

1  
2  
3  
4 **NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE LAUNCH (NSSL)**  
5 **PHASE 3 LANE 2 LAUNCH SERVICE PROCUREMENT**  
6 **FA8811-23-R-0002**  
7

8  
9  
10 **ATTACHMENT 12**  
11 **INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS (ITO)**  
12

13  
14  
15 **dRFP #2: 13 July 2023**  
16

17  
18  
19 **United States Space Force**  
20 **Space Systems Command (SSC)**  
21 **Assured Access to Space (AATS)**  
22 **Los Angeles Air Force Base, California**

## **1 PROGRAM STRUCTURE AND OBJECTIVES**

The Space Force Space Systems Command (SSC) will award three requirements contracts for launch services delivering multiple National Security Space (NSS) missions with annual ordering periods from Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 through FY 2029 comprising a portion of the National Security Space Launch (NSSL) program's manifest that will be ordered during that period. The general requirements for the launch services are defined in the Performance Work Statement (PWS) and Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL). Additionally, missions for the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) will have a companion contract for mission integration and additional security requirements.

## **2 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS**

The Offeror's proposal must include all data and information required by this Request for Proposal (RFP) and must be submitted in accordance with (IAW) these instructions. In developing the proposal, the Offeror shall ensure that its proposed offer complies with all the requirements contained in the RFP, to include the PWS and all its appendices, and CDRL. Any submitted proposal that does not adhere to the requirements in this RFP may be eliminated from the competition and ineligible for award.

The Offeror's proposal shall be clear, concise, and shall include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and substantiating the validity of stated claims. The proposal should not simply rephrase or restate the Government's requirements but shall provide convincing rationale to address how the Offeror's proposal meets or exceeds the full range of NSS requirements. The launch system the Offeror is proposing to fulfill the NSS requirements may include a single launch vehicle (LV) or a family of vehicles (Per SPRD Section 6.1.1 a launch system family is: A product line of launch vehicles offered by a launch vehicle contractor e.g., two different launch vehicles is acceptable). Offerors shall assume that the Government has no prior knowledge of its capabilities and experience. Nonetheless, during the source selection evaluation, the Government reserves the right to use data from other relevant sources.

The Government reserves the right to make award of the requirements contracts to three offerors without the use of discussions upon evaluation of the Offerors' initial proposals. However, the Government anticipates setting a competitive range and subsequently entering into discussions. The Government reserves the right to make a written request for information to evaluate any directly relevant information from performance on other contracts, ongoing early integration studies (EIS)/leading edge integration (LEI), mishap and anomaly investigations/findings, progress toward completing open Non-Recurring Design Validation (NRDV), and progress toward closing risk mitigation plans.

The proposal validity date must be specified, and the proposal must be valid for at least 365 calendar days after date of submission. In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) subpart 4.8, Government Contract Files, the Government will retain one copy of all

60 unsuccessful proposals. Unless the Offeror requests otherwise, the Government will destroy  
61 extra copies of such unsuccessful proposals.

## 62 **3 GENERAL INFORMATION**

### 63 **3.1 POINT OF CONTACT**

64 The Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO), Mrs. Kirsten Prechtl, is the sole point of contact for  
65 this acquisition. Address questions or concerns to the PCO at [kirsten.prechtl@spaceforce.mil](mailto:kirsten.prechtl@spaceforce.mil) or  
66 310-879-7530.

### 67 **3.2 DEBRIEFINGS**

68 The PCO will promptly notify Offerors of any decision to exclude them from the competitive  
69 range if a competitive range is established, whereupon they may request and receive a pre-award  
70 debriefing IAW FAR 15.505 or a post-award debriefing IAW FAR 15.506. In addition, the PCO  
71 will notify unsuccessful Offerors in the competitive range of the source selection decision IAW  
72 FAR 15.503. Upon such notification, unsuccessful Offerors may request and receive a post-  
73 award debriefing. Offerors desiring a debriefing must make their request IAW the requirements  
74 of FAR 15.505 or 15.506, as applicable.

### 75 **3.3 DISCREPANCIES**

76 If an Offeror believes that the requirements in this RFP contain an error or omission, or are  
77 otherwise unsound, the Offeror shall immediately notify the PCO in writing with supporting  
78 rationale as well as the remedies the Offeror is asking the PCO to consider as related to the  
79 omission or error.

### 80 **3.4 ELECTRONIC REFERENCE DOCUMENTS**

81 Referenced documents for this solicitation are available at <http://www.sam.gov> and the Bidders'  
82 Library. Offerors should contact the PCO to obtain access to the Bidders' Library. Potential  
83 Offerors are encouraged to subscribe for real-time e-mail notifications when information has  
84 been posted to the website for this solicitation.

### 85 **3.5 EXCHANGES**

86 Exchanges of source selection information between the Government and Offerors will be  
87 controlled by the PCO.

### 88 **3.6 DISCUSSIONS**

89 The Government reserves the right to award without discussions. However, if it is in the  
90 Government's best interest to hold discussions, then the Government may conduct discussions  
91 with Offerors after establishing a competitive range of the most highly rated proposals based on  
92 the ratings of each proposal against all evaluation criteria. The Government reserves the right to  
93 record audio telecommunications with the Offerors during the source selection.

### 3.7 USE OF NON-GOVERNMENT ADVISORS

Offerors are advised that data submitted to the Government in response to this solicitation will be released to individuals who work for the following company as non-Government advisors for review and analysis:

**Table 3.7-1: Source Selection Support Contractor**

| Company Name              | Address                                    |
|---------------------------|--|
| The Aerospace Corporation | P.O. Box 92957, Los Angeles, CA 90009-2957 |

Individuals from the above support contractor have signed individual non-disclosure agreements with the Government, which strictly prohibits any release or disclosure of information outside the source selection team.

Proposal submission constitutes written consent for the Government to release data submitted in response to this solicitation to the above-named company.

### 3.8 ALTERNATIVE OR MULTIPLE PROPOSALS

Alternative proposals will not be considered. Each Offeror may only submit one proposal.

## 4 PROPOSAL FORMAT

### 4.1 ORGANIZATION

The Offeror shall prepare the proposal as set forth in Table 4.1-1: Proposal Organization. The titles and contents of the volumes shall be as defined in this table and must adhere to the required page limits. The Volumes identified in the table shall be separately bound in three-ring, loose-leaf binders, plus each Volume's electronic copy shall be saved on a separate compact disc (CD) or digital video disc (DVD) for a total of six (6) total CDs or DVDs. Offeror shall use page separation tabs for each Factor and Subfactor for the Volume binders. The Offeror shall provide one hard copy of the proposal and two electronic copies of the proposal on CDs or DVDs (unclassified only). All classified sections of the proposal response shall be provided IAW Paragraph 4.4. The contents of each proposal volume are noted in the table below:

**Table 4.1-1: Proposal Organization**

| Volume | Title                                      |   | Hard Copies | Electronic Copies | Page Limit           |
|--------|--|---|-------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| I      | Executive Summary                          |   | 1           | 2                 | 15                   |
| II     | Minimum Gate – Approved Certification Plan |   | 1           | 2                 | Unlimited            |
| III    | Technical (Factor 1)                       | Subfactor 1: System Capability                          | 1           | 2                 | 60                   |
|        |  | Subfactor 2: SIS Category B                             | 1           | 2                 | 50                   |
|        |  | Subfactor 3: SIS Category C                             | 1           | 2                 | 60                   |
|        |  | Subfactor 4: System Risks and Mitigations               | 1           | 2                 | 100                  |
| IV     | Past Performance (Factor 2)                | Past Performance Information Forms Completed by Offeror | 1           | 2                 | 8 pages per contract |
|        |  | Team Member Consent Forms                               | 1           | 2                 | Unlimited            |
|        |  | Client Authorization Letters                            | 1           | 2                 | Unlimited            |
| V      | Small Business Participation (Factor 3)    |   | 1           | 2                 | Unlimited            |
| VI     | Price (Factor 4)                           |   | 1           | 2                 | Unlimited            |
| VII    | Model Contract                             |   | 1           | 2                 | Unlimited            |

**4.2 PAGE LIMITATIONS**

Page limitations shall be treated as maximums. If exceeded, the excess pages will not be read or considered in the evaluation of the proposal, and excess pages in paper copies will be shredded. If the Government issues Evaluation Notices (EN) for discussions, page limitations may be placed on responses to EN. The specified page limits for EN responses will be identified in the letters sent along with the EN to the Offerors. Unless otherwise specified, each page shall be counted except the following: cover/title pages, compliance matrix, cross-reference matrix, table of contents, lists of figures and tables, tabs, glossaries, and list of acronyms. For the Executive Summary, the page limit applies only to the Narrative Summary. The dispersion tables and diagrams for the Monte Carlo Orbital Parameter Accuracy and Mass-to-Orbit analyses do not count towards page limits within Technical, Factor 1, Subfactor 1. Elaborate brochures or documentation, binding, detailed artwork, or other embellishments are unnecessary and are not desired.

### 4.3 PAGE SIZE AND FORMAT

A page is defined as each face of a sheet of paper containing information. When both sides of a sheet display printed material, it shall be counted as two pages. Page size shall be 8.5 by 11 inches (in.), not including foldouts. Except for the reproduced sections of the solicitation document, the text size shall be no less than 12 point using Times New Roman font type. Tracking, kerning, and leading values shall not be changed from the default values of the word processing or page layout software. Use at least 1 in. margins on the top and bottom and ¾ in. side margins. Pages shall be numbered sequentially by volume. These page size and format restrictions shall also apply to EN responses.

Legible tables, charts, graphs, and figures shall be used wherever practical to depict organizations, systems and layout, implementation schedules, plans, etc. These displays shall be uncomplicated and legible and shall not exceed 11 by 17 in. in size. Foldout pages shall fold entirely within the volume, and each face of the foldout containing information will be counted as a single page. Foldout pages may only be used for large tables, charts, graphs, and figures, not for pages of text. For tables, charts, graphs, and figures, the text may be in the Offeror's preferred format.

### 4.4 CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

The Offeror shall provide unclassified proposal responses to the greatest extent possible. If classified information is provided as part of the proposal response, it shall be provided electronically via appropriate communication channels and as a single classified addendum. No bound, hard copies will be required. The electronic classified addendum shall be submitted according to the applicable security regulations as follows: Department of Defense (DoD) 5220.22-M, the NSSL Security Classification and Declassification Guide, Integrated NRO Classification Guide, NRO Launch Information Protection Guide, and the Air Force DD Form 254. Each entry in the classified addendum shall be referenced to the proposal volume, Factor/Subfactor, page number, and paragraph number to which it applies. Similarly, a reference shall be placed in the unclassified volume where the classified insert applies, giving the page and paragraph numbers within the addendum where it can be found. Pages in a classified addendum will be included in the page count for the applicable volume. For example, if the unclassified section is one-half page and the classified section is one-half page, they will be evaluated as a single page with regard to the page count, not as two pages.

### 4.5 CROSS-REFERENCING

Each volume shall be written on a stand-alone basis so that its contents may be evaluated without cross-referencing to other volumes of the proposal. However, cross-referencing within a proposal volume is permitted where its use would conserve space without impairing clarity.

#### **4.6 INDEXING**

Each volume shall contain a table of contents with more detail than the master table of contents included in the Executive Summary Volume. Tab indexing shall be used to identify sections.

#### **4.7 GROUND RULES AND ASSUMPTIONS**

Each volume shall contain the complete set of the offeror's ground rules and assumptions. For example, the Technical Volume shall contain ground rules and assumptions across all volumes (i.e., those that apply to Technical, Small Business, Past Performance, and Pricing Volumes). The ground rules and assumptions will not count against the offerors page count for that volume.

#### **4.8 GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

Each volume shall contain a glossary of all abbreviations and acronyms used with a definition for each item.

#### **4.9 BINDING AND LABELING**

Each volume of the proposal shall be separately bound in a three-ring, loose-leaf binder, permitting the volume to lie flat when open. Staples shall not be used. A cover sheet shall be placed in the front sleeve of each volume, clearly marked as to volume number, title, copy number, solicitation identification, and the Offeror's name. The same identifying data shall be placed on the spine of each binder. Be sure to apply all appropriate markings including those prescribed IAW FAR 52.215-1(e) (Restriction on disclosure and use of data) and FAR 3.104-4 (Disclosure, Protection, and Marking of Contractor Bid or Proposal Information and Source Selection Information).

#### **4.10 ELECTRONIC OFFERS**

The content and page size of electronic copies must be identical to the hard copy. All CDs shall be placed in plastic sleeves that open on the top in one separate binder, with the volume number and title indicated on each disc. Hypertext links shall be used to facilitate navigation within the document. Use separate files to permit rapid location of all portions, including factors, exhibits, annexes, and attachments, if any. If files are compressed, the necessary decompression program must be included. The electronic copies of the proposal shall be submitted in a format readable by Microsoft (MS) Office Word 2010/2016, MS Office Excel 2010/2016, MS Office Project 2010/2016, and MS Office Power Point 2010/2016, as applicable. In the event there are discrepancies between the hard copy and the electronic copies of the proposal, the electronic copies will be used for evaluation. The "original" electronic copy of the proposal shall be identified.

#### **4.11 DELIVERY INSTRUCTIONS**

Delivery of proposals shall be coordinated with the PCO at least one (1) business day in advance of the due date and time. Early deliveries of proposals shall also be coordinated with the PCO. Electronic and hard copies of proposals are due **15 December 2023 by 4:00 pm Pacific Time.**

Proposals received after the date and time specified will be treated IAW FAR 52.212-1(f). If a proposal will contain classified information, Offerors shall coordinate with the PCO at least seven (7) calendar days in advance of the due date and time.

Proposals shall be addressed to the PCO and mailed, or hand carried to:

SSC/AAK  
Attn: Mrs. Kirsten Prechtl  
483 N. Aviation Blvd.  
El Segundo, CA 90245

## **5 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The purpose of the Executive Summary Volume is to provide a complete overview of the Offeror's proposal. The Executive Summary Volume will not be evaluated, scored, or used to clarify discrepant information in other volumes. Any summary material presented in the Executive Summary Volume will not be considered as meeting the requirements for any portions of other volumes of the proposal. Do not include cost information. The Offeror shall provide the following information in the Executive Summary:

### **5.1 NARRATIVE SUMMARY**

The Executive Summary shall describe the proposed launch system and its prominent and distinguishing features. The narrative summary of the entire proposal shall be concise, to include addressing any risk areas and mitigation plans, and highlighting any key or unique features. The Executive Summary shall stand alone and not directly reference the other sections of the proposal. At a minimum:

- a. The Offeror shall address the ability to meet or exceed all NSS reference orbits' mass-to-orbit requirements and payload envelope categories, as defined in the NSSL System Performance Requirements Document (SPRD) Revision C, Tables 1 and 2, and NSSL Standard Interface Specification (SIS) Revision D, paragraph 3.1.1.4.
- b. The Offeror shall address the ability to meet or exceed all NSS reference orbital parameter accuracy requirements, as defined in the SPRD Rev C, Tables 3 and 4.
- c. The Offeror shall address the characteristics of its launch system infrastructure, including a description of both the East and West coast launch sites, that meet or exceed NSS requirements in the SPRD Rev C, paragraphs 3.2.7 Payload Orientation, 3.2.9 Launch Rate, 3.2.11 Basing, and 3.3.2 Protection of NSS Payload requirements.
- d. If the Offeror is involved in current NSSL certification efforts or will need to initiate future NSSL certification efforts, the Offeror shall outline the plan to achieve NSSL certification for the LV (or family of LVs) that meets or exceeds all NSS launch requirements.
- e. The Offeror shall briefly summarize any relevant launch system experience.

- f. The Offeror shall state in Table 5.1-1, for each reference orbit, a single, “primary” launch vehicle configuration that meets or exceeds all the reference orbit requirements. Mission reliability methodology for a single space vehicle (SV) payload configuration is defined in the SPRD Rev C, Appendix B.

**Table 5.1-1: NSSL Approach**

| Reference Orbit | Primary Launch Vehicle Configuration | Mission Reliability (%) |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| LEO             |                                      |                         |
| Polar 1         |                                      |                         |
| Polar 2         |                                      |                         |
| MEO Direct      |                                      |                         |
| MEO Direct 2    |                                      |                         |
| MEO Transfer    |                                      |                         |
| MEO Transfer 2  |                                      |                         |
| GTO             |                                      |                         |
| Molniya         |                                      |                         |
| GEO 1           |                                      |                         |
| GEO 1.5         |                                      |                         |
| GEO 2           |                                      |                         |

## **5.2 OFFEROR’S PROPOSED TEAM**

The Offeror shall briefly identify the Offeror’s team to include major subcontractors.

## **5.3 MASTER TABLE OF CONTENTS**

The Offeror shall include a master table of contents of the entire proposal.

## **5.4 CROSS REFERENCE MATRIX**

The Offeror shall fill in the proposal column of the cross-reference matrix below with the volume, sections, and paragraph numbers from its proposal that correspond with the paragraph numbers from Attachment 12 and Attachment 13 listed below.

**Table 5.4-1: Cross Reference Matrix**

| Volume   | Attachment 12:<br>Instructions to<br>Offerors | Attachment 13:<br>Evaluation Criteria | Counted<br>Towards<br>Maximum<br>Page<br>Limitation<br>(Y/N) | Proposal<br>Volume,<br>Section,<br>Paragraphs |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Volume I: Executive<br>Summary                           | 5.1   | N/A                                   | Y  | *   |
|  | 5.2   | N/A                                   | Y  | *   |
|  | 5.3   | N/A                                   | N  | *   |
|  | 5.4   | N/A                                   | N  | *   |
| Volume II Minimum<br>Gate                                | 6   | 6                                     | N  | *   |
| Volume III:<br>Technical/System<br>Capability            | 7.3   | 7.3                                   | Y  | *   |
| Volume III:<br>Technical/SIS Category<br>B               | 7.4   | 7.4                                   | Y  | *   |
| Volume III<br>Technical/SIS Category<br>C                | 7.5   | 7.5                                   | Y  | *   |
| Volume III:<br>Technical/System Risks<br>and Mitigations | 7.6   | 7.6                                   | Y  | *   |
| Volume IV: Past<br>Performance                           | 8   | 8                                     | Y  | *   |
| Volume V: Small<br>Business Participation                | 9   | 9                                     | N  | *   |
| Volume VI: Price   | 10  | 10                                    | N  | *   |
| Volume VII: Model<br>Contract                            | 11  | N/A                                   | N  | *   |

*\* To be filled in by Offeror*

## **6 MINIMUM GATE: APPROVED LAUNCH SYSTEM CERTIFICATION PLAN**

6.1 Pursuant to FAR15.306(c)(2), the PCO may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals. In the first phase of the evaluation, an Offeror's proposal must meet the Minimum Gate, before moving to the second phase of the evaluation. Offerors not meeting the Minimum Gate would then be excluded from further evaluation in the second phase and will receive an unsuccessful offeror letter IAW FAR 15.503(a)(1).

6.2 The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror has an existing or newly approved Certification Plan(s) if that launch system is not already certified. Offerors must submit any existing or newly approved Certification Plan(s) that addresses system development to meet the full range of NSSL requirements if launch system is not already certified. For certified launch

systems that have not changed capabilities, offerors do not have to conduct a new/delta certification.

6.3 Offerors who meet the Minimum Gate and advance to the second phase of the evaluation will be evaluated using the factors listed below.

## **7 FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL**

The purpose of this factor is to obtain information to evaluate how the Offeror's proposed launch system(s) will meet or exceed NSS requirements, meet selected requirements of sample NSSL missions, and meet key mission Initial Launch Capability (ILC) dates. The SPRD Rev C and the SIS Rev D are listed as compliance documents in PWS Appendix C, and nothing in this ITO relieves Offerors from having to meet those requirements.

### **7.1 RESERVED**

### **7.2 RESERVED**

### **7.3 SUBFACTOR 1: SYSTEM CAPABILITY**

#### **7.3.1 MASS-TO-ORBIT**

The Offeror shall state its launch system offering's mass-to-orbit capabilities for each proposed configuration for applicable reference orbits (as defined by the SPRD Rev C, Tables 1 and 2) in Table 7.3.1-1. For each reference orbit, the Offeror shall designate (with an upper case "P") a single, "primary" LV configuration, which meets or exceeds all requirements for that reference orbit. The maximum mass-to-orbit capabilities shall be calculated as defined in the SPRD Rev C, Appendix A, and must be inclusive of all Government directed and any applicable contractor performance reserves and Orbital Debris Mitigation Standard Practices (ODMSP) compliance (note: TOR-2023-01395 "Disposal Options for Selected Orbits" provides a methodology for evaluating long-term propagation and collision probability for orbits near GEO and MEO and may be used to evaluate compliance of disposal requirements). The Flight Performance Reserve value shall be calculated for the primary launch vehicle configuration for each reference orbit by 6 degrees-of-freedom Monte Carlo methodology or an alternate method. The preferred method is Monte Carlo. If the Monte Carlo methodology is selected, then a minimum of 10,125 runs shall be performed. The propellant margin values from these runs shall be sorted from their lowest to highest values and the 14th lowest value will be the 99.865% probability at 50% confidence propellant margin. If an alternate method is selected, the Offeror shall provide evidence that demonstrates the flight performance reserve is conservative with respect to the Monte Carlo evaluation described above. The Offeror shall describe the analysis and methodology it used to calculate the mass-to-orbit capability. The analysis methodology shall be based on either demonstrated flight performance or engineering data. If the analysis methodology is based on demonstrated flight performance, the offeror shall submit evidence of how the model was updated based on flight data along with historical orbital accuracy information. The Offeror shall state the launch origination point (Eastern or Western Range)

used for their calculation. If the Offeror intends to recover launch service hardware, the Offeror shall ensure that the performance required to recover the hardware is included under its contractor performance reserves and so indicate in its configuration description.

**Table 7.3.1-1: Mass-to-Orbit Capabilities of Proposed Configurations by Reference Orbit**

| Configuration   | LEO | Polar 1 | Polar 2 | MEO Direct | MEO Transfer | GTO | Molniya | GEO 1 | GEO 2 |
|-----------------|-----|---------|---------|------------|--------------|-----|---------|-------|-------|
| Configuration a |     |         |         |            |              |     |         |       |       |
| Configuration b |     |         |         |            |              |     |         |       |       |
| ...             |     |         |         |            |              |     |         |       |       |
| Configuration n |     |         |         |            |              |     |         |       |       |

| Configuration   | MEO Direct 2 | MEO Transfer 2 | GEO 1.5 |
|-----------------|--------------|----------------|---------|
| Configuration a |              |                |         |
| Configuration b |              |                |         |
| ...             |              |                |         |
| Configuration n |              |                |         |

Each capability listed shall be also listed in Appendix F of this attachment.

### **7.3.2 ORBITAL PARAMETER ACCURACY**

For the primary launch vehicle configuration of each reference orbit (as designated in section 7.3.1), the Offeror shall provide, in Table 7.3.2-1, the orbital parameter accuracies for that configuration IAW SPRD Rev C, paragraph 3.2.4 probability and confidence requirements and SPRD Rev C Appendix A Section A.5. The Offeror shall provide a detailed description of its approach to meet all orbital parameter accuracy requirements for the launch configuration proposed. The orbital parameter accuracy values shall be calculated by 6-degrees-of-freedom Monte Carlo methodology or by Covariance analysis. The preferred method is Monte Carlo. If the Monte Carlo methodology is selected, then a minimum of 10,125 runs shall be performed. The orbital parameters having a two-sided distribution shall be sorted from their lowest to highest values, and the 14th lowest and 14th highest values will be the 99.73% probability at 50% confidence orbital parameters. The orbital parameters having a one-sided distribution shall be sorted from their lowest to highest values, and the 14th highest value will be the 99.865% probability at 50% confidence orbital parameters. If a Covariance analysis is selected to determine the orbital parameter accuracy, the Offeror shall provide evidence that demonstrates

the orbital parameter accuracy is conservative with respect to the Monte Carlo evaluation described above. The Offeror shall describe and justify the methods used in determining the orbital parameter accuracy. The analysis methodology shall be based on either demonstrated flight performance or engineering data. If the analysis methodology is based on demonstrated flight performance, the offeror shall submit evidence of how the model was updated based on flight data and provide the associated historical orbital accuracy information.

**Table 7.3.2-1: Orbital Parameter Accuracies**

| Reference Orbit | Primary Launch Vehicle Configuration | Perigee Altitude (nmi) | Apogee Altitude (nmi) | Inclination (deg) | Argument of Perigee (deg) | Right Ascension of Ascending Node (deg) |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|---|
| LEO             |                                      |                        |                       |                   | N/A                       |   |
| Polar 1         |                                      |                        |                       |                   | N/A                       |   |
| Polar 2         |                                      |                        |                       |                   | N/A                       |   |
| MEO Direct      |                                      |                        |                       |                   | N/A                       |   |
| MEO Direct 2    |                                      |                        |                       |                   | N/A                       |   |
| MEO Transfer    |                                      |                        |                       |                   |                           |   |
| MEO Transfer 2  |                                      |                        |                       |                   |                           |   |
| GTO             |                                      |                        |                       |                   |                           |   |
| Molniya         |                                      |                        |                       |                   |                           |   |
| GEO 1           |                                      |                        |                       |                   | N/A                       | N/A                                     |
| GEO 1.5         |                                      |                        |                       |                   | N/A                       | N/A                                     |
| GEO 2           |                                      |                        |                       |                   | N/A                       | N/A                                     |

For each reference orbit, the Offeror shall describe all dispersions used to generate orbital parameter accuracy. All dispersions shall be listed in Table 7.3.2-2 with required data to describe the dispersions, including statistical distribution type (e.g., Gaussian, uniform), including justifications in a separate narrative.

**Table 7.3.2-2: Reference Orbit Dispersions List**

| Dispersion  | -3 sigma value       | Nominal              | +3 sigma value       | Statistical Distribution Type |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Parameter i | [Offeror to fill-in] | [Offeror to fill-in] | [Offeror to fill-in] | [Offeror to fill-in]          |

|             |                      |                      |                      |                      |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Parameter n | [Offeror to fill-in] | [Offeror to fill-in] | [Offeror to fill-in] | [Offeror to fill-in] |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|

### 7.3.3 MISSION ASSURANCE

#### 7.3.3.1 Mission Assurance Approach

The Offeror shall describe its mission assurance approach, the processes and relevant command media used, and the products it routinely generates as part of its mission assurance process from launch system development through flight to ensure mission success. The Offeror shall describe how the mission assurance approach identifies, assesses, and mitigates risk from launch system development through flight.

#### 7.3.3.2 Integration of Mission Assurance Products

The Offeror shall provide a description of how it will integrate its mission assurance processes, products, and command media with the Government's mission assurance processes.

#### 7.3.3.3 Subcontractor Mission Assurance

The Offeror shall describe how it flows down mission assurance requirements to subcontractors of flight critical items (hardware and software). The Offeror shall describe how it will ensure that subcontractor mission assurance approaches, processes, and products are in alignment with its own and Government mission assurance requirements. The Offeror shall describe how the mission assurance approach identifies, assesses, and mitigates subcontractor related risks.

### 7.4 SUBFACTOR 2: SIS CATEGORY B

This Subfactor addresses the Offeror's approach to launching sample NSSL Category B payload envelope missions. These sample missions are illustrative of missions that could be assigned under the Phase 3 contract; however, they are defined here for information purposes only. Each sample mission described in this document has an Interface Requirements Document (IRD) that is available in the Bidders' Library. For the purposes of the proposal evaluation, sample mission requirements, specified in this ITO, take precedence over the sample mission IRD. This subfactor addresses the Offeror's CONOPs approach. Additionally, this Subfactor addresses the readiness of the Offeror's proposed launch system(s) towards meeting NSSL ILC dates for Category B missions.

#### 7.4.1 CATEGORY B SAMPLE MISSIONS

##### 7.4.1.1 Category B LEO

The following information is provided as context for addressing the specific requirements in the following subparagraphs. This mission is a Category B "high" (7500 km semi-major axis) LEO mission launched from the Eastern or Western Range at the Offeror's option. The Integrated Payload Stack (IPS) consists of a primary SV, which is Category A in volume, and four Evolved Secondary Payload Adapter (ESPA) class satellites on an ESPA "Grande" ring. The orbital

parameters and injection accuracy requirements are those listed in Phase 3 LEO IRD Tables 3.4.1.1-1 and 3.4.1.2-1 in the Bidder's Library. The SV mass-to-orbit requirements are specified in Phase 3 LEO IRD paragraph 3.1.3.1. Other mission-specific requirements are provided in the Phase 3 LEO IRD. The following tables summarize performance requirements.

**Table 7.4.1.1-1: Mission Performance Requirements**

| Nearest Ref Orbit | Integrated Payload Stack Mass (lbm) | Semi-major Axis (nmi) | Eccentricity | Inclination (deg) | Argument of Perigee (deg) | RAAN (deg) | Payload Envelope |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------|------------------|
| LEO               | 14,903*                             | 4049.7                | 0.0131       | 63.535            | 190                       | 0          | B**              |

\* Per Phase 3 LEO IRD paragraph 3.1.3.1, maximum primary payload weight is 11,600 pounds and maximum ESPA payload weight is 3,140 pounds (ESPA Grande ring and four multi-manifest SVs).

\*\* Primary payload requires payload envelope A, while Integrated Payload Stack including ESPA Grande is payload envelope B.

**Table 7.4.1.1-2: Mission Orbital Accuracy Requirements**

| Nearest Ref Orbit | Apogee (nmi) | Perigee (nmi) | Inclination (deg) | Argument of Perigee (deg) | RAAN (deg) |
|-------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| LEO               | ±11.98       | ±4.96         | ±0.15             | ±5                        | ±0.2       |

The following are mission-specific requirements provided for information purposes only:

- Electrical trailblazer per Phase 3 LEO IRD Appendix B
- Horizontal or vertical integration
- Ordnance circuit verification
- Flight umbilical checkouts
- SV preparations at launch site
- Category A EELV SIS Rev D payload envelope acoustic environment
- Multi-manifest/Rideshare (ESPA Grande)

#### **7.4.1.1.1 LEO Launch Operations Concept of Operations (CONOPS)**

The Offeror shall describe their Phase 3 LEO IRD compliant Launch Operations CONOPS, including a graphical representation. The CONOPS shall include:

- Proposed launch operations flow from the time the Government provides the IPS elements to the Offeror as Government Property for encapsulation through liftoff, to include any contingency procedures;
- SV processing and encapsulation plans, either oriented to the Astrotech Processing Facility (APF) at Vandenberg Space Force Base (VSFB) for a Western Range solution, or

oriented to the Eastern Processing Facility (EPF) at Cape Canaveral Space Force Station (CCSFS) for an Eastern Range solution, and horizontal/vertical payload handling; and

3. LV to IPS mechanical and electrical interface verification to include end-to-end ordnance circuit continuity testing as defined in the Phase 3 LEO IRD, paragraph 3.2.3.7.5.6.

#### 7.4.1.2 Category B Molniya

The following information is provided as context for addressing the specific requirements in the following subparagraphs. This mission is a Category B mission for a modified Molniya orbit launched from the Western Range. The orbital parameters and injection accuracy requirements are those listed in Phase 3 Molniya IRD Tables 3.1.1.1-1 and 3.1.1.2-1 located in the Bidder's Library. The SV mass-to-orbit requirements are specified in Phase 3 Molniya IRD paragraph 3.1.1. The following tables summarize performance requirements.

**Table 7.4.1.2-1: Mission Performance Requirements**

| Nearest Ref Orbit | Payload Mass (lbm) | Apogee (nmi) | Perigee (nmi) | Inclination (deg) | Argument of Perigee (deg) | RAAN (deg) | Payload Envelope |
|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------|------------------|
| Molniya           | 12,900             | 9287         | 1250          | 63.4              | 270                       | TBD        | B                |

**Table 7.4.1.2-2: Mission Orbital Accuracy Requirements**

| Nearest Ref Orbit | Apogee (nmi) | Perigee (nmi) | Inclination (deg) | Argument of Perigee (deg) | RAAN (deg) |
|-------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| Molniya           | ±60          | ±5            | ±0.1              | ±0.1                      | ±0.1       |

The following are mission-specific requirements provided for information purposes only:

- a. Vertical or horizontal integration of the encapsulated SV to the LV
- b. Radio Frequency (RF) attenuation as documented in the Phase 3 Molniya IRD to include during Payload Fairing (PLF) door access operations

#### 7.4.1.2.1 Molniya Mission Profile

The Offeror shall describe its launch configuration for this sample mission. The Offeror shall provide a mission profile including upper stage ODMSP compliant disposal approach. The mission profile shall include the significant sequence of events to include times with respect to liftoff. At a minimum, the sequence of events shall include the following mission profile events listed below (a-j). The Offeror shall address Launch Profile Unique Maneuvers as required in the Phase 3 Molniya IRD, paragraphs 3.1.1 through 3.1.4. If an event is not applicable, the Offeror shall provide supporting rationale for its exclusion.

- a. First stage propulsion system(s) start
- b. Solid rocket motor ignition (if applicable)
- c. Solid rocket motor burnout and jettison sequence (if applicable)

- d. First stage, and subsequent (if applicable), engine cutoff and separation events
- e. Payload Fairing (PLF) jettison (if applicable)
- f. Upper stage engine burn ignition(s), cutoff(s), and coast time(s)
- g. SV separation
- h. Initiation of upper stage Contamination and Collision Avoidance Maneuver(s) (CCAM)
- i. Upper stage disposal initiation (ODMSP compliant)
- j. End of mission for upper stage, where end of mission is defined as the completion of passivation with no further planned maneuvers, or through upper stage impact after controlled reentry

The Offeror shall provide evidence for the applicable portions of the mission profile that have been flight demonstrated by the proposed launch vehicle system or a relevant comparison launch vehicle. The Offeror shall identify any applicable portions of the mission profile that have not yet been flight demonstrated by the proposed launch vehicle system or relevant comparison launch vehicle. For these applicable undemonstrated mission profile portions, the Offeror shall provide engineering and risk analyses of the affected launch vehicle subsystems. The Offeror shall provide mitigation approaches that address identified risks associated with the applicable undemonstrated portions of the proposed mission profile.

#### 7.4.1.3 Category B GEO 1.5 Co-Manifested Mission

This mission is a co-manifested sample mission with an augmented ESPA aft payload and a testbed satellite vehicle (SV) forward payload. This mission is a Category B GEO 1.5 mission. The orbital parameters and injection accuracy requirements are those listed in Phase 3 GEO 1.5 IRD Tables 2.1-1 and 2.1-2. The SV Mass-to-Orbit requirements are specified in Phase 3 GEO 1.5 Table 2.1-1. Other mission-specific requirements are provided in the Phase 3 GEO 1.5 IRD. The following tables summarize performance requirements.

**Table 7.4.1.3-1: GEO 1.5 Mission Performance Requirements**

| Nearest Ref Orbit | Payload Mass (lbm) | Apogee (nmi) | Perigee (nmi) | Inclination (deg) | Payload Envelope |
|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------|
| GEO 1.5           | 5500               | 19493        | 19493         | 0                 | B                |

**Table 7.4.1.3-2: GEO 1.5 Mission Orbital Accuracy Requirements**

| Nearest Ref Orbit | Apogee (nmi) | Perigee (nmi) | Inclination (deg) |
|-------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|
| GEO 1.5           | ±80          | ±80           | ±0.1              |

The following are mission-specific requirements:

1. Multi-manifest/rideshare
2. Forward and aft Space Vehicle access after encapsulation
3. Additional separation ordnance circuits

4. Primary and redundant ordnance circuit end-to-end continuity test at the launch complex
5. Aft payload fairing Environmental Control System (ECS)
6. T-0 GN2 instrument (spot) purge
7. Payload power during ascent
8. Integrated Payload Stack (a payload mounted to an ESPA ring port) integration/swap at NLT L-30 days
9. Cleared integrators
10. Horizontal or Vertical Integration

The Offeror shall provide the following detailed information for this sample mission:

#### **7.4.1.3.1 GEO 1.5 Mission Profile/Sequence of Events**

The Offeror shall describe its launch configuration for this sample mission. The Offeror shall provide a mission profile including upper stage disposal approach. The mission profile shall include the proposed launch site and significant sequence of events to include times with respect to liftoff. At a minimum, the sequence of events shall include the following mission profile events listed below (a-j); and the Offeror shall include any other significant events in the proposed mission profile. This mission requires multiple separation events – first, the separation of the testbed SV, and second, the separation of the augmented ESPA SV. If an event is not applicable, the Offeror shall provide supporting rationale for its exclusion.

- a. First stage propulsion system(s) start
- b. Solid rocket motor ignition, burnout and jettison sequence (if applicable)
- c. First stage, and subsequent (if applicable), engine cutoff and separation events
- d. PLF jettison
- e. Upper stage engine burn ignition(s), cutoff(s) and coast time(s)
- f. Testbed SV separation
- g. Augmented ESPA SV separation(s)
- h. Initiation of upper stage CCAMs
- i. Upper stage disposal initiation
- j. End of mission for upper stage, where end of mission is defined as the completion of passivation with no further planned maneuvers, or through upper stage impact after controlled reentry.

The Offeror shall provide evidence for the applicable portions of the mission profile that have been flight demonstrated by the proposed launch vehicle or a relevant comparison launch vehicle. The Offeror shall identify any applicable portions of the mission profile that have not yet been flight demonstrated by the proposed launch vehicle or relevant comparison launch vehicle. For these applicable undemonstrated mission profile portions, the Offeror shall provide engineering and risk analyses of the affected launch vehicle subsystems. The Offeror shall provide mitigation approaches that address identified risks associated with the applicable undemonstrated portions of the proposed mission profile.

#### **7.4.1.3.2 Mission Unique Integration (Co-Manifested Payloads)**

The Offeror shall provide CONOPS for the integration of the two SVs. The Offeror shall describe the following: encapsulation processes, forward and aft payload access during integration and prior to final closeouts and meeting unique environmental control system requirements for both SVs while encapsulated on the launch pad. Furthermore, the Offeror shall describe its: launch environments for the two SVs, separation attitude and re-contact analyses, and multiple separation signal/circuit capabilities. In addition, the Offeror shall provide a detailed description of its approach for placing the augmented ESPA in the same initial orbit as the testbed SV per the Phase 3 GEO 1.5 IRD.

#### **7.4.1.3.3 GEO 1.5 Classified Payload Management**

The Offeror shall provide a detailed plan to manage and process classified payloads (Special Access Program/Special Access Required), and handle and protect classified mission data (requirements, analysis inputs and results). The proposed plan shall be supported by previously demonstrated efforts. If never demonstrated, the Offeror shall provide evidence-based rationale to support the proposed plan.

### **7.4.2 CATEGORY B SYSTEM READINESS**

This element addresses the Offeror's launch system readiness with respect to the Launch System Maturity Assessment Process (LSMAP) (LE OI 17-001 dated 2 April 2018) and Offeror's plan to meet a 1 October 2026 launch date. Whether the Offeror is involved in current NSSL certification efforts or will need to initiate future NSSL certification efforts, the Offeror shall request, from the Government, LSMAP reports for its launch system(s) that meet all Category B requirements. The LSMAP captures any relevant demonstrated flight data of the proposed system. The Offeror shall append the LSMAP evaluation reports to its proposal. LSMAP evaluation reports will not count against page limit. The Government will request updated LSMAP reports during discussions and with the Final Proposal Revision (FPR).

#### **7.4.2.1 Category B System Technical Assessment**

In a narrative, the Offeror shall provide a summary of its Category B system LSMAP technical assessment and describe the primary drivers for the assessments. The Offeror shall describe plans to complete remaining NRDV, to include all data and support for USSF IV&V completion, for its Category B system. The Offeror shall provide the rationale, assumptions, supporting data, and methodology used to formulate its plans.

#### **7.4.2.2 Category B System Eastern Range Schedule Assessment**

In a narrative, the Offeror shall provide a summary of its Category B system LSMAP schedule assessment for launch capability for a mission with an ILC of 1 October 2026 from CCSFS and/or KSC. The Offeror shall describe the primary drivers for the assessment. The Offeror shall describe its plan to meet the ILC date using the proposed launch system. The Offeror shall provide the rationale, assumptions, supporting data, and methodology used to formulate its plans.

Secondary launch systems will not be considered a viable risk mitigation strategy for the Eastern Range schedule assessment for meeting ILC dates.

#### **7.4.2.3 Category B System Western Range Schedule Assessment**

In a narrative, the Offeror shall provide a summary of its Category B system LMAP schedule assessment for launch capability for a mission with an ILC of 1 October 2026 from VSFB. The Offeror shall describe the primary drivers for the assessment. The Offeror shall describe its plan to meet the ILC date using the proposed launch system. The Offeror shall provide the rationale, assumptions, supporting data, and methodology used to formulate its plans.

### **7.5 SUBFACTOR 3: SIS CATEGORY C**

This Subfactor addresses the Offeror's approach to launching sample NSSL Category C payload envelope missions. These sample missions are illustrative of missions that could be assigned under the Phase 3 contract; however, they are defined here for information purposes only. Each mission has a supporting IRD. For the purposes of the proposal evaluation, sample requirements, specified in the ITO, take precedence over the sample mission IRD. Additionally, this Subfactor addresses the readiness of the Offeror's proposed launch system(s) towards meeting NSSL ILC dates for Category C missions.

#### **7.5.1 CATEGORY C SAMPLE MISSIONS**

##### **7.5.1.1 Category C GEO 2**

The following information is provided as context for addressing the specific requirements in the following subparagraphs. This mission is a Category C GEO 2 mission. The orbital parameters and injection accuracy requirements for the GEO 2 mission are those listed in SPRD Rev C Tables 1 and 3. The GEO 2 Space Vehicle (SV) Mass-to-Orbit requirements are specified in SPRD Rev C Table 1. Other mission-specific requirements are provided in the Phase 3 GEO 2 IRD. The following tables summarize performance requirements.

**Table 7.5.1.1-1: Mission Performance Requirements**

| <b>Nearest Ref Orbit</b> | <b>Payload Mass (lbm)</b> | <b>Apogee (nmi)</b> | <b>Perigee (nmi)</b> | <b>Inclination (deg)</b> | <b>Payload Envelope</b> |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| GEO 2                    | 14500                     | 19323               | 19323                | 0                        | C                       |

**Table 7.5.1.1-2: Mission Orbital Accuracy Requirements**

| <b>Nearest Ref Orbit</b> | <b>Apogee (nmi)</b> | <b>Perigee (nmi)</b> | <b>Inclination (deg)</b> | <b>Right Ascension of Ascending Node (RAAN) (deg)</b> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---|
| GEO 2                    | ±80                 | ±80                  | ±0.1                     | N/A   |

The following are mission-specific requirements provided for information purposes only:

- a. Vertical integration with on-pad payload access
- b. RF protected payload compartment from Payload Processing Facility (PPF) departure through PLF separation per SIS Rev D, Appendix A.7
- c. Mission Support Equipment (MSE) accommodations
- d. Long coast
- e. Five “Dipout” maneuvers during transfer orbit coast
- f. 1 hour launch window with eclipse period avoidance constraints, any day of the year

#### **7.5.1.1.1 GEO 2 Mission Profile**

The Offeror shall describe its launch configuration for this sample mission. The Offeror shall provide a mission profile including upper stage ODMSP compliant disposal approach. The mission profile shall include the proposed launch site and significant sequence of events to include times with respect to liftoff. At a minimum, the sequence of events shall include the following mission profile events listed below (a-j). The Offeror shall address Launch Profile Unique Maneuvers as required in the Phase 3 GEO 2 IRD, paragraphs 3.1.1, and 3.1.3 through 3.1.7. If an event is not applicable, the Offeror shall provide supporting rationale for its exclusion.

- a. First stage propulsion system(s) start
- b. Solid rocket motor ignition (if applicable)
- c. Solid rocket motor burnout and jettison sequence (if applicable)
- d. First stage, and subsequent (if applicable), engine cutoff and separation event(s)
- e. PLF jettison (if applicable)
- f. Upper stage engine burn ignition(s), cutoff(s), dipout(s) timing, and coast time(s)
- g. SV separation
- h. Initiation of upper stage CCAM(s)
- i. Upper stage disposal initiation (ODMSP compliant)
- j. End of mission for upper stage, where end of mission is defined as the completion of passivation with no further planned maneuvers, or through upper stage impact after controlled reentry

The Offeror shall provide evidence for the applicable portions of the mission profile that have been flight demonstrated by the proposed launch vehicle system or a relevant comparison launch vehicle. The Offeror shall identify any applicable portions of the mission profile that have not yet been flight demonstrated by the proposed launch vehicle system or relevant comparison launch vehicle. For these applicable undemonstrated mission profile portions, the Offeror shall provide engineering and risk analyses of the affected launch vehicle subsystems. The Offeror shall provide mitigation approaches that address identified risks associated with the applicable undemonstrated portions of the proposed mission profile.

#### **7.5.1.1.2 GEO 2 Mission Support Equipment (MSE) Accommodations**

The Offeror shall describe its approach to providing mechanical interfaces to the SV-provided MSE as described in SIS Rev D, Appendix A, paragraph A.8 and Phase 3 GEO 2 IRD, paragraphs 3.1.6 and 3.2.3.2. The Offeror shall describe analysis demonstrating that the mechanical interface is able to withstand launch and ascent loads while maintaining adequate positive clearance between the retracted MSE and the SV during all applicable flight events. The Offeror shall describe its approach to facilitate MSE installation by the Launch Service Integration Contractor (LSIC) during the encapsulation process. The Offeror shall describe its capability to issue the MSE arm and fire discrete commands, including timing of MSE firing commands to support MSE release.

## **7.5.2 CATEGORY C SYSTEM READINESS**

This element addresses the Offeror's launch system readiness with respect to the LSMAP (LE OI 17-001 dated 2 April 2018) and the Offeror's plans to complete NRDV by L-12 months prior to 1 October 2026. Whether the Offeror is involved in current NSSL certification efforts or will need to initiate future NSSL certification efforts, the Offeror shall request, from the Government, LSMAP reports for its launch system that meets all Category C requirements. The LSMAP captures any relevant demonstrated flight data of the proposed system. The Offeror shall append the LSMAP evaluation reports to its proposal. LSMAP evaluation reports will not count against page limit. The Government will request updated LSMAP reports during discussions and with the Final Proposal Revision (FPR).

### **7.5.2.1 Category C System Technical Assessment**

In a narrative, the Offeror shall provide a summary of its Category C system LSMAP technical assessment and describe the primary drivers for the assessment. The Offeror shall describe plans to complete remaining NRDV, to include all data and support for USSF IV&V completion, for its Category C system. The Offeror shall provide the rationale, assumptions, supporting data, and methodology used to formulate its plans.

### **7.5.2.2 Category C System Eastern Range Schedule Assessment**

In a narrative, the Offeror shall provide a summary of its Category C system LSMAP schedule assessment for a launch capability from CCSFS or KSC. The Offeror shall describe the primary drivers for the assessment. The Offeror shall describe its plan to meet an ILC of 1 October 2026 for a mission requiring vertical integration from CCSFS or KSC. The Offeror shall provide the rationale, assumptions, supporting data, and methodology used to formulate its plan.

### **7.5.2.3 Category C System Western Range Schedule Assessment**

In a narrative, the Offeror shall provide a summary of its Category C system LSMAP schedule assessment for a launch capability from VSBF. The Offeror shall describe the primary drivers for the assessment. The Offeror shall describe its plan to meet an ILC of 1 October 2026 from VSBF. The Offeror shall provide the rationale, assumptions, supporting data, and methodology used to formulate its plan.

## 7.6 SUBFACTOR 4: SYSTEM RISKS AND MITIGATIONS

For the launch vehicle or family of launch vehicles being offered, the Offeror shall identify the top technical risks. Specifically, these would be technical risks that have the potential to result in less than full compliance with NSSL performance or interface requirements. For each identified technical risk, the Offeror shall provide a corresponding risk mitigation plan and schedule (“waterfall” chart and narrative), which should address off-ramps as appropriate. Each risk mitigation narrative shall address the expected effectiveness of the plan and associated uncertainties and be informed by flight data where applicable.

The Offeror shall provide the top technical risk(s) and corresponding mitigations, or confirm no risks apply to compliance, in each of the following areas:

- a. Booster Stages (e.g., rocket propulsion system, structures, avionics, software)
- b. Upper Stages (e.g., rocket propulsion system, structures, avionics, software)
- c. Long Coast Capability (e.g., GEO 1, GEO 1.5, and GEO 2)
- d. Infrastructure (e.g., production, launch, and recovery/refurbishment, as applicable)
- e. Design (e.g., new and modifications to existing design)
- f. RF Attenuation Approach (e.g., Molniya and GEO 2)
- g. Development and qualification risks (e.g., anomalies, design changes)
- h. Operational (e.g., production, system integration, launch, recovery, or refurbishment)
- i. Vertical integration (e.g., SV processing and encapsulation, post encapsulation access, and launch operations)
- j. LV/SV interface risks (e.g., loads, vibration, shock (especially Molniya and GEO 2), thermal, acoustic, Electromagnetic Interference (EMI), and contamination)
- k. Requirements flow down to subcontractors
- l. One additional top risk if not covered above

The Government reserves the right to identify additional technical risks, for which the Offeror shall provide corresponding risk mitigation plans.

## 8 FACTOR 2: PAST PERFORMANCE

### a. General

The Offeror shall submit Present and Past Performance Information for itself and any joint venture member, in accordance with the format contained in the Past Performance Information (PPI) Form (see Attachment 12 Appendix A) and the following paragraphs.

### b. Past Performance Format

- i. The requested present and past performance information shall be provided in a separate volume (i.e., 3-ring binder) labeled “**Volume IV – Past Performance**”. **A summary page shall be provided for this acquisition, describing the proposed role of the offeror and any joint venture member (nature of work and percentage of overall work).**

ii. Each Offeror/joint venture member shall complete a separate PPI Form (Attachment 12 Appendix A) for five (5) active or completed contracts (with at least one year of performance history) in the past five (5) years from the issuance date of the RFP, that the offeror/joint venture member considers relevant in demonstrating its ability to perform the proposed effort. The evaluation of the Offeror's/joint venture member's present/past performance WILL NOT include the present/past performance of any predecessor companies, affiliates, other divisions or corporate management, even though they may perform major or critical aspects of this requirement. The PPI Form (Attachment 12, Appendix A) shall clearly indicate the division or corporate organization that performed or is presently performing the contract. Contracts listed may include those with the Federal Government, state and local governments or their agencies, and commercial customers.

**c. Ordering Type Contracts Submission**

i. If the contract you are submitting is an ordering type contractual vehicle (for example, including but not limited to an Indefinite Delivery "D" type contract per FAR 16.5), only after issuance of a delivery/task order does performance occur. Given this, an individual order (or series of orders) under the basic ordering contract shall be submitted, in lieu of just the basic ordering contract itself. All information provided to the Government, for an ordering type contractual vehicle, shall be at the order level (i.e., a delivery/task order).

When determining what order (or series of orders) to submit for evaluation, please reference Attachment 13, Evaluation Criteria, Paragraph 8 which details on how the Government will evaluate each submitted effort for recency, relevancy, and quality. In order to achieve optimal scope and magnitude of effort and complexities, as described in Attachment 12 Paragraph 8, the Offeror should consider submitting a series of orders, if possible. However, a series of orders should only be submitted if the series of orders is for continuous technical scope demonstrating relevancy to the instant acquisition. Not all ordering type contractual vehicles will have series of orders that meet this criteria. In this instance, only the single order demonstrating relevant technical scope should be submitted for evaluation.

ii. When submitting an individual order (or series of orders) under an ordering type contractual vehicle, it is important that the offeror's past performance information be accurate, complete, and in the correct format. If the information is not submitted in the correct format, the Government will not be able to evaluate the effort for recency, relevancy, and quality. There are specific places for submission of this information in the PPI Form (Attachment 12 Appendix A). Please ensure the information submitted, in the PPI Form (Attachment 12 Appendix A), is for each order (or series of orders), in lieu of just the basic ordering contract itself. This includes but is not limited to information such as the dollar value and period of performance for each order or series of orders. See paragraph iii below for further information on how to submit series of orders.

iii. Series of Orders. When submitting a series of orders for evaluation, the Offeror should list the orders under the basic ordering type contractual vehicle that demonstrate relevancy, as defined in the Relevancy Definitions in Attachment 13, Evaluation Criteria, Paragraph 8. Per

Attachment 13 Paragraph 8, Relevancy consists of not only technical complexities, but programmatic considerations. The programmatic considerations include dollar value and length of effort. If an Offeror submits a series of orders for evaluation, the total dollar value of each order (in the series of orders), the period of performance dates of each order (in the series of orders) and the total quantity produced on each order (in the series of orders) shall be submitted. The total dollar value of each order (in the series of orders) shall be added up to calculate the Total Dollar Value to be used in the evaluation, for the submitted effort. The total period of performance of each order (in the series of orders) shall be added up to calculate the Total Period of Performance to be used in the evaluation, for the submitted effort. The total quantity produced on each order (in the series of orders) shall be added up to calculate the Total Quantity Produced to be used in the evaluation, for the submitted effort.

Caution: All orders within the series of orders, being submitted, should be for the same continuous technical scope demonstrating relevancy to the instant acquisition. The Government reserves the right to request additional information from the Offeror or Points of Contacts provided to verify that the series of orders is for the same continuous technical scope.

#### **d. Teaming Member Consent Form**

In addition to the information provided in the PPI Form (Attachment 12 Appendix A) for each entity as required above, the Offeror must submit a consent letter executed by each of its proposed teaming member(s) authorizing release of adverse past performance information to the prime offeror to allow the prime offeror an opportunity to respond. A sample Teaming Partner Consent Form is attached (see Attachment 12 Appendix B). The consent form shall be completed by the team member(s) identified in your proposal. The completed consent forms shall be submitted as part of your Past Performance Volume IV.

#### **e. PPI Form**

The Offeror/joint venture member, if applicable, shall focus its PPI Form responses so that they clearly correlate present and past performance with the requirements of this RFP. The PPI Form responses must clearly describe the relevance of the effort to the work proposed. The answering space on the PPI Form may be expanded so that the filled-in PPI Form for each relevant contract covers no more than both sides of four (3) 8 ½ x 11-inch pages (i.e., no more than eight (8) pages). Provide the most current information for the Points of Contact (POCs) identified on the PPI Form. At least two of the following (in descending order of availability) should be identified as current POCs on the PPI Form:

- i. Program/Project Manager, or equivalent
- ii. Procuring Contracting Officer/Contract Negotiator or equivalent
- iii. Administrative Contracting Officer/Contract Administrator or equivalent
- iv. Other (as specified in your PPI Form)

If problems were encountered during the performance of the identified contracts, provide evidence of the ability to isolate the root causes of problems and include in the PPI Form a description of programs or actions taken to resolve those causes. Problems not addressed in the PPI Form but found by the Government during the evaluation of the information in this volume, will be assumed to still exist. Note: In the case of Contractor Performance Assessment Report System (CPARS), if your input has already been provided and the rationale/circumstances have not changed, DO NOT repeat them here.

**f. Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ)**

The Present/Past Performance Questionnaire (see Attachment 12 Appendix C) will be one means used by the Government to obtain present/past performance information. The Government reserves the right to change, alter, and/or supplement the questionnaire without further notice to the offeror(s). The Offeror shall send out and track the completion of the Present/Past Performance Questionnaires (see Attachment 12 Appendix C) to each of the offeror's, joint venture member's (i.e., each entity's) Points of Contact (POCs) identified in each PPI Form. The responsibility to send out and track the completion of the Present/Past Performance Questionnaires rests solely with the Offeror - i.e., it shall not be delegated to any other entity. The Transmittal Letter (see Attachment 12 Appendix D) shall be used by the Offeror in sending out the Present/Past Performance Questionnaires. Exert your best effort to ensure that at least two POCs per relevant contract submit a completed Present/Past Performance Questionnaire **directly to the Government not later than the date established in the RFP for receipt of proposals**. POCs may submit their completed Present/Past Performance Questionnaire either electronically or by mail. If sending electronically, follow the procedures outlined in paragraph 3.1 Point of Contact above, and email to: [kirsten.prechtl@spaceforce.mil](mailto:kirsten.prechtl@spaceforce.mil). If mailing, the POCs may return the completed questionnaires via mail directly to:

SSC/AAK  
ATTN: Ms. Kirsten Prechtl  
483 N. Aviation Blvd  
El Segundo, CA 90245  
Reference: RFP# FA8811-

If mailing, the outside envelope must be marked as follows:

**NOTE: TO BE OPENED BY ADDRESSEE ONLY**

The completed questionnaires should be contained in a second envelope marked with the mailing address and the following legend:

**SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - See FAR 2.101 and 3.104**

Once the Present/Past Performance Questionnaires are completed by your POCs, the information contained therein shall be considered source selection sensitive and shall not be released to you, the offeror. Therefore, any exchange/contact between the offeror/joint venture member and its own POCs in regard to comments made on the questionnaire is not permitted.

**g. Client Authorization Letter**

In the event that commercial contracts are presented as present/past performance sources of information, a client authorization letter shall be issued to those commercial POCs requesting/authorizing them to complete a PPQ. A sample client authorization letter is attached to this RFP (see Attachment 12 Appendix E). The Offeror is required to send the client authorization letter(s) with the PPQ(s) to each POC on commercial contracts. A separate copy of client authorization letter(s) for each commercial contract shall be included in the Offeror's Present/Past Performance submission for the Government's use in case additional questionnaires need to be sent by the Government after the RFP due date.

**h. Follow-up Discussions**

The Government may conduct follow-up discussions with any of the people identified in the PPI Form or in the Offeror's Present/Past Performance Volume. Pursuant to FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii), the Government may obtain other information by sending out additional questionnaires and/or through other sources, other than those listed within the PPI Forms.

**i. RFP Attachment Legend**

Attachment 12 Appendices A (PPI Form) and C (PPQ) must include the following legend at the top and bottom of the page:

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - See FAR 2.101 and 3.104

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

**9 FACTOR 3: SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION**

**9.1 RESERVED**

**9.2 SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION**

**9.2.1 SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN**

Other than Small Business (OTSB) Offerors shall submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan IAW FAR 52.219-9 including information required in paragraphs (d) (1) through (d) (15) of that clause. The Small Business Subcontracting Plan must be determined to be acceptable by the PCO in order for the Offeror to be eligible for contract award.

Offerors shall ensure that the information provided in the Small Business Subcontracting Plan is consistent with the information included in the Small Business Participation Commitment Document.

If the Offeror is operating under a DoD Comprehensive Subcontracting Plan IAW DFARS 252.219-7004, or a Commercial Subcontracting Plan, the Offeror shall submit that document. To be considered for award, the submitted document must be current and valid as of the date of its submission in response to this solicitation.

The Small Business Subcontracting Plan or DoD Comprehensive or Commercial Subcontract Plan for each successful Offeror will be incorporated into their respective contract as Attachment 3.

#### **9.2.2 SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION COMMITMENT DOCUMENT**

IAW Defense FAR Supplement (DFARS) 215.304(c)(i), the extent to which Offerors identify and commit to small business participation shall be evaluated in other than lowest priced technically acceptable acquisitions. All Offerors, including small businesses and those OTSB companies operating under a DoD Comprehensive Subcontracting Plan or a Commercial Subcontracting Plan, shall submit a Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD), which specifies the Offeror's level of commitment to small business utilization in performance of this requirement. The SBPCD shall address the following:

- a. The quantitative degree (based on the percentage of Total Launch Service price) to which the Offeror will utilize small business (including small disadvantaged business, women-owned small business, historically underutilized business zone (HUB Zone) small business, veteran-owned small business, and service-disabled and veteran-owned small business). A minimum quantitative requirement (MQR) of 4% or better of the Total Launch Service price (CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003) for small business participation is required. The 4% may be met by each launch service task order, or on an average basis for all launch services ordered in a year. Small business primes may take credit for their performance in calculating the 4% or better participation. Small business participation constitutes small business utilization contributions to contract performance at the first tier subcontract level only.
- b. Identification of participating small businesses by type of business, product/service, dollar value, timeframe, as available.
- c. The complexity and variety of the work small firms are to perform.
- d. Enforceable commitments to use such firms. Enforceable commitments (e.g., fully executed teaming agreement, planned purchase order, signed letters of commitment, etc.) are more convincing than non-enforceable ones. The Offeror shall submit evidence of the existence of at least three (3) enforceable commitments to use small business in the performance of this effort. (Note: this information will not be incorporated into the resultant contract.)

The SBPCD for each successful Offeror will be incorporated into their respective contract as Attachment 4.

## **10 FACTOR 4: PRICE**

All proposed pricing inputs shall be returned to the Government as a part of Volume VI, Price, and are required to be input into Appendix F of this attachment. Offerors shall provide pricing inputs in the following areas:

1. Directly related to mission task orders – Basic Launch Service, Mission Acceleration, Mission Unique Services
2. Annual Task Order Pricing – Launch Service Support (LSS), Fleet Surveillance (FS), and Government Property rental
3. Studies – Quick Reaction and Anomaly Resolution, Special Studies, Early Integration Studies (EIS)/Mission Analyses

Offeror's price inputs shall be given for the entire period of performance (PoP) – from anticipated Authority to Proceed (ATP) through PoP expiration. All CLINs under number 1 above will be procured on a Fiscal Year (FY) basis. All CLINs under number 2 above will be procured on an annual basis with ATP commencing at contract award and ending at PoP expiration in 2032. These should be priced accordingly. The Offeror shall fill out Appendix F IAW the instructions in the first tab. The Government will calculate one TEP from the Offeror's pricing inputs. The TEP is the weighted summation based on Government potential requirements from years 2025 through 2032, as described in Section 10.4.

Each CLIN price must be independent of the other CLIN prices. All pricing inputs should correspond to the year being priced (e.g., basic launch services ordered in FY 2025 should use FY 2025 "dollars" for the offered price). All prices should be rounded to the nearest dollar.

If, after receipt of proposals, the PCO determines that there is insufficient data available to determine price reasonableness, the Offeror shall be required to submit additional data other than certified cost or pricing data IAW FAR 15.403-1(b) and 15.403-3(a).

### **10.1 BASIC LAUNCH SERVICE PRICE**

#### **10.1.1 MULTIPLE CONFIGURATIONS FOR VARYING MASS-TO-ORBIT PRICING TABLE – ORDER YEAR PRICING**

The Offeror shall provide a basic launch service price for each of the SPRD Rev C Tables 1 and 2 reference orbits for a range of maximum mass-to-orbit Appendix F. The primary (first) LV configuration listed shall be the configuration that meets or exceeds the SPRD Rev C Tables 1 and 2 mass-to-orbit requirements. The basic launch service price shall include all work delineated in Attachment 1, PWS, with the exception of Section 3.4, Mission Integration (MI), and those paragraphs identified as Launch Service Support (LSS), Mission Unique (MU), Fleet Surveillance (FS) or "Multi-manifest-only." These items will be priced separately. The Offeror shall propose pricing in the Price Input tabs of Appendix F.

The purpose of the mass-to-orbit pricing table within Appendix F is two-fold. First, it enables the Offeror to propose a number of configurations that support the orbital parameters of a

specific mission yet are tailored to lower mass-to-orbit. Second, based on the Offeror's proposal, it enables the Government to avoid buying excess capability when not needed. The Offeror shall describe each configuration priced to include PLF size. If the Offeror intends to recover launch vehicle hardware, the Offeror shall ensure that the performance required to recover the hardware is bookkept under its contractor performance reserves and so indicate in its configuration description. The actual launch service price paid per launch will be a sum of the basic launch service price plus mission-specific enhancements. The Offeror shall describe the specific items/services that are included in the basic launch service price.

The Offeror shall propose pricing in the Pricing Tables tab of Appendix F, which will be incorporated into the contract and become the ordering table for the Government given a specific launch system configuration. The prices in the Pricing Tables tab must be consistent with the prices in the Notional Weights tab.

#### **10.1.2 MISSION ACCELERATION**

The Offeror shall provide a Mission Acceleration single mission price for SIS Category B SPRD Rev C Tables 1 and 2 reference orbits, by year for three, six, nine, and twelve month accelerations in Appendix F. The Offeror shall provide this price as a dollar value for the respective acceleration timelines. This price will be weighted and added to the TEP assuming four accelerated missions per year. The proposed price should assume any Mission Unique Services (CLIN 0002 and 0003) identified for the mission will also be accelerated. The proposed price should assume that an EIS was accomplished for the mission or one very similar to it. If assigned an accelerated mission, the Offeror shall proceed so as to launch at the accelerated ILC. Launch Schedule Acceleration procedures are delineated in Attachment 10 of the Model Contract.

#### **10.2 MISSION UNIQUE SERVICES**

The Offeror shall provide prices for the mission unique services by inserting them into the Price Input tabs of Appendix F. Offerors should price the scope of these items to the maximum extent practicable without including pricing that would otherwise also be priced under a separate Mission Unique item in the pricing table. For example, if MSE Accommodations are included in the bundle service but are also priced elsewhere individually, exclude MSE Accommodations from the bundle service price. All instances where pricing was intentionally not included per the above guidance shall be clearly identified in the Offeror's proposal.

As needed, these mission unique services will be identified by the Government at the time of the launch order. The Government reserves the right to order all other additional unique services for a specific mission until L-12 months for that mission. The Offeror shall describe specifically what they are offering for the prices for the mission unique services identified.

### 10.3 OTHER REQUIRED PRICING TABLES

#### 10.3.1 GOVERNMENT PROPERTY (GP)

If the Offeror requires the use of GP, the Offeror shall utilize the notional Table 10.3.1-1 to complete the GP Rental tab in Appendix F, using the acquisition cost information from Attachment 6, Government Property, and the rental equivalency method described in FAR 52.245-9(e)(2) as laid out below:

- a. In Column (A), identify the requested GP
- b. In Column (B), identify the acquisition cost
- c. In Column (C), multiply column (B) by 2% (round to the nearest dollar) to determine the monthly acquisition cost of the item and list the dollar value
- d. In Column (D), divide column (C) by 720 to determine the hourly rental rate (round to the nearest cents) and list the dollar value
- e. In Column (E), propose the rental time required (round to the nearest whole hour) for the Period of Performance and list the value; “rental time” is defined in 52.245-9(a)
- f. In Column (F), multiply column (D) by (E) (round to the nearest dollar) to determine the total rental charge for the requested item and list the dollar value
- g. Add the sum of Rental Charges in Column (F).

**Table 10.3.1-1: Notional Example Only: Rental Equivalency for Government Property Use**

| (A)<br>Item<br>Requested  | (B)<br>Acquisition<br>Cost<br>(\$) | (C)<br>Monthly Acquisition<br>Cost<br>(Multiply B by 2%)<br>(\$) | (D)<br>Hourly Rental<br>Rate<br>(Divide C by 720)<br>(\$) | (E)<br>Rental<br>Time<br>(hrs) | (F)<br>Rental Charge<br>(Multiply D by E)<br>(\$) |
|---|------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|---|
| *Item A   | \$100,000                          | \$2,000  | \$2.78  | 400                            | \$1,112   |
| *Item B   | \$77,777                           | \$1,556  | \$2.16  | 250                            | \$540   |
| <b>Sum of Rental Charges for All GP Items:<br/>(Insert Sum into Attachment 7)</b> |                                    |  |   |                                | <b>\$1,652</b>                                    |

*\* Notional cost figures are included in the table as examples only*

#### 10.3.2 LAUNCH SERVICE SUPPORT

The Offeror shall provide an LSS price by year in Appendix F. The LSS ATP will commence at contract award and end with the eighth PoP year expiration in 2032. No single year LSS price shall exceed \$100,000,000, and the price and scope of work of this CLIN shall not be included in the price and scope of work of any other CLIN.

The Offeror shall describe the activities supported under the LSS. LSS requirements are defined in the Phase 3 PWS, as annotated by paragraph designation “LSS.”

If a Phase 2 provider is awarded a Phase 3 Lane 2 contract, the Government will not execute LSS task orders against that provider's respective Phase 2 contract. The Offeror, therefore, must ensure its proposed annual prices for LSS accounts for the entire scope of the Phase 3 Lane 2 LSS requirement.

#### **10.3.3 FLEET SURVEILLANCE**

The Offeror shall provide a FS price by year in Appendix F. The FS ATP will commence at contract award and end with the eighth PoP year expiration in 2032.

The Offeror shall describe the activities supported under the FS. FS requirements are defined in the Phase 3 PWS, as annotated by paragraph designation "FS."

If a Phase 2 provider is awarded a Phase 3 Lane 2 contract, the Government will not execute FS task orders against that provider's respective Phase 2 contract. The Offeror, therefore, must ensure its proposed annual prices for FS accounts for the entire scope of the Phase 3 Lane 2 FS requirement.

#### **10.3.4 QUICK REACTION AND ANOMALY RESOLUTION**

CLIN 0005 carries 100,000 hours per fiscal year for quick reaction and anomaly resolution activities as described in PWS paragraph 3.7. The Offeror shall provide a composite labor rate by fiscal year for use in this CLIN in Appendix F.

#### **10.3.5 SPECIAL STUDIES**

CLIN 0006 carries 100,000 hours per fiscal year for special studies as described in PWS paragraph 3.10. The Offeror shall provide a composite labor rate by fiscal year for use in this CLIN in Appendix F.

#### **10.3.6 EARLY INTEGRATION STUDIES (EIS)**

The Offeror shall provide a firm fixed price for the performance of EIS tasks in Appendix F. An EIS is generally awarded one year prior to the expected reference mission assignment (order) year; therefore, pricing is only required through the fifth order year as described in the Instructions to Offerors tab in Appendix F. The first EISs under the Phase 3 contract will be awarded shortly after ATP for launches ordered for order year two.

EIS efforts are described in PWS Section 3.9 and may include early mission integration analysis tasks, creation of draft Interface Control Documents (ICDs) to document LV-to-SV interface requirements, initial Payload Adapter design, and Ground Operations planning. Specific interface analysis tasks may include acoustic analysis, contamination analysis, integrated thermal analysis, early coupled loads analysis, GN2 purge and monitoring, battery cooling, trajectory, and mission design. Specific Ground Operations planning tasks may include SV integration, trailblazer, RF monitoring, lightning monitoring, Electromagnetic Interference (EMI)/RF compatibility, and security.

The Government reserves the right to leverage the Offeror's proposed EIS prices on the NRO-issued and executed companion contract using the agreed-to pricing in the Pricing Tables tab of Appendix F for required NRO LEI efforts.

#### **10.4 TOTAL EVALUATED PRICE (TEP)**

The TEP for the Phase 3 Launch Service Procurement will be the weighted sum of the following items over the PoP:

- a) The Basic Launch Service Price for each fiscal year, identified by reference orbit and mass-to-orbit, plus,
- b) The Mission Integration price for each launch service, plus,
- c) The Acceleration price applied four times per year for fiscal years 1-5, plus,
- d) For each fiscal year, for each mission, the associated Mission Unique Services, plus,
- e) The total Rental Equivalency for Government Property Use amount, plus,
- f) The annual LSS price by order year, plus,
- g) The annual FS price by order year, plus,
- h) The dollarized value for Quick Reaction, and Anomaly Resolution based upon multiplying 100,000 hours by the proposed composite rate, plus,
- i) The dollarized value for Special Studies based upon multiplying 100,000 hours by the proposed composite rate, plus,
- j) For non-NRO missions, Early Integration Studies (EIS), based upon specific study components priced individually for all order years.

TEP will be calculated using the weighted sum of items a through j above. This is further detailed in the Total Evaluated Price tab in Appendix F. The weightings included in the Total Evaluated Price tab are examples only. The Government will apply different weightings during the source selection that are sample of the expected requirements in the ordering period. These weightings will be generated prior to the receipt of proposals.

### **11 MODEL CONTRACT**

#### **11.1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS**

The purpose of this volume is to provide information to the Government for preparing the contract document and supporting file. The Offeror's proposal shall include one (1) signed and dated copy of the Standard Form (SF) 1449, delivered with the fillable sections detailed below. The original shall be clearly marked and shall be provided without any punched holes. The SF1449 shall not have any proprietary markings. Fill in all blanks in the Solicitation. Specifically, complete the following:

#### **11.2 SF1449 SOLICITATION/CONTRACT FORM**

The Offeror shall complete blocks 12, 17, and 30 on the SF 1449 – Solicitation/Contract/Order for Commercial Items. The Offeror shall use the SF 1449 Continuation Pages in place of

completing blocks 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23. The signature by the Offeror on the SF 1449 constitutes an offer, which the Government may accept.

### **11.3 DEFENSE PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS SYSTEM RATING OF CONTRACT**

Under Defense Priorities and Allocations System (DPAS) (15 CFR 700), the overall contract rating is DX. The highest payload rating, either DO or DX, will set individual mission ratings.

### **11.4 CONTRACT DOCUMENTS, EXHIBITS AND ATTACHMENTS**

#### **11.4.1 ATTACHMENT 2: DD FORM 254**

The Offeror shall complete the DD Form 254 SCI Addendum.

#### **11.4.2 ATTACHMENT 3: SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN**

The Offeror shall provide a Small Business Subcontracting Plan IAW FAR 52.219-9 and Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement 5319.704. The subcontracting plan will be incorporated into the contract and assessed IAW FAR 19.704.

#### **11.4.3 ATTACHMENT 4: SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION COMMITMENT DOCUMENT (SBPCD)**

The Offeror shall provide an SBPCD IAW Paragraph 9.2.2. The SBPCD will be incorporated into the contract.

#### **11.4.4 ATTACHMENT 6: GOVERNMENT PROPERTY**

If the Offeror requires the use of GP, the Offeror shall complete and submit Attachment 6, Government Property, IAW procedures and definitions detailed in DFARS 245.103-72 and 245.201-70. For more information, see the Department of Defense Procurement Toolbox at <http://www.dodprocurementtoolbox.org/site/detail/id/26>. Failure to complete each applicable data field in Attachment 6 may render the proposal unawardable. For each item of GP requested, the "Use As Is" column shall be filled in as "true."

For each item of GP requested, the Offeror shall provide a written authorization of availability and confirmation of the acquisition cost from the cognizant Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO). GP proposed without an authorization from the cognizant ACO may render the proposal unawardable. All supporting documentation associated with GP shall be submitted outside of the model contract within Volume III (Price).

#### **11.4.5 ATTACHMENT 7: PRICING TABLES**

As stated in 10.1.1, the Offeror's completed Pricing Tables tab in Appendix F will be incorporated into the contract and become the ordering table for the Government given a specific launch system configuration.

#### **11.4.6 ATTACHMENT 8: PAYMENT PLAN**

A payment plan will be filled out for each individual launch service when ordered. These plans will become an attachment to the contract when launch service task orders are issued. IAW FAR 32.204 alternative financing terms shall not be accepted.

#### **11.4.7 ATTACHMENT 11: POTENTIAL ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST (OCI)**

The Offeror shall perform its own OCI analysis and submit the results of that analysis as part of its proposal and provide an OCI plan to be incorporated as Attachment 11 to any resulting contract/order, **only** if there is an actual or potential OCI.

If the Offeror deems there is an actual or potential OCI, the Offeror shall analyze the planned acquisition for actual or potential OCI situations associated with its or any of its teammate's or subcontractor's performance under any contract it or any of its teammates or subcontractors has been or may be awarded by any federal agency or other entity. The Offeror shall describe in detail the methodology used to identify actual or potential OCI issues. At a minimum, the OCI plan shall address all of the items identified in Appendix G, SSC OCI Mitigation Plan Checklist. Any proposed avoidance or mitigation techniques shall be consistent with FAR subpart 9.5 and the most recent decisions of the Government Accountability Office and the United States Court of Federal Claims.

If award is made to the Offeror, the resulting contract may include an organizational conflict of interest limitation applicable to subsequent Government work, at either a prime contract level, at any subcontract tier, or both. During evaluation of proposals, the Government may, after interactions with the Offeror and consideration of ways to mitigate or avoid identified actual or potential conflicts of interest, insert a clause or term and condition in the resulting contract which disqualifies the Offeror from further consideration for award of future contracts. An offeror can be eliminated from the competition if the Government determines it has an unmitigable OCI.

#### **11.5 SOLICITATION PROVISIONS**

All representations and certifications must be completed IAW FAR 52.212-3, Offeror Representations and Certifications – Commercial Items, of the model contract. Offerors may complete the representations and certifications in the Online Representations and Certifications (ORCA) system via sam.gov. All representations and certifications not completed in the online database shall be provided within the Offeror's proposal.

#### **11.6 SIGNATURE**

The Offeror's signature on the SF 1449 constitutes an offer, which the Government may or may not accept. Proposals without signatures may warrant a rejection of the proposal submittal. Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, including terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements. Therefore, any tailoring to the solicitation is not allowed and may warrant a rejection of the proposal.

1099 **11.7 CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITY**

1100 **11.7.1 SPACE CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITY WATCH LIST (CRWL)**

1101 In accordance with Section 1612 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal  
1102 Year (FY) 2018 (P.L. 115-91) and SSC Instruction (SSCI) 64-101, the PCO may not award a  
1103 contract to a contractor included on the CRWL without making a determination of responsibility  
1104 and obtaining the approval of the SSC Commander. A contractor that has been notified that it  
1105 has been added to the CRWL may respond to this solicitation but must submit documentation in  
1106 this volume describing how it has addressed the conditions that resulted in its inclusion on the  
1107 CRWL and why those conditions will not impact performance on a contract resulting from this  
1108 solicitation. The PCO will consider this information as well as other available information in  
1109 making the determination of responsibility or nonresponsibility required by FAR 9.103.

1110 In addition, in accordance with Section 1612 of the NDAA for FY18 (P.L. 115-91), SSCI 64-  
1111 101, and FAR clause 52.212-4, in this solicitation, the Offeror must receive written consent of  
1112 the Contracting Officer prior to subcontracting with any contractor on the CRWL for any  
1113 subcontract valued in excess of \$3M or 5% of the prime contract value, whichever is lesser. The  
1114 PCO may not provide this consent without obtaining the approval of the SSC Commander.  
1115 Offerors must inform proposed subcontractors that the proposed subcontractors must notify the  
1116 Offeror if the proposed subcontractors have been notified by the SSC Commander that they have  
1117 been included on the CRWL. In order to be considered for a subcontract, a proposed  
1118 subcontractor that has been notified that it has been added to the CRWL must submit  
1119 documentation describing how it has addressed the conditions that resulted in its inclusion on the  
1120 CRWL and why those conditions will not impact its performance on a subcontract to a contract  
1121 resulting from this solicitation. The proposed subcontractor may submit CRWL-related  
1122 documentation through the Offeror or directly to the PCO as long as the information is received  
1123 prior to the proposal due date. In addition, the Offeror must submit its determination of  
1124 subcontractor responsibility in this volume. The PCO will consider information provided by the  
1125 Offeror and the proposed subcontractor as well as other available information in determining  
1126 whether to grant consent to subcontract.

1127 **11.7.2 FINANCIAL RESOURCES**

1128 In accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a) a contractor must have adequate financial resources to  
1129 perform the contract, or the ability to obtain them. The Offeror shall fill out highlighted portions  
1130 of Appendix H, Standard Form (SF) 1407 Pre-award Survey of Prospective Contractor  
1131 (Financial Capability), to help determine adequate financial resources.

1132 **11.7.3 U.S. COMMERCIAL PROVIDER**

1133 In accordance with FAR 9.104-1(g), for purposes of this award the Offeror must comply with the  
1134 U.S. Commercial Provider definition IAW the Commercial Space Act of 1998, Title II Public  
1135 Law 105-303. The Offeror must provide supporting documentation and statement attesting to  
1136 how the Offeror meets the requirements of a U.S. Commercial Provider. The Offeror shall

1137 complete all portions of Appendix I, SF 328 Certificate Pertaining to Foreign Interest. Failure to  
1138 meet these requirements may result in the Offeror being determined ineligible for award.  
1139

DRAFT

1140

## **List of Appendices**

- 1141 Appendix A: Past Performance Information (PPI) Form
- 1142 Appendix B: Joint Venture/Subcontractor/Teaming Contractor Consent Letter
- 1143 Appendix C: Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ)
- 1144 Appendix D: Transmittal Letter
- 1145 Appendix E: Client Authorization Letter
- 1146 Appendix F: RFP Pricing Tables
- 1147 Appendix G: SSC OCI Mitigation Plan Checklist
- 1148 Appendix H: SF 1407 Pre-award Survey of Prospective Contractor (Financial Capability)
- 1149 Appendix I: SF 328 Certificate Pertaining to Foreign Interest

1150

1151

1152

1153

1154

**Appendix A**  
**Past Performance Information (PPI) Form**

DRAFT

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

**PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION (PPI)  
FORM  
(TO BE COMPLETED BY OFFEROR, JOINT  
VENTURE MEMBER)**

Request the Offeror/Joint Venture member complete a separate PPI Form for each relevant contract. See Attachment 12 Paragraph 8 of this RFP for detailed instructions and limits on number and recency of contracts. The Offeror is requested to provide frank, concise comments regarding present/past performance on the program identified in Paragraph B below.

If the contract being submitted is an ordering type contractual vehicle (for example, including but not limited to an Indefinite Delivery "D" type contract per FAR 16.5), only after issuance of a delivery/task order does performance occur. Given this, an individual order (or series of orders) under the basic ordering contract shall be submitted, in lieu of just the basic ordering contract itself. All information provided to the Government, for an ordering type contractual vehicle, shall be at the order level (i.e., a delivery/task order). The Contract Number, Total Contract Dollar Value, Period of Performance, submitted here should be for the order or series of orders, the offeror has performed under this ordering type contractual vehicle.

If a series of orders is being submitted, the offeror shall include a list that includes the order numbers, each order's Total Contract Dollar Value, and each order's Period of Performance. If the series of orders contains more than 5 orders, include this information on a separate attachment. See Attachment 12 Paragraph 8 for more information on proposal submission and Attachment 13 Paragraph 8 for evaluation information.

**A. Offeror**

1. Name (Company/Division): \_\_\_\_\_
2. Address: \_\_\_\_\_
3. CAGE Code: \_\_\_\_\_
4. DUNS Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**B. Program Title and Contract Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

(If submitting ordering type contract: List the basic contract number and each order number or order number within the series of orders)

**C. Role of Offeror in Effort:** \_\_\_\_\_ Prime Contractor \_\_\_\_\_ Subcontractor

The information provided shall reflect the role that the Offeror performed in the effort (i.e., an offeror who performed as a subcontractor shall identify the contract type, dollar value, description, etc. of its subcontract with the prime contractor).

Please explain what Factor/Subfactor(s) that are relevant to this proposed effort.

1192 \_\_\_\_\_

1193 \_\_\_\_\_

1194 \_\_\_\_\_

1195 \_\_\_\_\_

1196 \_\_\_\_\_

1197 \_\_\_\_\_

1198 \_\_\_\_\_

1199 \_\_\_\_\_

1200 \_\_\_\_\_

1201 \_\_\_\_\_

1202 \_\_\_\_\_

1203 \_\_\_\_\_

1204 \_\_\_\_\_

1205 **D. Name of Contracting Activity or Customer:** \_\_\_\_\_

1206 **E. Contract Type(s)** – Check all that apply

- 1207 1. Firm Fixed Price \_\_\_\_\_
- 1208 2. Time and Materials \_\_\_\_\_
- 1209 3. Cost \_\_\_\_\_
- 1210 d. Other (explain) \_\_\_\_\_

1211 **F. Total Contract Dollar Value**

1212 (If you performed work as a subcontractor, identify your total contract dollar value and the Prime

1213 Contractor's total contract dollar value, if known. Describe any changes in dollar value that may

1214 have occurred from time of contract award to the conclusion of the effort or the present,

1215 whichever is applicable.) If submitting an ordering type contract, list the original and current

1216 total contract dollar values for each order or order within the series of orders. If your series of

1217 orders consists of more than five (5) individual orders include the information in a separate

1218 attachment.)

1219 **1. Original Total Contract Dollar Value:** \_\_\_\_\_

1220 (If submitting ordering type contract: List the original total contract dollar value for each order or

1221 order within the series of orders)

1222 **2. Current Total Contract Dollar Value:** \_\_\_\_\_

1223 (If submitting ordering type contract: List the current total contract dollar value for each order or

1224 order within the series of orders)

1225 3. Explain the difference in Total Contract Value, if applicable:

1226 (Enter an explanation of the difference between the Original Total Contract Dollar Value and the

1227 Current Total Dollar Value as of the time of proposal submission)

1228 4. If Award Fee Contract, what percentages of the fee have been awarded in each of last 3 years?

1229 **G. Period of Performance** (includes start and end dates, e.g., Jan 2004 – Dec 2007)

1230 (If submitting an ordering type contract, the “Period of Performance” submitted here should be  
1231 for the order (or series of orders), the Offeror has performed under this ordering type contractual  
1232 vehicle. The Offeror shall submit the “Start Date” for the individual order or the first order in the  
1233 series. The Offeror shall submit the “Original End Date” for the individual order or the last order  
1234 in the series. If the “End Date” on the individual order or last order within the series of orders  
1235 has changed, these changes would need to be reflected in the “Current End Date” Section below.  
1236 Also, if submitting a series of orders, list the Start Date, Original End Date and Current End Date  
1237 for each order. If your series of orders consists of more than 5 individual orders include the  
1238 information in a separate attachment.)

1239 1. Start Date:  
1240 (Input start date of contract/order/series of orders)

1241 2. Original End Date:  
1242 (Input original end date of contract/order/series of orders based on award)

1243 3. Current End Date (if changed):  
1244 (Input end date, as the contract/order/series of orders stands at time of proposal submission)

1245 **H. Launch Vehicle Configuration:** \_\_\_\_\_

1246 **I. Orbit Parameters:**

1247 Apogee: \_\_\_\_\_ Perigee: \_\_\_\_\_  
1248 Mass: \_\_\_\_\_ Inclination: \_\_\_\_\_

1249 **J. Completion Date:**

1250 1. Initial launch date: \_\_\_\_\_  
1251 2. Current/Final Launch date: \_\_\_\_\_  
1252 3. Estimate at Completion: \_\_\_\_\_  
1253 4. How Many Times Changed: \_\_\_\_\_  
1254 5. Primary Causes of Change: \_\_\_\_\_

1255 **K. Primary Customer Points of Contact:**

1256 (The Offeror/Joint venture is responsible for exerting its best efforts to ensure that current  
1257 information is provided for all individuals. For Government contracts provide current  
1258 information on both individuals. For commercial contracts, provide points of contact fulfilling  
1259 these same roles.)

1260 1. Program Manager and/or Site Manager:

1261 Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
1262 Office: \_\_\_\_\_  
1263 Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
1264 Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_  
1265 Email address: \_\_\_\_\_

1266 2. Contracting Officer:

1267 Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
1268 Office: \_\_\_\_\_  
1269 Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
1270 Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_  
1271 Email address: \_\_\_\_\_

1272 L. Address any technical (or other) area about this contract that is considered unique and relevant  
1273 to the source selection.

1274 \_\_\_\_\_  
1275 \_\_\_\_\_  
1276 \_\_\_\_\_  
1277 \_\_\_\_\_  
1278 \_\_\_\_\_  
1279 \_\_\_\_\_  
1280 \_\_\_\_\_  
1281 \_\_\_\_\_  
1282 \_\_\_\_\_  
1283 \_\_\_\_\_  
1284 \_\_\_\_\_  
1285 \_\_\_\_\_  
1286 \_\_\_\_\_  
1287 \_\_\_\_\_  
1288 \_\_\_\_\_  
1289 \_\_\_\_\_  
1290 \_\_\_\_\_  
1291 \_\_\_\_\_  
1292 \_\_\_\_\_

1293 M. For each of the applicable Technical Factor/Subfactors in Attachment 13, Evaluation Criteria,  
1294 only illustrate how this experience on this contract applies to that Factor/Subfactor.

1295 \_\_\_\_\_  
1296 \_\_\_\_\_  
1297 \_\_\_\_\_  
1298 \_\_\_\_\_  
1299 \_\_\_\_\_  
1300 \_\_\_\_\_  
1301 \_\_\_\_\_  
1302 \_\_\_\_\_  
1303 \_\_\_\_\_  
1304 \_\_\_\_\_  
1305 \_\_\_\_\_  
1306 \_\_\_\_\_

1307 \_\_\_\_\_  
1308 \_\_\_\_\_  
1309 \_\_\_\_\_  
1310 \_\_\_\_\_  
1311 \_\_\_\_\_  
1312 \_\_\_\_\_  
1313 \_\_\_\_\_  
1314 \_\_\_\_\_  
1315 \_\_\_\_\_  
  
1316 N. Please discuss efforts accomplished within this contract to resolve problems encountered, as  
1317 well as efforts to identify and manage program risk.  
1318 \_\_\_\_\_  
1319 \_\_\_\_\_  
1320 \_\_\_\_\_  
1321 \_\_\_\_\_  
1322 \_\_\_\_\_  
1323 \_\_\_\_\_  
1324 \_\_\_\_\_  
1325 \_\_\_\_\_  
1326 \_\_\_\_\_  
1327 \_\_\_\_\_

1328

1329

1330

1331

1332

## **Appendix B**

### **Joint Venture/Subcontractor/Teaming Contractor Consent Letter**

DRAFT

1333 **Joint Venture**

1334 **Consent Form**

1335  
1336 NOTE TO OFFERORS: Past performance information concerning joint venture members cannot be  
1337 disclosed to a private party without the joint venture member's consent. Because a prime contractor is a  
1338 private party, the Government will need that consent before disclosing joint venture partner past and  
1339 present performance information to the prime during exchanges. In an effort to assist the Government's  
1340 Past Performance Team in assessing your past performance relevancy and confidence, we request that the  
1341 following consent form be completed by the joint venture members identified in your proposal. The  
1342 completed consent forms shall be submitted as part of your Past Performance Volume.  
1343  
1344

1345 FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
1346

1347 **JOINT VENTURE CONSENT FORM FOR THE RELEASE OF PAST AND PRESENT**  
1348 **PERFORMANCE INFORMATION TO THE PRIME CONTRACTOR**  
1349

1350 Dear (Contracting Officer)  
1351

1352 We are currently participating as a (joint venture partner) with (prime contractor or name  
1353 of entity providing proposal) in responding to the United States Space Force, Space  
1354 Systems Command, Request for FA8811-23-R-0002 for the National Security Space  
1355 Launch (NSSL) Phase 3 Lane 2 Launch Service Procurement.  
1356

1357 We understand that the Government is placing increased emphasis on past performance  
1358 in order to obtain best value in source selections. In order to facilitate the performance  
1359 confidence assessment process, we are signing this consent form to allow you to discuss  
1360 our past and present performance information with the prime contractor during the source  
1361 selection process.  
1362

1363 \_\_\_\_\_  
1364  
1365 \_\_\_\_\_  
1366 (Signature and Title of individual who has the authority to sign for and legally bind the  
1367 company)  
1368

1369 Company Name:

1370  
1371 Address:

1372

1373

1374

1375

1376

**Appendix C**  
**Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ)**

DRAFT

## Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ)

### Controlled Unclassified Information

*When completed, this document is Source Selection Information IAW FAR 2.101 and 3.104*

#### **Section 1: Contract Identification**

A. Contractor (Company/Division):

B. Contractor Cage Code:

C. Contract Number:

D. Contract Type (e.g., FFP, FPIF, CPIF, CPFF, etc.):

E. Program Title:

F. Brief Program Description:

G. Period of Performance

1. Original Schedule (assuming all options exercised):

Beginning Date \_\_\_\_\_ through \_\_\_\_\_

2. Current Schedule (assuming all options exercised):

Beginning Date \_\_\_\_\_ through \_\_\_\_\_

3. Reason for difference (if applicable):

H. Launch

1. Initial Launch Schedule:

2. Current/Final Launch Schedule:

3. Reason for differences between initial launch schedule and current/final launch schedule:

I. Contract Dollar Value

1. Original maximum contract dollar value (assuming all options exercised): \$

2. Current maximum contract dollar value (assuming all options exercised): \$

3. Reasons for difference between original and current contract dollar value (if applicable):

J. Description of service provided (e.g., mission unique activities, payload processing, classified security):

K. Was this a competitively awarded contract? ☐ Yes ☐ No

L. Contractor's Role: ☐ Prime Contractor ☐ Subcontractor ☐ Key Personnel

M. Orbit Parameters:

Apogee: \_\_\_\_\_ Perigee: \_\_\_\_\_

Mass: \_\_\_\_\_ Inclination: \_\_\_\_\_

N. Launch vehicle Configuration:

## **Section 2: Customer or Agency Identification**

A. Customer or agency name:

B. Customer or agency description (if applicable):

C. Geographic description of services under this contract (i.e., local, nationwide, worldwide, other Commands):

## **Section 3: Respondent Identification**

A. Respondent's name:

B. Respondent's title:

C. Respondent's phone number / fax number / e-mail address:

D. Respondent's position (e.g., Program Manager, PCO/ACO, etc.):

E. Length of time (number of years/months) respondent worked on subject contract and description of responsibility/position/role:

F. Other suggested points of contact:

#### **Section 4: Performance Information**

A. In the tables below, indicate your rating for the contractor's performance by placing an "X" in the appropriate block to the right of each question. Provide supporting information for each response in the space provided. Attach additional pages if more space is needed. The performance rating scale is defined as follows:

| <u>Code</u> | <u>Performance Rating</u>  |
|-------------|--|
| <b>E</b>    | <b>EXCEPTIONAL</b> – Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many requirements to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.                               |
| <b>V</b>    | <b>VERY GOOD</b> – Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some requirements to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.                                       |
| <b>S</b>    | <b>SATISFACTORY</b> – Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance being assessed contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.  |
| <b>M</b>    | <b>MARGINAL</b> – Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions or the contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented. |
| <b>U</b>    | <b>UNSATISFACTORY</b> – Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance being assessed contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.  |
| <b>N/A</b>  | <b>NOT APPLICABLE</b> – Unable to provide a rating. Contract did not include performance for this aspect, performance was not observed, or information was not available. Do not know.   |

| Technical Performance  | E | V | S | M | U | N/A |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| <p>T1. How well did the contractor meet the technical requirements of the specification?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p>   |   |   |   |   |   |     |
| <p>T2. How was the quality of technical data or report preparation efforts?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p>  |   |   |   |   |   |     |
| <p>T3. How did the contractor conduct requirements management and flow-down?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p>   |   |   |   |   |   |     |
| <p>T4. How well did the contractor conduct/support the customer's required technical reviews, mission Assurance or Independent Readiness Review Teams?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p> |   |   |   |   |   |     |
| <p>T5. How well did the contractor implement quality processes, operation, maintenance, upgrades and configuration control?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p>                            |   |   |   |   |   |     |
| <p>T6. How effective were the contractor's methodologies used for software/hardware qualification and flight testing?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p>                                  |   |   |   |   |   |     |
| <p>T7. How well did the contractor meet design criteria?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p>   |   |   |   |   |   |     |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>T8. How successfully did the contractor execute orbital payload insertion mission(s)?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>T9. How complete and structured was the contractor's design in terms of meeting technical requirements and presenting rigorous analysis of designs and design alternatives?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>T10. How cooperative and responsive was the contractor when dealing with other Mission Partners (i.e., Range, Space Vehicle Contractor, Encapsulation Facility Contractor, etc.)?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>T11. How effectively did the contractor manage integration of the primary payload and secondary payload (e.g., Evolved Secondary Payload Adapter [ESPA] or similar rideshare capability into an integrated payload stack?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p> |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>T12. How successfully did the contractor accommodate changes to the secondary payload configuration (e.g., ESPA and APL configuration) during the integration cycle?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>T13. How effectively/successfully did the contractor manage and execute integration of classified payloads?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>T14. How complete and adequate was the contractor's support of payload processing for multiple payloads?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>T15. How effectively/successfully did the contractor provide access to information to enable required Government insight?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p>                     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>S1. How accurately did the contractor forecast the schedule?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>S2. How well did the contractor perform against the contract and/or delivery schedule?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>S3. How successfully did the contractor alert the customer of unforeseen schedule changes (accelerations and/or delays) before they occurred?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p> |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>S4. How successfully did the contractor respond to emergency and/or surge situations?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>S5. How effectively did the contractor manage scheduling and communicate issues that may affect other stakeholders and/or project completion?</p> <p><u>SUPPORTING INFORMATION:</u></p> |  |  |  |  |  |  |

B. Please provide any specific strengths that provided value to the customer in the contractor's execution in their responsibilities.

C. **Government Contracts Only:** Was this contract partially or completely terminated for default or convenience, or are there any pending terminations?

☐ Yes    ☐ Default    ☐ Convenience    ☐ Pending Terminations    ☐ No

If yes, please explain (e.g., inability to meet cost, performance, or delivery schedules).

#### **SECTION 5: GENERAL COMMENT**

Given what I know today about the contractor's ability to execute what he promised in his proposal, I [ click and select an item ] award to this contractor, or have this contractor perform one of my critical and demanding programs, today given that I had a choice.

REMARKS:

Please provide any additional comments concerning this contractor's performance, to include areas where the contractor made improvements throughout the life of the contract, or any additional information of note.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Respondent's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
[click and pick the date]

Date

**Thank you for your prompt response and assistance!**  
*Please return this completed questionnaire to:*

Mailing Address:

SSC/AAK

ATTN: Ms. Kirsten Precht

483 N. Aviation Blvd

El Segundo, CA 90245

Reference: RFP# FA8811-

E-Mail to: [kirsten.precht@spaceforce.mil](mailto:kirsten.precht@spaceforce.mil)

1553

1554

1555

1556

1557

**Appendix D**  
**Transmittal Letter**

DRAFT

Transmittal Letter for Government Sources to Accompany Present/Past Performance  
Questionnaire

[TO BE COMPLETED BY OFFEROR]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

MEMORANDUM FOR: [OFFEROR'S/JOINT VENTURE MEMBERS'S POC]

FROM: [OFFEROR'S ADDRESS AND POINT OF CONTACT]

SUBJECT: Present/Past Performance Questionnaire for Contract(s) \_\_\_\_\_.

1. We are currently responding to the United States Space Force, Space Systems Command, Request for Proposal (RFP) FA8811-22-R-0002, for the procurement of the National Security Space Launch (NSSL) Phase 3 Lane 2 Launch Service. This RFP is being conducted as a Tradeoff Source Selection and specifically requires that we, as an offeror, do the following:

The offeror shall send out – and track the -- Present/Past Performance Questionnaire to each of the offeror's joint venture members' Points of Contact (POCs). The responsibility to send out and track the Present/Past Performance Questionnaires rests solely with the offeror - i.e., it shall not be delegated to any subcontractors and/or joint venture partners. The completed Present/Past Performance Questionnaire shall be submitted **directly to the Government not later than 4:00 pm Pacific Time on 12 August 2023**. Each of the offeror's POCs may submit its completed Present/Past Performance Questionnaire either electronically or by mail.

If sending electronically, the following applies: Exchanges of source selection information between government and questionnaire respondents will be controlled by the Contracting Officer. Email may be used to transmit such information only if the email can be sent and encrypted and must include "Source Selection Information – See FAR 2.101 and 3.104" in the subject line of the email. In order to facilitate the sending and receiving of encrypted emails, a questionnaire respondent must use MS Outlook email configured to support encryption, or a different email product that is S/MIME compatible and configured to support encryption. If you intend to submit your completed questionnaire via an encrypted email, you will need to contact the Buyer/Contracting Officer indicated below, prior to that first submittal, in order to exchange certificates used for encryption. To ensure the process is working correctly, send a test encrypted message first (without including any source selection information). Email to: kirsten.precht@spaceforce.mil.

If mailing, mail directly to:

1596 SSC/AAK  
1597 ATTN: Ms. Kirsten Precht  
1598 483 N. Aviation Blvd  
1599 El Segundo, CA 90245  
1600 Reference: RFP# FA8811-  
1601

1602 If mailing, the outside envelope must be marked as follows:

1603 NOTE: TO BE OPENED BY ADDRESSEE ONLY  
1604

1605 The completed questionnaires should be contained in a second envelope marked with the mailing  
1606 address and the following legend:

1607 SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - See FAR 2.101 and 3.104

1608 FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
1609

1610 2. We have identified subject contract(s) as relevant to this acquisition and you as our POC. As  
1611 such, please take a few moments of your time to fill out the attached questionnaire and send it  
1612 directly back to the contracting officer. The information contained in the completed Present/Past  
1613 Performance Questionnaires is considered sensitive and cannot be released to us, the offeror. If  
1614 you have any questions about the acquisition or the attached questionnaire, your questions must  
1615 be directed back to the Government's points of contact identified above. Thank you for your  
1616 timely assistance.

1617

1618

1619

1620 Sincerely,

1621 [OFFEROR'S POINT OF CONTACT]  
1622

1623

1624

1625 1 [2?] ATCH

1626 Present/Past Performance Questionnaire

1627 [Client Authorization Letter(s), if applicable]

1628

1629

1630

1631

1632

**Appendix E**  
**Client Authorization Letter**

DRAFT

**Client Authorization Letter**

NOTE TO OFFERORS: To assist the Government's Past Performance Team in assessing your present and past performance on relevant commercial contracts, the following letter must be sent to your points of contact (POCs) for those commercial efforts that you identify to us in your past performance volume. Should you propose to use joint venture members, you must obtain a similar client authorization letter from each entity. However, it is your sole responsibility, as the Offeror, to then send out these authorization letters with the Present/Past Performance Questionnaire to your own POCs and to those of your joint venture members and include a copy in your past performance volume.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

**Client Authorization Letter**  
**(TO BE ACCOMPLISHED BY**  
**OFFEROR)**

Dear (Client):

We are currently responding to the United States Space Force (USSF), Space Systems Command, Request for FA8811-XX-XXXX for the National Security Space Launch (NSSL) Phase 3 Lane 2 Launch Service Procurement.

As you know past performance has become an element of increased emphasis in the USSF's acquisitions. They are requesting that clients of companies who submit proposals in response to their RFP for the NSSL Phase 3 Lane 2 Launch Service Procurement be contacted, and that their participation in the validation process be requested. We, therefore, respectfully request and hereby authorize you to complete the attached Questionnaire with regards to work we have performed for you and submit it either electronically or by mail.

If sending electronically, the following applies: Exchanges of source selection information between Government and questionnaire respondents will be controlled by the Contracting Officer. Email may be used to transmit such information only if the email can be sent and encrypted and must include "Source Selection Information – See FAR 2.101 and 3.104" in the subject line of the email. In order to facilitate the sending and receiving of encrypted emails, a questionnaire respondent must use MS Outlook email configured to support encryption, or a different email product that is S/MIME compatible and configured to support encryption. If you intend to submit your completed questionnaire via an encrypted email, you will need to contact the Buyer/Contracting Officer indicated below, prior to that first submittal, in order to exchange certificates used for encryption. To ensure the process is working correctly, send a test encrypted message first (without including any source selection information). Email to: [kirsten.prechtl@spaceforce.mil](mailto:kirsten.prechtl@spaceforce.mil).

If mailing, the outside envelope must be marked as follows:

1673 NOTE: TO BE OPENED BY ADDRESSEE ONLY

1674

1675 The completed questionnaire should be contained in a second envelope marked with the mailing  
1676 address and the following legend:

1677 SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - See FAR 2.101 and 3.104

1678 FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

1679 Mail directly to:

1680 SSC/AAK  
1681 ATTN: Ms. Kirsten Prechtl  
1682 483 N. Aviation Blvd  
1683 El Segundo, CA 90245  
1684 Reference: RFP# FA8811-  
1685

1686 We also respectfully request and hereby authorize you to verbally discuss the attached  
1687 Questionnaire when contacted via telephone by the Government with regards to work we have  
1688 performed for you.

1689

1690 We have identified Mr./Ms. (Name) of your organization as the point of contact based on their  
1691 knowledge concerning our work. Your cooperation in this matter is appreciated. Any questions  
1692 may be directed to: [NAME, PHONE NUMBER, FAX NUMBER FOR THE OFFEROR'S  
1693 POINT OF CONTACT]

1694

1695 Sincerely,

1696

1697

1698 [OFFEROR'S POINT OF CONTACT]

1699

1700

1701 FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

1702

1703

1704

1705

1706

1707

**Appendix F**  
**RFP Pricing Tables**  
(In a separate file)

DRAFT

1708

1709

1710

1711

1712

1713

**Appendix G**  
**SSC OCI Mitigation Plan Checklist**  
(In a separate file)

DRAFT

**Appendix H**

**SF 1407 Pre-award Survey of Prospective Contractor  
(Financial Capability)**

(In a separate file)

1721

1722

1723

1724

1725

1726

**Appendix I**  
**SF 328 Certificate Pertaining to Foreign Interest**  
(In a separate file)

DRAFT