continue to be .txt file based?</p>	<p><b>A116.</b> Over the years, SEWP has found .txt files to be the most efficient and effective way for contract holders to submit products to their contracts. If there is improvements that can be made on that process and method, the SEWP PMO welcomes that feedback.</p>
<p><b>Q117.</b> Will there be "minimum mandatory" CLINs that need to be updated annually as with SEWP V? These become challenging to maintain as technologies evolve.</p>	<p><b>A117.</b> The SEWP PMO has not made any determination on what the "Minimum Mandatory" CLINs, process will be for SEWP VI, and the government welcomes feedback/input from industry on this matter.</p>
<p><b>Q118.</b> In regards to Services, we recommend that "Product Based Services" be added at the contract level with the 541512 NAICS with large and small business tracks. We do NOT recommend that SEWP add a wide open area for any and all IT related services. This would dramatically complicate and slow the procurement and likely generate 100s of protests like we have seen with other GWACS. Restricting services to "Product Based Services" will maintain SEWP's differentiation, brand, and streamlined ordering methods.</p>	<p><b>A118.</b> Thank you for the suggestion. The government is still considering suggestions on NAICS codes and scope and will take that into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q119.</b> More services included as well as software and hardware. Many new technologies need services to install and setup the software and hardware. Specifically cloud services will be important to add. Indicate that they are authorized distributors on the page that says "providers" it is unclear what they actually do and leads people to believe they are contract holders. Make SEWP a one stop shop for services, hardware and software. Ensure the new SBA rules don't allow large businesses to boot out or eat up all the work for SBs. For an IDIQ capabilities should be more important than methodologies when evaluating a proposal. We recommend a 2 step evaluation process based on capabilities first. NAICS 541519. Put labor rates and service CLINs on the contract. Cloud based infrastructure will be a large part of future tech. Be open to all contract types, except LPTA.</p>	<p><b>A119.</b> Thank you for the suggestion. Cloud services, services, software and hardware are currently in scope for the SEWP contracts. The government will take these suggestions in consideration in developing the RFP for SEWP VI.</p>

## West Coast Reverse Industry Day 2/13/23

Questions	Answers
<b>Q120.</b> Are you estimating a similar number of contracts awarded as there was in SEWP V?	<b>A120.</b> The government cannot predict how many companies will be SEWP VI awardees.
<b>Q121.</b> Could you share some estimated numbers as to how many contractors responded to the last SEWP RFP but were not awarded? Just trying to get an idea of how competitive it is.	<b>A121.</b> Having a SEWP Contract is highly sought after, in SEWP V there were 233 timely responses but only 144 contracts were awarded.
<b>Q122.</b> Are you planning to utilize the response rate on SEWP V for SEWP VI? Will there be a required response rate for SEWP VI that will be looked for and required to maintain the contract award?	<b>A122.</b> Reference the response provided in Question #19.
<b>Q123.</b> Will SEWP publish a SEWP VI for dummies book?	<b>A123.</b> SEWP has a Contract Holder User Manual and other documentation that are used in previous versions of SEWP. Updates will be made to that documentation and will be made available to all awardees at the proper time.
<b>Q124.</b> You have 100 small businesses in SEWP V, will they be guaranteed the contract in SEWP VI? Or they will be treated just like a new company applying for SEWP VI? Meaning they will get any preference?	<b>A124.</b> No preferential treatment will be given to any companies including previous awardees of SEWP contracts. Each interested company should submit their full proposal at the required time.
<b>Q125.</b> Please do not add more regulation and certification, it's tough for small business.	<b>A125.</b> Thank you for the feedback the government will take this into consideration.
<b>Q126.</b> If we only sell products and not services, is that a deal breaker?	<b>A126.</b> Any company interested in responding to the SEWP RFQ should consider if they are able to meet the breadth and depth of requirements set forth in the RFQ.
<b>Q127.</b> Recommend explaining the NMR and how it could apply to SEWP. Most people don't get it.	<b>A127.</b> The NMR or Non-Manufacturer Rule requires that in order to qualify for a small business set-aside, the small business must either manufacture the product they are selling or provide at least 50% of the services on a given task order.
<b>Q128.</b> Will SEWP be willing to roll in State / Local agencies so we can facilitate those agencies purchasing via SEWP?	<b>A128.</b> The SEWP PMO does not have the legal authority to allow State and Local governments to utilize the SEWP contracts.
<b>Q129.</b> What ISO certifications will be required for SEWP VI? How does this compare with SEWP V?	<b>A129.</b> The government is still determining if ISO requirements will be included as part of the SEWP VI RFP, however we welcome any feedback on this topic.
<b>Q130.</b> Will it be mandatory to bid on both Professional Services and Product? Will we have choice either/or?	<b>A130.</b> Information concerning proposal requirements will be provided in the Draft RFP.
<b>Q131.</b> Will services be tied to a product only? Is PMO looking to add Professional Services outside the vendor?	<b>A131.</b> Please refer to Question #26.

<b>Q132.</b> Are you creating a separate group for Professional Services or is it going to be combined i.e. both Professional Services and Product?	<b>A132.</b> The government is still evaluating how best to address additional services and groupings for the SEWP VI contracts. We welcome industry's feedback on this matter.
Q133. Will there be a requirement for past performance for bidding on services on SEWP VI? If yes, how long back are you looking for in terms of past performance, e.g. 5 years?	<b>A133.</b> The government is still reviewing evaluation factors and we welcome feedback on this matter.
<b>A134.</b> Is price a consideration for being awarded a contract?	<b>A134.</b> The government is still reviewing evaluation factors and we welcome feedback on this matter.
<b>Q135.</b> Will there be a way to extend a catalog beyond the expiration date of the base contract? Such as the way a task order works.	<b>A135.</b> The government will work with other federal agencies on any existing actions/delivery orders/task orders on SEWP V to determine the best recommendations and steps forward for that agency's needs.
<b>Q136.</b> Will there be an NMR waiver in place for SEWP VI, similarly to SEWP V?	<b>A136.</b> The government is still evaluating how the Non-Manufacturer Rule will impact the SEWP VI contract, but we welcome feedback from industry on this matter.
<b>Q137.</b> You mentioned adding additional services to SEWP VI, can you provide some examples of the type of services you are considering?	<b>A137.</b> The government has not finalized the scope for SEWP VI.
<b>Q138.</b> Will there be an 8(a) and/or SDVOSB set aside pool (i.e. a pool where only 8(a) and/or SDVOSB companies can bid/quote)?	<b>A138.</b> The government is still determining which set-aside groups will be available on the SEWP VI contracts, however we welcome feedback from industry on this matter.
<b>Q139.</b> How many of the 6 scope areas does a proposing business need to show competence/past performance in to be competitive for an award?	A139. A137. The government has not finalized the scope for SEWP VI.
<b>Q140.</b> We are new to federal contracting, but not new to business. We are small. Is SEWP right for us?	<b>A140.</b> Each potential offeror has to make the determination for themselves. When the RFP is issued your company should evaluate if it is able to meet the day to day requirements of possibly responding to the 100+ RFQ that are issued daily and fulfilling those orders they awarded in accordance with the requirements of the contract.
<b>Q141.</b> Are any evaluation factors available for us to look at?	<b>A141.</b> The government is still reviewing evaluation factors and we welcome feedback on this matter.
<b>Q142.</b> Are the NAICS codes going to stay the same from SEWP V?	<b>A142.</b> The government is considering additional NAICs codes for SEWP VI and we welcome feedback from industry on which NAICs codes to use.
<b>Q143.</b> Will there be authorized products or is there currently interest from DoD customers for sensors in the following arenas: GPS (m-Code or commercial); electro-optical; infrared; handheld precision azimuth and vertical angle measurement?	<b>A143.</b> Sensors are currently in scope for SEWP V and will be in scope for SEWP VI.
<b>Q144.</b> Is there a plan to expand the amount of related services allowed on individual task orders? The market is moving towards expanded adoption of as a Service contract structures. Is SEWP considering moving to a contract solution that can facilitate this type of construct for their customers?	<b>A144.</b> The "X as a Service" Model is currently in scope for SEWP V and the plan is for that to also be included as part of the scope for SEWP VI.

<p><b>Q145.</b> Is there a copy of the current draft or previous solicitation available for review by interested vendors?</p>	<p>A145. The draft for the SEWP VI RFP is anticipated to be released in the summer of calendar year 2023.</p>
<p><b>Q146.</b> How can vendors stay up to date on information distributed (updates, draft RFP release, etc.) about SEWP VI? Such as via SAM.gov, following a web page, or joining a mailing list.</p>	<p><a href="http://www.SAM.gov">A146. All official solicitation information regarding SEWP VI will be posted www.SAM.gov</a></p>
<p><b>Q147.</b> What is the anticipated contract length (base + option periods) for SEWP VI?</p>	<p>A147. The anticipated length of the SEWP VI is still in consideration. The government welcomes feedback from industry on this matter.</p>
<p><b>Q148.</b> Will a list of registered vendors attending today's reverse industry day be published/made available to attendees?</p>	<p>A148. We will provide a list of company names who attended both East Coast and West Coast Reverse Industry Days.</p>
<p><b>Q149.</b> Would recommend ISO 9001/14001/27001/28001 for overall quality, Environmental, Supply chain and Security.</p>	<p>A149. Thank you for the feedback, the government will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q150.</b> We would certainly like solution on the redundancy of documents being requested by customers? Example 889 form...We have to submit this almost every time with a RFQ.</p>	<p>A150. Each individual agency has their own unique documentation requirements, however the government will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q151.</b> Less regulation.</p>	<p>A151. Thank you for the feedback, the government will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q152.</b> In regards to the scorecard system, we'd recommend there be questions for business objectives and future goals, current improvements and past performance that is not necessarily federal but still relevant.</p>	<p>A152. Thank you for the recommendation, the government will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q153.</b> Regarding mandatory minimum requirements, recommend being extremely lenient with those, if implemented. ITES had a high mandatory minimum requirement, and it was very difficult for truly small businesses to maintain. We ended up "throwing a lot of spaghetti at the wall", instead of being strategic in our responses. It's much easier to maintain now that they've lowered their requirements to 5% response rate from 30%!</p>	<p>A153. Thank you for the recommendation, the government will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q154.</b> Certifications process and applications require a tremendous amount of cost, research, over site and management. Additional resources and guidance on approach and process would be beneficial and a substantial value add from the SEWP PO. Perhaps a consultant or SEWP employee that was an expert in the process of certification —someone that can point primes in the right direction. Or a resource page (templates) that we can use to build off of.</p>	<p>A154. Thank you for the feedback, the government will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q155.</b> The new contract should address local sales/transaction taxes. Some jurisdictions are going to collect these taxes later from small businesses, and if they are not built into the sales price the Government is going to have a supply chain crisis when it loses small business resellers to financial crisis when they can't pay the tax bill.</p>	<p>A155. The contracts currently allow for the contractor to charge an additional tax in jurisdictions where applicable using the GOVERNMENTAL-Z CLIN.</p>

<p><b>Q156.</b> A contractor's performance on a prior GWAC should be considered, rather than just performance of a purchase order. Too many times a Solicitation requests a past performance of a separate purchase orders rather than a demonstration that the contractor has shown capability to meet all of the requirements of another GWAC. Significantly, past performance under SEWP V should be given greater weight.</p>	<p><b>A156.</b> Thank you for the feedback, the government will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q157.</b> What is the % of services vs HW/SW on SEWP5 vs SEWP6?</p>	<p><b>A157.</b> SEWP V is approximately 70% hardware and 30% services. Once SEWP VI is awarded and orders are submitted, we will monitor the percentage for SEWP VI.</p>
<p><b>Q158.</b> Encourage more diversity. Allow for equal evaluations factors for minorities and WOSBs.</p>	<p><b>A158.</b> Thank you for the feedback, the government will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q159.</b> HP and Dell are becoming oligopoly in the IT hardware, please encourage local US manufacturer.</p>	<p><b>A159.</b> Thank you for the feedback, the government will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q160.</b> For CMMC, rollout has been delayed to 2024, but it's never too early to begin considering. Level 2 certs will require third-party assessment, and Level 3 will require a Government assessment, so this will be a time-consuming process.</p>	<p><b>A160.</b> Thank you for the feedback, the government will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q161.</b> Are you considering allowing some services only task orders on SEWP VI?</p>	<p><b>A161.</b> As with SEWP V in scope service only task/delivery orders will be allowed.</p>
<p><b>Q162.</b> Allow for on ramp and off ramp process. The onramp was missing on the SEWP V.</p>	<p><b>A162.</b> The government is still evaluating the need for an on-ramp and off-ramp and welcomes feedback from industry on this matter.</p>
<p><b>Q163.</b> As part of your policy interactions with the government, has there been discussions around a new NAICS code for resellers of IT technology and services? This would help with the non-manufacturing exceptions.</p>	<p><b>A163.</b> The government is still evaluating which NAICS codes to use for the SEWP VI contracts and we welcome feedback on this matter.</p>
<p><b>Q164.</b> Will Industry Partners/Manufacturers be able to help establish the mandatory CLINS for their brand that appear in the RFP?</p>	<p><b>A164.</b> The government will take feedback from industry into consideration when establishing mandatory CLINS or deliverables.</p>
<p><b>Q165.</b> Will SEWP Approved Support Contractors (Letter of Authorization holders) with a valid term automatically be eligible to use SWP VI?</p>	<p><b>A165.</b> Any Approved Service support contract with valid period of performance at the time SEWP VI is awarded will be permitted to use the SEWP VI contracts. If the period of performance is expired the contractor will need to have their Contracting Officer submitted a new letter with a valid period of performance.</p>
<p><b>Q166.</b> NASA PMO mentioned that they would like to implement an "On Ramp" and "Off Ramp" mechanism by which new contractors could be added and existing contractors taken off of the contract- they were asking for criteria by which to base such decisions.</p>	<p><b>A166.</b> That is correct.</p>
<p><b>Q167.</b> Will there be any bid response requirements for SEWP VI solicitations? If so, will this be your basis of which a contract holder could be off ramped?</p>	<p><b>A167.</b> The government has not determined what the requirements will be for an awardee to remain in good standing, and we welcome feedback on this matter.</p>

<p><b>Q168.</b> Will NASA SEWP be used for acquiring open source software solutions? Example: DKAN is an open source (license free) software alternative to Socrata, an open data catalog, often procured on SEWP. By not asking for Socrata by name, vendors can offer alternatives that are more flexible, cost efficient and allows gov't to retain its data.</p>	<p><b>A168.</b> Software is 100% in scope for the SEWP contracts.</p>
<p><b>Q169.</b> Modus eDiscovery offers the suggestion of having a multi-platform partner for eDiscovery, including in a FedRAMP environment. At Modus, we offer multiple eDiscovery platforms our Commercial and our FedRAMP authorized environment. This allows agencies to have options in platforms based on what is best for their agency, staff, and matters. They can have large matters in a more robust review platform with analytics, and smaller matters in a more streamlined platform that has a lower price point.</p>	<p><b>A169.</b> Thank you for the feedback, we will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q170.</b> Will service contractors be required to also provide products?</p>	<p><b>A170.</b> Thank you for your inquiry, however no decision has been made and the SEWP PMO is still taking into consideration requirements of contractors.</p>
<p><b>Q171.</b> SEWP V had quite a large number of small businesses - will SEWP consider continuing this trend in SEWP VI?</p>	<p><b>A171.</b> The government plans to ensure small business has every opportunity to participate in the SEWP VI contracts.</p>
<p><b>Q172.</b> Please consider price reasonableness or best value evaluation in lieu of lowest price evaluation since price will be re-competed at the delivery order level.</p>	<p><b>A172.</b> Thank you for the feedback, we will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q173.</b> If a discount from MSRP approach will be used for the price evaluation, how do we ensure everyone is using the same MSRP?</p>	<p><b>A173.</b> SEWP PMO is still taking this into consideration; if you have any suggestion or alternative ideas, SEWP is interested to hear more.</p>
<p><b>Q174.</b> From an evaluation perspective, please consider giving much greater weight to offerors that had an existing SEWP or other IDIQ contracts and had favorable past performances over offerors that do not have similar experience.</p>	<p><b>A174.</b> Thank you for the feedback, we will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q175.</b> Please reduce the number of technical specs / mandatory CLINs that has to be submitted as part of the technical evaluation (if possible).</p>	<p><b>A175.</b> Thank you for the feedback, we will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q176.</b> I think ISO 9001:2015 and O-TTPS 1.1.1 can be required, but not CMMC.</p>	<p><b>A176.</b> Thank you for the feedback, we will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q177.</b> I believe 334111 and 541519 NAICs have worked well.</p>	<p><b>A177.</b> Thank you for the feedback, we will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q178.</b> The SEWP PMO needs to play an enhanced role in supply chain integrity (Support, track, and verify supply chain relationships) as the foundation for the SEWP VI contract and require validation of authorized reseller status from the SEWP Industry Partner/manufacturers prior to award.</p>	<p><b>A178.</b> The SEWP PMO currently requires the contract holder to validate their relationship with an OEM/Provider by providing a point of contact from said OEM/Provider that can attest to the relationship between the contract holder and OEM/Provider. We plan on enhancing the capability in SEWP VI.</p>
<p><b>Q179.</b> A systems enhancement needs to be made to prevent solicitations from being responded to by non-authorized contract holders.</p>	<p><b>A179.</b> Only contract holders have access to SEWP solicitations that are posted via the SEWP Quote Request Tool, which is the only recommended method for the federal agencies to post SEWP requirements.</p>

<p><b>Q180.</b> Please ensure the onboarding is less costly and time intensive than most MACs these days, such as CIO-SP4 and CMS ACME. Consider how small businesses have limited resources to invest and however it can be expedited and streamlined would be greatly appreciated!</p>	<p><b>A180.</b> Thank you for the feedback, we will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q181.</b> (Assuming groups are anticipated to stay the same), since groups B-D are predominately VARs, SEWP VI NAICS should include FAR 54159 footnote 18 with a SB size status of 150 employees. The DHS FirstSource III program office obtained a Class Waiver for the Non-Manufacturers rule to alleviate the problems this would cause to small business resellers. We recommend doing the same for SEWP VI.</p>	<p><b>A181.</b> Thank you for the feedback, we will take this into consideration.</p>
<p><b>Q182.</b> With added services in Groups B-D, so long as the services stay ancillary to the products, the primary NAICS code should still be 541519 footnote 18 (VAR exception). Adding other straight services NAICS codes may create other unintended issues regarding the overall purpose of the vehicle or socioeconomic concerns for legitimate VARs.</p>	<p><b>A182.</b> Thank you for the feedback, we will take this into consideration.</p>
<p>Q183. As simple as SEWP V is with a single NAICS and single small business size standard, it still confuses a lot of people (our own employees and customers alike). Adding more complexity would not make the SEWP VI vehicle more valuable or flexible; it would probably need to be done as a separate contract vehicle (for services) and thus can (and we recommend should) be done outside of the SEWP VI procurement should the NASA SEWP office decide to pursue such a vehicle.</p>	<p><b>A183.</b> Thank you for the feedback, we will take this into consideration.</p>
<p>Q184. Service Contract Labor Standard (SCLS/SCA) may apply to services generally but would need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis where the services are considered more central to the procurement (rather than product). Many VARs, commercial offerors and other government contractors offering product-centric solution may not be interested in pursuing work subject to SCLS/SCA due to the additional human resource mandates that require additional company investment to manage. As a result, if the Government determines SCLS/SCA to be applicable on a specific procurement, recommend providing guidance to the issuing agencies to make sure the SCA/SCLS requirements are clearly articulated in the RFQ documents.</p>	<p><b>A184.</b> Thank you for the feedback, we will take this into consideration.</p>



<p>Q185. CMMC is fraught with questions of if (is it really going to be mandated for all organizations, even if it poses an existential threat to a significant number of small businesses) and when (when will compliance be made mandatory, when will compliance auditors be sanctioned to bestow official compliance designations over mere self-certification?) it will be operational. Do bidders need to be compliant and certified as of SEWP VI submission? As of SEWP VI award? If CMMC isn't officially operational until after SEWP VI award, would there be a provision to attain certification within a designated timeframe? Might there be two tiers of SEWP contract holders, those CMMC certified and those not? We are well on our way to complete self-certification, but it has taken years to get to this point and to-date hasn't delivered any tangible benefits.</p>	<p><b>A185.</b> The government is still monitoring all developments as it relates to CMMC and its potential impact on the SEWP VI contracts.</p>
<p>Q186. Please address how the non-manufacturing rule applies to SEWP VI?</p>	<p><b>A186.</b> The non-manufacturing rule may impact SEWP VI based on the NAICS codes selected for SEWP VI.</p>
<p>Q187. Please promote open source software!</p>	<p><b>A187.</b> Thank you for the feedback, we will take this into consideration.</p>