

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
1	SSP 51101	1.4	1-3	Please confirm reference to section 2.2 should be 2.1	No, the reference to Section 2.2 was correct. Section 2.2 Reference Documents is located on pages 2-6 of the SSP 51101 United States Deorbit Vehicle Systems Requirements Document.
2	SSP 51101	3.1.3	3-2	Please provide radio noise flux and planetary geomagnetic activity index tables or fix tabular data links at https://www.nasa.gov/msfcsolar	The website is updated and tabular data links are fixed. This SRD update (SSCD 16863) will be included with Amendment 3 to the Synopsis in SAM.gov. Website redirects to: https://www.nasa.gov/solar-cycle-progression-and-forecast/
3	SSP 51101	3.1.3	3-2 through 3-4	Can NASA provide descriptions of the ISS state represented by configuration codes used in tables 3.1.3-1 through 3.1.3-3? Unclear what physical state of the ISS is represented by these configurations; applicability of those configurations is unclear.	The configurations represent expected nominal configurations, as well as bounding configurations caused by a contingency that can drive attitude control and translational maneuver capability. For example, the nominal deorbit capability requires that the Axiom Commercial Segment depart the International Space Station (ISS) prior to the United States Deorbit Vehicle (USDV) arrival, however, a contingency exists that would require deorbit of ISS with the Axiom Commercial Segment still attached.

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
4	SSP 51101	3.1.3	3-4	<p>Does the USDV need to be designed for all of these configurations through all mission phases, or are certain configurations applicable to certain flight phases?</p> <p>If the latter is true, can NASA provide mapping of which configurations are applicable to each phase of flight? Some configuration have mass >450t assumed ISS mass or N2F docking port in a different location which seems to imply that the ISS could not be in these configurations for the deorbit mission, at least for certain phases of the mission.</p>	<p>Yes, the USDV needs to be designed for all of these configurations through all mission phases. The configurations represent expected nominal configurations, as well as bounding configurations caused by a contingency that can drive attitude control and translational maneuver capability. For example, the nominal deorbit capability requires that the Axiom Commercial Segment depart ISS prior to USDV arrival, however a contingency exists that would require deorbit of ISS with the Axiom Commercial Segment still attached. In this scenario, NASA requires a USDV design that can maintain attitude control of this bounding configuration.</p> <p>However, for SSP 51101 3.1.5 and 3.1.6, a mass of 450,000 kg is still used instead of the mass in table 3.1.3.1-1, because NASA would accept impacts to translational burn performance in the contingency scenario due to the larger mass, and NASA does not require a design to accommodate this mass for a contingency scenario.</p>
5	SSP 51101	3.1.3	3-4	<p>Please confirm X-axis projected areas provided in table 3.1.3-3 for configurations 1-9G are thousands (3####), not decimals (3##.#)</p>	<p>X-axis projected areas provided in SSP 51101 Table 3.1.3-3 for configurations 1G -9G are thousands (3####).</p>

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
6	SSP 51101	3.1.3	3-4	Please provide ISS ballistic coefficient or coefficient of drag to be used for aerodynamic modelling (unable to calculate aerodynamic force/torque without this). Please confirm correct interpretation of data in table: Does 'X Center of Pressure' describe ISS attitude such that aerodynamic flow aligned with ISS x-axis (and similarly defined for Y and Z)?	SSP 51101 page 3.1.3 will be updated to include a coefficient of drag ranging from 2.0 to 2.5. The range encompasses various ISS mass, inertia, aerodynamic properties and ISS Solar Array configurations to be assessed and the altitude regime to be flown during the mated USDV duration and deorbit operations. This SRD update (SSCD 16863) will be included with Amendment 3 to the Synopsis in SAM.gov. The 'X Center of Pressure' is the center of the plate normal to the X axis and has the Projected Area X.
7	SSP 51101	3.1.6	3-6	During the reentry burn, ISS attitude will be +XVV, will Z axis also be constrained? (in other words - are we expecting +ZLV?)	Yes, the Z Axis will be constrained. ISS attitude will be +XVV +ZLV.
8	SSP 51101	3.2.2	3-8	Please confirm if there is a required standoff distance/waypoint for contingency hold or if provider is free to select this.	Yes, the contractor can select an operationally safe standoff distance/waypoint, however, will need to consider propellant consumption, operational impacts, plume loads, heating, etc.
9	SSP 51101	3.2.7	3-10	Please confirm rate and null are defined in the same frame in LOAC recovery scenarios for LOAC recovery verification.	0.28 deg/sec is the inertial angular rate (i.e., magnitude of angular rate vector w.r.t. inertial reference frame), and the USDV will have to arrest/null this rate w.r.t. the controller reference frame,

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
					which could be in Local Vertical Local Horizontal (LVLH) or Inertial. The final rate should be 0 deg/s in the controller reference frame, which can be either LVLH or Inertial. SSP 51101 3.2.7 will be updated to state “with respect to LVLH and inertial reference frame post Loss of Attitude Control” and “considered successful when the simulation shows that inertial rates of 0.28 deg/s can be detected”. This SRD update (SSCD 16863) will be included with Amendment 3 to the Synopsis in SAM.gov.
10	SSP 51101	3.5.1	3-37	Please provide interface limit loads for docked vehicles with mass >34,000 lbm SSP 50808 §3.2.2.6.4.1 contains note saying there is "a higher set of interface loads to be supplied by NASA" for docked vehicles with mass >34,000 lbm.	Per the response to Question #11, the USDV mass will be provided per SSP 50808 International Space Station (ISS) to Commercial Orbital Transportation Services (COTS) Interface Requirements Document (IRD) 3.2.2.6.4.9. Once the USDV mass is provided, the interface load limits will be developed per the USDV mass and provided to the USDV Contractor.
11	SSP 51101	3.5.1	3-38	Please confirm whether USDV may exceed 34,000 lbm limit for mated COTS vehicles SSP 50808 §3.2.2.6.4.9 states docked vehicle "shall be less than 34,000 lbm" but also contains a note implying that vehicles may exceed this mass.	Yes, the USDV may exceed 34,000 lbm. Per SSP 50808 3.2.2.6.4.9, "Docked COTS vehicles exceeding 34,000 lbm will require verification to a higher set of interface loads to be

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
					supplied by NASA." This effort will occur early in the USDV lifecycle.
12	SSP 51101	3.7.1	3-74	This section states "The USDV shall be tested to proto-qualification margins and durations, as defined in section 8.3 of SMC-S-016". Please confirm if this is superseded by full compliance with SMC-S-016 or an approved alternate standard, such that full qualification of vehicle systems and hardware can be covered through representative hardware qualification rather than requiring specific proto-qualification testing be performed on the flight vehicle at the full vehicle assembly level.	For the purposes of SSP 51101 Section 3.7.1, the USDV is defined as the System. The System is tested to proto-qualification margins and durations in 8.3 in SMC-S-016 (Part b), whereas all else is tested to qualification margins and durations in 6.3 and 7.3 of SMC-S-016 (Part a). Part a and Part b are both required and one cannot be substituted for another. Full qualification at the unit and subsystem level (Part a) does not replace the requirement for some testing to proto-qualification margins and durations at the vehicle level (Part b). Review of offeror's alternate standards will occur via DRD USDV-33.
13	SSP 51101	Multiple	Multiple	Information about intended ISS configuration, attitude, and orientation throughout the USDV mission timeline will be needed during the USDV design phase in order for the USDV provider to perform analyses related to power consumption/energy balance prediction as well as communications coverage (for example, determining comm satellite line of sight to USDV during deorbit conops and shadowing of	Yes, NASA intends to provide relevant data about the ISS configuration, attitude, and orientation throughout the USDV mission timeline as part of nominal execution of contract requirements to enable the contractor to perform the analysis required to satisfy SSP 51101 requirements. As described in SSP 51105, this data will be

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
				USDV solar arrays by ISS). Please confirm that NASA intends to provide this relevant ISS data as part of nominal execution of contract requirements, in order to enable the contractor to perform the analyses required to satisfy SSP 51101 requirements, and that a Government Task Agreement (GTA) is not required in order to request NASA to provide that data.	provided to the USDV Contractor via Bilateral Data Exchange Agreements, Lists, and Schedules (BDEALS). A Government Task Agreement (GTA) is not required for this data.
14	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	SOW 2.11.1.i	C-24	Can NASA clarify that the requirement to meet applicable Range Safety Requirements will pertain to tailored SSCMAN 91-710 requirements for the USDV, since all vehicles require some amount of tailoring?	As a NASA payload, SOW 2.11.1.f requires that USDV comply with NPR 8715.7 and NASA-STD-8719.24. An Air Force/Space Force memo in NASA-STD-8719.24 states that compliance with NASA-STD-8719.24 satisfies a tailored set of SSCMAN requirements for NASA payload programs. Tailoring to NASA-STD-8719.24 is governed by procedures in NPR 8715.7.
15	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	SOW 2.11.4.c	C-25	Please clarify what is meant by "report to NASA all failures during qualification and acceptance tests, as well as failures during any additional testing performed with qualification or flight hardware." Does NASA expect notification of every single test failure during the normal process of production, on every piece of hardware including components, subassemblies, integrated vehicle, etc.? It is especially important to clarify the bounds of	(1) NASA expects notification of every test failure associated with qualification hardware or flight hardware. This SOW requirement does not apply to failures during development testing. (2) The intent is that "safing and securing" and "not breaking configuration until NASA has been notified" only apply to "Reportable

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
				<p>when it is required for "contractor to safe and secure the test system and unit under test without breaking configuration until NASA has been notified." One recommendation is to loosen / remove the restriction against breaking configuration, and instead utilize the PAA process on any activity NASA deems as high criticality.</p>	<p>Anomalies" per SOW 2.11.9.b. SOW 2.11.4.c will be updated to clarify in Request for Proposal (RFP) Amendment 2.</p>
16	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	SOW 2.11.9.a and b	C-27	<p>Please clarify if "The Contractor shall report all anomalies to NASA" means that proactive tracking and notification to NASA is explicitly required, or if NASA access to contractor issue tracking systems via established and agreed upon Insight protocols could meet this requirement.</p>	<p>"Reportable Anomalies" (SOW 2.11.9.b) are a subset of "Anomalies" (SOW 2.11.9.a). 2.11.9.a requires that the Contractor have some method for cataloging and tracking-to-closure of anomalies and communicating that information to NASA. By contrast, 2.11.9.b requires explicit notification to NASA within 24 hours of that subset of "Reportable Anomalies." The final sentence of SOW 2.11.9.a will be updated in RFP Amendment 2.</p> <p>This distinction of "Reportable Anomalies" and "Anomalies" is consistent with the distinction in reporting requirements between Major and Minor Nonconformances in SOW 2.6.e (within 24 hrs for the former, at Program Management Review (PMR) for the latter).</p>

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
17	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	SOW 4.3.3	C-57	SOW 4.3.3 Assembly, Integration, and Test Progress Review (APR) is defined as SAR-12 months. In a situation where Dwell is not required and SAR will be sequenced off of the launch call up, how will the Offeror know when to do the APR?	The Offeror shall propose the System Acceptance Review (SAR) date in Attachment J-30 Work Plan based on the Clause F.3 acceptance date. The Assembly, Integration, and Test Progress Review (APR) occurs 12 months prior to SAR.
18	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	SOW 4.4.4.d	C-61	Requirement for contractor to deliver procedures inputs for nominal operations, etc. in accordance with DRD USDV-48 appears to be inconsistent with the contents of DRD USDV-48, which requires the contractor to actually deliver the procedures. Please clarify: Is the requirement to deliver inputs or to deliver procedures?	The USDV Contractor shall provide USDV procedures via DRD USDV-48. Additionally, the USDV Contractor shall provide inputs to ISS/USDV integrated procedures developed by the NASA Flight Operations Directorate (FOD) team. A clarification will be added to SOW 4.3.2 and 4.4.4 in RFP Amendment 2.
19	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	SOW 4.4.5	C-61	SOW 4.4.5 states "If the USDV will enter dwell prior to shipment to the launch site, SAR will also include..". This implies SAR must be sequenced prior to dwell, if dwell is required, which appears to be inconsistent with the CLIN 2/CLIN 3 timeline overlap flexibility laid out in SOW 1.2.	It is the Government's intention to complete as much of the Assembly Integration and Test (AI&T) effort as possible prior to Dwell, if Dwell is required, to reduce risk to the Government. A System Acceptance Review will be held prior to Dwell, if Dwell is required. If the full scope of the System Acceptance Review contents is not completed prior to Dwell, the C2-4 System Acceptance and C2-5 Shipment to Acceptance Destination Milestones will remain open during Dwell.

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
20	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	SOW 5.0.c	C-67	SOW 5.0c states "The Contractor shall store and maintain the USDV in a state of readiness for the time between Milestone C2-4 System Acceptance and shipment to the Launch Site post dwell". This implies that dwell is intended to occur only after SAR and is inconsistent with the CLIN 2/CLIN 3 timeline overlap flexibility laid out in SOW 1.2 and implies that dwell is only intended to occur between SAR and shipment to launch site.	See response to Question #20
21	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	SOW 6.2.2.o	C-72	Please clarify the requirement to allocate and support 15 working days of dedicated USDV test during USDV/LV I&T at the launch site. What is the intent of this requirement? Can this requirement be changed to be less prescriptive, i.e., "allocate and support USDV/LV testing in the launch schedule as required for mission success"?	SOW 6.2.2.o assumes a quantity of days to meet mission success based on historical experience. The 15 days was included based on historical experience.
22	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	SOW 6.2.8	C-75	Are the subsections under 6.2.8 intended to be numbered a, b, c instead of d, e, f, or were some requirements inadvertently omitted?	SOW Section 6.2.8 will be updated to a, b, c in RFP Amendment 2.
23	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	H.4	H-3	In NFS 1852.209-71 the Contracting Officer determined that this acquisition may give rise to potential OCI based on information shared during execution of the contract. What information is expected to trigger an OCI concern, and will Contractors be notified ahead of receipt?	Offerors are responsible for identifying any potential conflict of interest within their Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) Plan. The Government has notified offerors through NFS 1852.209-71 <i>Limitation of Future Contracting</i> of potential OCI concerns with this acquisition. However, it is the

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
					Offeror's responsibility to identify and mitigate any concerns.
24	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	H.9	H-9	NASA should limit required insight into the contractor and specific named subcontracts executed as a direct result of the award, and not expect to flow this down to vendors, etc. Recommend truncating or editing the last sentence of the second paragraph under H.9 to this effect.	The USDV NASA Insight and Approval clause reference to NASA insight to "Contractor, subcontractor, vendors, and partner entities" is consistent with the NASA insight in the ISS Program's Commercial Resupply Services-2 contract.
25	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment J-01, CDRL Submission Table	J01-12	DRD USDV-9 appears to be missing from the table	The Table will be updated to reflect that USDV-9 is RESERVED in RFP Amendment 2.
26	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment J-01, DRD USDV-7	J01-49	SRA is required "semi-annually in April"-- is the other semi-annual milestone in October?	Yes. Attachment J-01 DRD USDV-7 will be updated in RFP Amendment 2 to show another semi-annual delivery in October.
27	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment J-01, DRD USDV-7	J01-49	Will the Government consider removing the requirement to submit a Schedule Risk Assessment with proposal submission?	The Schedule Risk Assessment (SRA) is required with proposal. In accordance with Section M, the Government evaluates the Offeror's Technical and Management Approach for overall demonstrated understanding, reasonableness, feasibility, completeness, and effectiveness and any ensuing impacts and risk to the Government. Each Offeror's integrated master schedule and schedule risk

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
					assessment provides the Government specific insight into the Offeror's proposed schedule to accomplish the requirements of the USDV contract and its assessment of risk associated with the proposed schedule.
28	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment J-01, DRD USDV-7	J01-49	Would the Government consider removing the requirement to provide the Schedule Risk Assessment bi-annually in lieu of the project life-cycle reviews?	Attachment J-01 DRD USDV-7 will be updated in RFP Amendment 2 to show that a semi-annual SRA may be combined with a project life-cycle review SRA when the two deliveries are planned to be within 45 days of each other.
29	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment J-01, DRD USDV-30	J01-164	DRD USDV-30 defines the scope of the USDV Spacecraft Readiness Plan as pertaining to "execution of CLIN 3 Dwell for the period between System Acceptance Review (SAR) and shipment to the Launch Site Payload Processing Facility (LS PPF)". This implies that dwell is intended to occur only after SAR and is inconsistent with the CLIN 2/CLIN 3 timeline overlap flexibility laid out in SOW 1.2.	See response to Question #20
30	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment J-01, DRD USDV-30	J01-164	Section (a) (4), regarding ISO Class 8 cleanroom requirements for "all contractor facilities used for processing of flight hardware", is overly restrictive (many subassembly processing facilities are not required to be maintained to this level of cleanliness).	Attachment J-01, DRD USDV-33 will be updated in RFP Amendment 2 to include ISO 14644-1 in Table DRD USDV-33-2 Applicable List of NASA Design and Construction Standards and Specifications. All tailoring and alternate standards shall be submitted

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
				Recommend more clearly defining the scope of this requirement.	via DRD USDV-33 with the proposal and adjudicated per SOW 2.9.1 Design and Construction Standards.
31	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment J-01, DRD USDV-33	J01-173	One of the required columns in Table DRD-USDV-33-1 has the header "Identify the subject NASA reference standard (s) that the contractor standard addresses". It is unclear how this is different from the first three columns which identify the NASA reference standard identifier, name and applicable version for the given row in the table.	Table DRD-USDV-33-1 headers will be updated in RFP Amendment 2 to clarify.
32	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment J-01, DRD USDV-33	J01-173	How would the Government like Offerors to indicate in Table DRD USDV-33-1 if they accept the NASA standard? If Offerors accept the NASA standard, do they still need to address justification of suitability?	Offerors should state "Accept" in the final column for NASA Standards where the Contractor accepts applicability as-is. Justification of suitability is not required in cases where the Offeror accepts the NASA standard "as-is".
33	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment J-01, DRD USDV-34	J01-181	Can USDV coordinates for mass properties analysis be delivered in USDV-relative coordinate frame?	No, Mass Properties Reports shall be reported in the Space Station Analysis Coordinate System, as written in DRD USDV-34. For reference see SSP 30219, Space Station Reference Coordinate Systems Document.
34	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment J-01, DRD USDV-34	J01-181	Please clarify whether/how many of the additional submissions require explicit measurement of physical vehicle mass properties versus analysis products being acceptable.	As stated in DRD USDV-34, measurements are required for Build Complete (both dry and wetted).

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
35	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment J-01, DRD USDV-35	J01-184	<p>Please clarify if requirement (h), Description on movement limits for any articulating items, is only required for things external to the vehicle?</p> <p>Would a keep-out zone provided in CAD be acceptable?</p>	<p>Yes, paragraph (h), is only required for hardware external to the vehicle.</p> <p>Yes, a keep-out zone provided in Computer-Aided Design (CAD) models is acceptable.</p>
36	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment J-01, DRD USDV-38	J01-191	The Operations Data Book (ODB) for USDV is very extensive. Is it possible for other existing documents, where relevant and applicable to USDV, to be referenced in order to satisfy portions of these requirements?	No, the Operations Data Book (ODB) cannot reference other documents to satisfy the requirements. The purpose of the ODB is to be a single source for NASA FOD personnel during USDV operations, as seen in DRD USDV-38 where it states the ODB "is the single authoritative source".
37	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment J-01, DRD USDV-44	J01-207	How does NASA intend to address reflown flight hardware for use on the USDV?	RFP Amendment 2 will address Previously Flown Hardware for use on USDV in the SOW and DRD USDV-44 Qualification and Acceptance Plan.
38	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment J-01, DRD USDV-48 (a)	J01-217	Requirement for contractor to deliver USDV operations procedures appears to be inconsistent with SOW 4.4.4.d, which requires the contractor to deliver "procedures inputs." Please clarify: Is the requirement to deliver inputs, or deliver procedures?	See answer to Question #19
39	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	L.15	L-13	If an Offeror proposes to use the NASA Docking System (NDS), is the NDS cost included in the total evaluated price?	Yes, per RFP provision L.26.1 GENERAL COST AND PRICE INSTRUCTIONS, paragraph e, the Offerors are instructed to include the

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
					<p>price of the Government Furnished Property requested in Provision L.15 NFS 1852.245-81 LIST OF AVAILABLE GOVERNMENT PROPERTY in the Cost and Price volume. The Provision L.15 includes the price of the NDS and sustaining engineering. Per Provision M.2 COST AND PRICE FACTOR (VOLUME I), paragraph b, part 8, the price of this Government Furnished items requested is included in the Offeror's Total Evaluated Price.</p>
40	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	L.16	L-15	<p>Please confirm that if an Offeror wants to use the Space Station Processing Facility (SSPF) as listed in L.16 table, we only need to add that Facility as an OFI to Attachment J-33, Government-Furnished Property, Facilities, and Data/Information in our proposal and that no Government Task Agreements (GTA) is required for SSPF.</p>	<p>Yes. Any items the Offeror requests to use in L.16 table shall be included in the Offeror Fill-Ins (OFIs) in the Offeror's Attachment J-33, TABLE J-33-3 GOVERNMENT FACILITIES REQUESTED. The dates requested for this facility and the cost for those Government Fiscal Years shall be consistent with the Offeror's Cost and Price Volume submittal to reflect the correct value of this Government Furnished item requested. This value is included in the Offeror's Total Evaluated Price per provision M.2 Cost and Price Factor (Volume I) paragraph b, part 8</p>

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
					Offerors are advised that the L.16 table for Space Station Processing Facility (SSPF) contains only the standard services listed. If additional services are requested above and beyond the standard service, these items shall be requested via GTA as noted in provision L.16.
41	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	L.25.a.2	L-29	We understand NASA's desire to prevent offerors from using diagrams, charts, etc. to circumvent text size limitations in the proposal, but the strict limitation to Times New Roman 12pt font is extremely difficult to incorporate for technical documents such as schematics (sensor labels, etc), which are required by NASA as part of TA.2.	In accordance with L.25(a)(2), text in diagrams, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs shall be Times New Roman font and no smaller than 12-point text size. Diagrams, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs shall not be used to circumvent the text size limitations of the proposal.
42	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	L.27.1	L-52	Please clarify: TA.2 instructions state "Items a and b above in the USDV System Architecture narrative shall be written by the Offeror as a separate narrative and submitted in the Mission Suitability proposal...". Is the intent to require that the offeror address (a) and (b) in their entirety as a clearly delineated section in the proposal? Or is the intent of this specific instruction just to clarify that only (a) and (b) will be incorporated into the model contract, and not (c) and beyond?	Offerors shall include TA.2 (a) through (f) in their proposals (Volume II: Mission Suitability Factor). Offerors shall clearly delineate (a) and (b) as a separate narrative. Offerors shall also include (a) and (b) as Part A of Attachment J-08 in the Model Contract (Volume V). This will be clarified in RFP Amendment 2.
43	80JSC023 R0003	L.29 (a) (1) (g)	L-63	Recommend NASA consider removing the requirement for Financial Capability Information, or reduce this requirement to a	No, NASA is not able to remove the Financial Capability Information or reduce the requirement. NFS 1809.105-

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
	USDV RFP.pdf			financial overview or financial health letter. We understand NASA wants to ensure the contractor's financial ability to achieve success with the USDV, but the amount of information requested is extensive.	1 requires that "NASA's most significant contracts for design and development programs and projects, with a lifecycle cost of \$500 million or more.... require a financial capability assessment prior to award".
44	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	L.29 (a) (2) (a)	L-65	Is the Business System Adequacy requirement applicable to FFP bidders? Other systems-level requirements on accounting have been demarcated with "Applicable to CPIF only" notes	Offerors proposing Cost Plus Incentive Fee (CPIF) are required to respond to all elements of Business System Adequacy. Offerors proposing only Firm Fixed Price (FFP) are required to only respond to Government Property systems of Business System Adequacy.
45	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	L.30 Table, Section J	L-69	Several of these Section J Attachments are related to DRDs that have final submittals that aren't due until after Contract award. Please clarify: are Offerors required to include preliminary versions of these Section J Attachments in the Model Contract, or were those particular Section J Attachments included in this Model Contract Table in error?	Several of these Section J Attachments were included in error. The L.30 Model Contract Table Section J will be updated in RFP Amendment 2, which will also include corresponding updates to the J-Attachment title pages, L.27, and L.29 where inclusion in the Model Contract was referenced.
46	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment L-01B	L-73	The Firm Price Template (L-01B) has very high overlap tab with the Cost Plus Template (L-01A), specifically on CLIN 1 (the hybrid procurement CLIN). FFP providers are asked to provide labor estimate breakdowns SOW task by SOW task on tab "CLIN 1 Labor Cost Details" – the same requirement as Cost Plus providers. We ask that FFP providers be	The labor estimate breakdown is the same in both templates to allow for the Technical Evaluation of the resources and to ensure the evaluation is performed on a common basis between Offerors proposing a Hybrid Contract or 100% Firm Fixed Price.

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
				required to provide labor breakdowns at the summary level by CLIN.	
47	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment L-01B	L-73	FFP template requires on the “Non-Labor Resources (CLIN1)” tab and “CLIN 4 (SOW 4.0) FFP” tab that FFP providers break down non-labor resources (materials) by SOW task by SOW task, similar to Cost Plus providers. We ask that FFP providers be required to provide material breakdowns at the summary level by CLIN, or by assembly / subassembly.	The material breakdown by the SOW task is the same in both templates to allow for the technical evaluation of the resources and to ensure the evaluation is performed on a common basis between Offerors proposing a Hybrid Contract or 100% Firm Fixed Price.
48	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	Attachment L-01B	L-73	CLIN 1 should have 1 tab in the Attachment L-01B pricing template, similar to CLIN 2. Specifically, we recommend removing the following tabs (the last 8 tabs of the attachment) from Attachment L-01B, and modeling the “CLIN 1 (SOW 3.0) FFP” tab after the “CLIN 2 (SOW 4.0) FFP” tab. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Summary Labor Cost (CLIN 1) 2. Summary SOW 2.0 Labor Cost 3. CLIN 1 Labor Cost Details 4. Summary SubK Cost (CLIN 1) 5. Summary SOW 2.0 SubK Cost 6. SubK Cost Details (CLIN 1) 7. Non-Labor Resources (CLIN 1) 8. Indirect Rates Summary Table 	The information is required to ensure the price evaluation is performed on a common basis between Offerors proposing a Hybrid Contract or 100% Firm Fixed Price.
49	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	MA.3	L-56	Sub-section mis-numbering error: there are two section "e"; the second one should be section "g"	Provision MA.3 will be updated in RFP Amendment 2.

United States Deorbit Vehicle
Final Request for Proposal Questions and Answers

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
50	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	M.2(b)	M-2	The Long Lead Parts purchased in CLIN 2, Milestone C2-1 are likely double booked in the Total Evaluated Price. These Long Lead Parts are part of the CLIN2 Core price and Delivery Order 2 price. Is it the Government's intention to count the price of these Long Lead Parts twice in the Total Evaluated Price for selection purposes?	RFP Amendment 1 updated this provision to remove the Delivery Order 2 price from the Total Evaluated Price. Offerors are advised that the Delivery Order 2 parts may only be a subset of the long lead parts procured in CLIN2 Milestone C2-1 (Refer to L-04B attachment, Assumption #1).
51	80JSC023 R0003 USDV RFP.pdf	M.3(b)	M-4	M.3(b) states, "To be considered by the Government, GTAs must be submitted to the applicable Center Partnership Office Point of Contact no later than 15 days after initial solicitation release", but L-08 states "Offerors shall submit all complete final GTA request form via email to...Kristi Duplichen, no later than 22 calendar days of the issue of the initial RFP". Please clarify which date is correct, or if these are two different submission requirements.	RFP Amendment 1 updated Provision M.3(b) to 22 days.
52	USDV Launch Vehicle Summary	6.1		NASA's launch services information summary document includes performance for a heavy-class launch vehicle up to 25mT to LEO. This curve is well below the LEO capability existing Launch Services Program providers. Can NASA please add additional clarification to that section in the launch services information summary that highlights this is not intended to be a maximum mass/performance limit for the USDV mission?	The USDV Launch Vehicle Summary will be updated and included with RFP Amendment 2.