

80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
1	80JSC23R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	Section C, 5.0.h	C-63	SOW section 5.0.h states "The Contractor shall perform all preventative and corrective maintenance for hardware and software to maintain the USDV in a state of readiness that supports the mission." With the CLIN 3 scope limited to maintenance as well as the identification of needed repairs in line with DRD USDV-30 USDV Spacecraft Readiness Plan, will the actual repairs being performed on the Government-owned vehicle be paid under a future CLIN 4 or CLIN 5 task order?	<p>Corrective maintenance is the responsibility of the contractor prior to Government acceptance of the USDV. Corrective maintenance post-government acceptance may be ordered if required via a CLIN 4 task order. Section C Statement of Work 5.0 and 6.2.2 will be updated in Amendment 6 for clarification.</p> <p>In accordance with the USDV contract clauses in Section E, Inspection and Acceptance, the Government has the right to inspect the supplies delivered and services performed. If any of the supplies and services do not conform with contract requirements, the Government may require the Contractor to deliver the supplies or perform the services again in conformity with contract requirements, at no increase in contract value.</p>
2	80JSC023R0003 Model Contract Amendment 5	4.5.1.h	C-68	<p>At what point does NASA take acceptance of the USDV via a signed DD-250?</p> <p>Is it upon successful completion of Milestone C2-4 System Acceptance per the associated DRD USDV-36 USDV Acceptance Data as delivered with that milestone?</p> <p>Or upon successful completion of Milestone C2-5 Shipment to Acceptance Destination?</p> <p>We recommend that the exact timing of USDV</p>	NASA acceptance of the USDV occurs upon successful completion of Milestone C2-4 System Acceptance, Milestone C2-5 Shipment to Acceptance Destination, and all issues identified during the Government's final inspection are corrected and/or resolved via signed DD-250.

80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
				acceptance via DD-250 be clarified in the contract.	<p>The following updates will be made in Amendment 6 to clarify:</p> <p>Clause E.5 PRELIMINARY INSPECTION AT SOURCE AND FINAL INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE AT DESTINATION has been updated to read “USDV acceptance via DD-250 occurs at Acceptance Destination upon completion of both Milestone C2-4 System Acceptance, C2-5 Shipment to Acceptance Destination and all issues identified during the Government's final inspection are corrected and/or resolved”</p> <p>Clause F.3 FAR 52.211-9 DESIRED AND REQUIRED TIME OF DELIVERY (JUN 1997) has been updated to clarify “Completion of both Milestone C.2-4 System Acceptance and Milestone C.2-5 Shipment to Acceptance Destination:”</p>
3	80JSC023R0003 Model Contract Amendment 5	5.0.c	C-69	The model contract indicates dwell will be "between Milestone C2-4 System Acceptance and shipment to the Launch Site." Wouldn't dwell be between "Milestone C2-5 Shipment to Acceptance Destination and shipment to the Launch Site" instead?	Section C Statement of Work 5.0 Paragraph c is updated in Amendment 6 to read “The Contractor shall store and maintain the USDV in a state of readiness for the time between Shipment to the Dwell facility and

80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
					Shipment to the LS PPF, if dwell is required, and in accordance with <i>USDV Spacecraft Readiness Plan (DRD USDV-30)</i> .” to reflect storage between shipment to the Dwell facility and shipment to the Launch Site Payload Processing Facility.
4	80JSC023R 0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	Clause F.3	F-2	NASA states a "desired" USDV delivery date that is significantly earlier than the required USDV delivery date, but later states that the offeror may propose to the (later) required delivery date "without prejudicing evaluation of its offer." This creates an ambiguity and/or contradiction in the evaluation, as the Government states a desired outcome but later implies that meeting this desired outcome will not be evaluated more favorably than not meeting the desired outcome. The Government should eliminate this ambiguity by either incentivizing the offeror to deliver ahead of the required date or by removing the desired delivery date.	<p>In accordance with FAR 52.211-9 Desired and Required Time of Delivery, the Government has outlined the required delivery date creating a delivery date free from ambiguity.</p> <p>The desired delivery date provides an earlier date, allowing offerors a timeframe for delivery that is effective for the Government. However, if an offeror proposes the required date, it will be not evaluated with prejudice.</p> <p>The evaluation of the offeror’s approach including schedule will be evaluated in Mission Suitability in accordance with Section M for overall demonstrated understanding, reasonableness, feasibility, completeness, and effectiveness and any ensuing impacts and risk to the Government.</p>
5	80JSC023R 0003 Model	H.25(b)(1)	H-19	The model contract reflects "FAR 52.243-1 – Changes – Cost-Reimbursable (ALT V)"	Yes. The RFP and model contract will be updated in Amendment 6 to read

80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
	Contract Amendment 5			which seems to be a typo. Should it reflect "FAR 52.243-2 – Changes – Cost-Reimbursable (ALT V)"?	"The Contractor shall be responsible for the cost of any such new or modified GTA, and the Parties shall effectuate the addition of new or modified GTAs, and corresponding contract price adjustments, pursuant to FAR 52.243-1 – Changes – Fixed-Price (ALT V) and FAR 52.243-2 – Changes – Cost-Reimbursable (ALT V), as incorporated herein."
6	80JSC023R 0003 Model Contract Amendment 5	I.1	I-6	The model contract reflects "52.243-2 CHANGES-COST-REIMBURSEMENT ALTERNATE V(APR 1984) (Applies to FFP only)" which seems to be a typo. Should it be "Applies to CPIF only."?	Yes. FAR 52.243-2 will be updated to read "CHANGES-COST-REIMBURSEMENT ALTERNATE V(APR 1984) (Applies to CPIF only)" in Amendment 6.
7	80JSC023R 0003 Model Contract Amendment 5	I.8	I-13	Are there any maintenance, testing, and/or repair requirements of spares procured in the CLIN 2A Spare option after NASA takes acceptance of them in-place via DD-250? If so, in what CLIN would that scope fall, e.g. a future CLIN 5 task order?	The cost of maintenance, testing, and/or repair of spares procured in CLIN 2A Spare Option after Government acceptance is not included in the CLIN 2A Cost/Price. Post-acceptance ground processing, testing, preventative maintenance, and corrective maintenance may be ordered if required in a CLIN 4 task order.
8	80JSC023R 0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	Attachm ent J-01	J01-10	In accordance with the instructions in the "Reference to Other Documents and Data Deliverables in Data Submittals" paragraph in section/page J01-10 in Attachment J-01, Data Requirements Description, please confirm the acceptability of referencing a DCMA Approved Master Subcontracting Plan with the	Yes, a DCMA approved Master plan can be submitted. However, the offeror must submit goals with respect to this specific requirement. NASA has updated the RFP in Amendment 6 to include an unlimited page count for the Small Business Utilization 1 (SBU1)

80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
				required elements of FAR 52.219-9(d) to address the portions of the subcontracting plan content required in DRD USDV-11, and providing the DCMA approved Master Subcontracting Plan as a separate attachment that is not subject to the 15 page count restriction for the Small Business Utilization – Attachment J-11.	section and a 10-page maximum for SBU2.
9	80JSC023R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	Att. J-01 USDV-20	J01-112	Could NASA please clarify the intent of DRD USDV-20, Volume 1(b)(9) instructions: "Provide process details of compliance to verification details of key Contractor reliability and NASA PRA support tasks." What does NASA mean by "process details of compliance to verification details"?	DRD USDV-20 will be updated in Amendment 6 to delete this sentence.
10	80JSC023R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	Attachm ent J-33	J33-3	Can NASA confirm that the intent of J33-2 (Government Services Requested) is for the Government to summarize GTAs there upon contract award?	Table J33-2 Government Services Requested is filled in by the Government. There is no action for the Offeror to fill-in this table as part of their proposal/model contract. The table may be used during post-award contract administration.
11	80JSC023R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	Section L	N/A	Did NASA intend to omit an executive summary from the proposal requirements?	Yes, NASA intended to omit the executive summary from the proposal requirements.
12	80JSC023R0003 USDV RFP	L.15	L-14	The RFP states: "The Offeror shall not include in Attachment J-33, Government-Furnished Property, Facilities, and Data/Information, any property not listed in Table L.15-1 or request	In accordance with the RFP, the Offeror shall not include any Government-furnished property in J-33, Government Furnished Property,

## 80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
	Amendment 4			quantities in excess of those.” Where should the contractor list GFP/S/D required to perform the contract but not appropriate for a GTA, such as ISS to VV power quality test equipment?	<p>Facilities, and Data/Information that is not already listed in Table L.15-1. If there is additional Government-furnished property the contractor needs, this may be requested via a Government Task Agreement.</p> <p>Scenarios are:</p> <p>a. If the GFP is listed in Table L.15-1 and an Offeror plans to use it, the Offeror shall list it in J-33 Government Furnished Property, Facilities, and Data/Information</p> <p>b. If the GFP is not in Table L.15-1 and the Offeror requests NASA to transfer it to them, the Offeror shall request it as a GTA.</p> <p>c. If the GFP is not in Table L.15-1, and the Offeror is not requesting NASA to transfer it to them, but it is needed to perform requirement verification through ISS/USDV joint testing (such as ISS to VV power quality testing), it will be documented in the Joint Integration Verification and Test Plan (JIVTP) (see generic template in USDV Technical Library). The Offeror should not list this in J-33 Government Furnished Property, Facilities, and Data/Information nor request it via GTA.</p>

## 80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
13	80JSC023R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	L.26.1(c)(10)	L-33	<p>RFP section L.26.1(c)(10) indicates that Offerors will be eliminated from competition if all subcontractors do not submit their completed Attachment L-01 (A-D as applicable). The subcontractors are given the option to submit their files directly to NASA if they don't want to share with the Prime. However, Cost/pricing data at the level of detail contained in those attachments is typically waived if the subcontracts are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• procured with adequate price competition per FAR 15.403-1(b)(1);</li> <li>• for a commercial product or service per FAR 15.403-1(b)(3), or;</li> <li>• under the threshold per FAR 15.403-4(a)(1), i.e. \$2M.</li> </ul> <p>The RFP requirement as is may unduly burden our subcontractors in that it is not typically requested of them, will increase the time they need to respond, and will likely significantly increase the number of subcontractor submittals directly to NASA as they typically withhold that data from Primes which complicates our pricing process. Additionally, some suppliers are unable to provide the requested detail because of the way their commercial accounting systems are set up. Therefore, can subcontractors that meet one of the exceptions above be waived from having to fill out the applicable Attachment L-01 template?</p>	<p>The Contracting Officer has determined that other than certified cost or pricing data is required. If an item is a commercial product or service, the Prime shall provide the appropriate support data which evidences/validates the subcontractors' commercial pricing, at the pricing level as required by the Prime which satisfies the Government's RFP requirement(s). RFP Amendment 6 will be updated to include the commercial product or service instruction. Please refer to USDV RFP L.26.1(a), L.26.1(c)(10), and L.26.2(e)(7).</p>

80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
14	80JSC023R0003 Amendment 5	L.24	L-24	Will the Government consider breaking the Volume II submission into smaller sections? For example, Offerors can submit the non-page-limited sections in a separate file from the page-limited Mission Suitability file.	Offerors may provide multiple files of the same volume if the individual volume file is larger than the 150GBs per file submission outlined in L.18 ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS – PROPOSAL MARKING AND DELIVERY THROUGH NASA’S EFSS BOX. Offerors’ individual proposal files shall follow the individual file names outlined in L.18 ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS – PROPOSAL MARKING AND DELIVERY THROUGH NASA’S EFSS BOX ensuring each file is sequentially numbered and is clearly labeled with the contents of the file.
15	80JSC23R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	Table L.24-1	L-25	DRD USDV-4 ConOps looks to have been removed from the Page Count Section from Draft to Final RFP. Was this intentional?	Table L.24-1 will be updated in Amendment 6 to show that DRD USDV-4 Con Ops is required to be included in the designated page count.
16	80JSC23R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	L.25 (a)(2)	L-29	The Final RFP requires 12 point Times New Roman font in diagrams, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs. Will the Government consider allowing 10 point Times New Roman in these items? If not, will the Government then consider increasing the page count?	In accordance with L.25(a)(2), which applies to page-limited sections, text in diagrams, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs shall be Times New Roman font and no smaller than 12-point text size. Diagrams, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs shall not be used to circumvent the text size



## 80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
					limitations of the proposal. The Government will increase the page count in Amendment 6 for the Volume II Mission Suitability, Small Business Utilization 1 (SBU 1) section.
17	80JSC23R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	Table L24-1	L-26	We recommend unlimited page count for the Small Business Utilization – Attachment J-11 due to the requirement for 18 separate goal tables that provide the breakdown of proposed small business subcontracting goals, by small business category, expressed in terms of both a percent of TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE and a percent of TOTAL PLANNED SUBCONTRACTS, for the basic contract requirement and each option separately, per L.27.3 SMALL BUSINESS UTILIZATION (SBU) - MISSION SUITABILITY SUBFACTOR 3, SBU.1 Small Business Subcontracting, paragraph (h).	NASA will update the RFP in Amendment 6 to include an unlimited page count for the Small Business Utilization section.
18	80JSC23R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	L.26.1(b)(4)	L-31	RFP L.26.1(b)(4) states "Minor Subcontractor(s), as used in this provision, is a subcontractor other than the Major Subcontractor that will perform a percentage of the contract allocated workload in offerors fully integrated Attachment L-01A, L-01B, or L-01D "SubK Cost Details"...," and L.26.1(c)(4) states Attachment L-01C is required by all minor subcontractors.  However, General Instructions #5 and #8 in Attachment L-01C seem to contradict this	Please refer to USDV RFP L.26.1(b)(4) for definition of minor subcontractors. The Attachment L-01C instruction (#5) related to "L-01" only was an oversight by the Government and will be updated in Amendment 6 to read "Minor Subcontractors (Reference: RFP, L.26.1(c)(4)) in the Cost Volume Instructions defines "Minor Subcontractor"(s), as used in this provision, is a subcontractor other than the Major Subcontractor that will

## 80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
				<p>instruction. General Instruction #5 quotes the definition of a Minor Subcontractor as "subcontractor other than the Major Subcontractor that will perform a percentage of the contract allocated workload in Attachment L-01 USDV Hybrid Cost Price Template "SubK Cost Details (CPIF)" tab", and General Instruction #8 references attachments L-01A and L-01D, but not L-01B.</p> <p>Please clarify: Is Attachment L-01C required of all minor subcontractors, including from Firm Fixed Price (Attachment L-01B) bidders, or only from cost plus or hybrid bidders?</p>	<p>perform a percentage of the contract allocated workload in offerors fully integrated Attachment L-01A, L-01B, or L-01D "SubK Cost Details..." tabs, but not specifically related to the vendors used for the Consolidated Bill of Material (CBoM)." .</p> <p>As stated in USDV RFP L.26.1 Attachment L-01C collects fully burdened labor rates and its labor rate details, is required by all minor subcontractors "that will perform a percentage of the contract allocated workload in offerors fully integrated Attachment L-01A, L-01B, or L-01D "SubK Cost Details..." tabs", regardless of the offerors' selection of contract type.</p>
19	80JSC23R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	L.26.2	L-42	<p>Can NASA clarify the meaning of the instructions marked "(3) WYE and Skill Mix Detailed Explanation: Reference RFP, L.27.2 TECHNICAL APPROACH (TA) - MISSION SUITABILITY" in L.26.2 Specific Cost Instructions?</p> <p>What specific requirement is NASA referencing from within the Mission Suitability volume?</p> <p>Is NASA asking that the Basis of Estimate provided in TA.1 be repeated in the Price volume?</p>	<p>The USDV RFP L.26.2(a)(3) is referencing RFP L.27.1 TECHNICAL APPROACH (TA) - MISSION SUITABILITY because the WYE and Skill Mix detailed data shall be consistent for both volumes so that there is traceability to the Price/Cost Volume and to keep the evaluation factors separated. Provision L.26.2 Paragraph (c) will be updated in Amendment 6 to read "The Offeror shall provide traceability from the</p>

80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
				Please clarify these instructions and consider amending the RFP to eliminate this duplication and include BOE/cost and pricing data only in the pricing volume.	<p>USDV Cost Price Templates to the technical/management proposal(s) to verify the consistency of the WYE. Offerors may reference RFP, L.27.2 TECHNICAL APPROACH (TA) - MISSION SUITABILITY.” to clarify that the information should be consistent and does not need to be duplicated.</p> <p>In addition, Amendment 6 will include an update for USDV RFP L.26.2(a)(3) reference name to "L.27.1 TECHNICAL APPROACH (TA) - MISSION SUITABILITY"</p>
20	80JSC23R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	L.26.2(a)(10)	L-44	While the RFP Amendment 4 references clause 52.222-2 Payment for Overtime Premiums, the clause itself is not included in the model contract released with RFP Amendment 5. Can this clause be added so that we may propose an NTE value for paragraph (a) if applicable?	This was an error in the RFP and will be modified in Amendment 6. The Section L instructions have been amended to state "Overtime Premiums (if applicable): Offerors shall take into consideration the definition of a normal workweek outlined in FAR 22.103-1 if overtime hours are proposed."
21	80JSC23R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	L.27.1 TA.1, in particular (b) and (c), and Attachments L-	L-50 thru L-51	The RFP requires the BOE and detailed labor breakdown in both the Mission Suitability Volume and the Price Volumes. While consistency between the cost volume and technical volume is a common Government evaluation theme, it is highly unusual to see the Basis of Estimate, which contains cost data and is used to ascertain cost	RFP Amendment 6 will be updated in Section L.27.1 (b) to clarify the distinction between the information in the Mission Suitability Volume and Cost/Price Volume. The information requested in the Technical Approach for BOE includes WYE, Skill Mix, and Non Labor Resources (NLR). While

80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

Question #	File Name	Section Number	Page Number	Question	Answer
		02 and L-03		<p>reasonableness, included within and evaluated as part of the technical volume.</p> <p>Inclusion of basis of estimate data in both volumes is something the Government typically tries to avoid (commonly, contractors are directed to include cost and pricing data ONLY in the price volume). Including Basis of Estimate data in both volumes creates a very large amount of duplicated content for the Government to review and potentially unbalances the evaluation (where price is already heavily emphasized based on the stated weighting), with the cost data effectively being "double counted" under both the price and technical criteria.</p> <p>Recommend NASA amend the RFP to eliminate this duplication and include BOE/cost and pricing data only in the pricing volume.</p>	the Cost and Price Volume includes pricing information for WYE, hours, and NLR.
22	80JSC23R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	L.27.1 TA.1 (d) (1) through (5)	L-51 and L-52	Please clarify whether the Government expects to receive five separate IMSs as listed in Part IV, L.27.1 TA.1 (d) (1) through (5) or if the Offeror may have flexibility to combine IMSs as appropriate.	The Government requires receipt of five separate Integrated Master Schedules as listed in Part IV, L.27.1 TA.1 (d) (1) through (5).

80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

23	80JSC23R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	Attachment L-04B	L-84	<p>May a Contractor no-bid the CLIN 4 Long Lead Parts Representative Delivery Order (RDO) and still be considered acceptable and evaluated for award by NASA?</p> <p>Given this, please confirm that an offer proposing the CLIN 4 Long Lead Parts RDO at a value greater than 10% of CLIN 2 may be considered acceptable and evaluated for award by NASA. Additionally, please confirm that an offer proposing the CLIN 4 Long Lead Parts RDO that allows NASA to delay CLIN 2 ATP by less than a year may be considered acceptable and evaluated for award by NASA.</p>	<p>Offerors that fail to propose to all CLINs and representative delivery and task orders may result in the offeror being eliminated from competition without further evaluation in accordance with L.26.1(c)(10). NASA will update Attachment L-04B CLIN 4 RDO to state " The Delivery Order milestone payments shall be phased such that the total sum of all Delivery Order milestone payments in the first 365 days of the delivery order shall not exceed 10% of CLIN2 Core price listed in Table B.2 SUPPLIES AND/OR SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED AND TOTAL AMOUNT."</p>
24	80JSC23R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	Attachment L-04B	L-84	<p>The RFP indicates the scope of the CLIN 4 Long Lead Delivery Order would be complete at Contractor acceptance of the parts. Would any scope associated with those long leads after Contractor acceptance such as testing, maintenance, repairs, integration into vehicle, etc, be considered CLIN 2 Core scope, or would it fall under a future CLIN 4 task order?</p>	<p>The CLIN4 Long Lead Parts (LLP) Delivery Order scope covers all tasks to procure and accept the long lead parts to allow NASA to delay the start of CLIN 2 by 365 days.</p> <p>Testing required for contractor acceptance is included within the scope of the CLIN4 LLP Delivery Order.</p> <p>After contractor-acceptance of these Long Lead Part (LLP)s, the maintenance, testing, repairs, and integration into the vehicle are within CLIN 2 Core scope, which is the same had the Government not ordered these LLP via this CLIN 4 Delivery Order.</p>

80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

					Attachment L-04B will be updated in Amendment 6 to provide clarification.
25	80JSC23R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	Attachment L-04B	L-84	How does NASA plan to address the CLIN 2 price, and any adjustment therein, in the event the PrePriced CLIN 4 Long Lead Delivery Order is awarded given the different contract types and potentially different pricing methodologies between the two offerings? Please clarify the process.	NASA would subtract the Long Lead Parts Delivery Order value from the value of CLIN 2 in either of the contract types if the Long Lead parts Delivery Order is awarded.
26	80JSC23R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	ATTACHMENT L-04B CLIN 4 – LAUNCH VEHICLE INTEGRATION AND SUSTAINING – LONG LEAD PARTS REPRESENTATIVE DELIVERY ORDER	L-85	The limitation that the Attachment L-04B CLIN 4 RDO total price does not exceed 10% of CLIN 2 core price is over-constraining and may create undesirable outcomes for the Government. It appears NASA's intent may have been consistency between nominal ATP scenario, where the long-lead C2-1 milestone must not exceed 10% of the CLIN2 price, and the RDO scenario. However, the effort and contractor outlays required for the C2-1 milestone in the nominal scenario versus under the RDO are vastly different: For the nominal C2-1 milestone, contractors need to place orders for long-lead parts and/or initiate long-lead production activities; however, for the RDO, the long-lead parts must be ordered, completed, and delivered. Even if the long-lead parts of the RDO are a fractional set of the long-lead parts in the nominal scenario, the work and outlays required in the RDO scenario could be vastly higher. Thus, the current limitations could force an offeror to baseline a later F.3 delivery date than otherwise	Amendment 6 will update Attachment L-04B CLIN 4 Representative Delivery Order to the following: 1. Removed Assumption 2 to delete: Total Delivery Order price shall be equal to or less than 10% of CLIN2 Core price 2. Added Instruction 8 to state: The Delivery Order milestone payments shall be phased such that the total sum of all Delivery Order milestone payments in the first 365 days of the delivery order shall not exceed 10% of CLIN2 Core price listed in Table B.2 SUPPLIES AND/OR SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED AND TOTAL AMOUNT.

80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

		(RDO)		<p>achievable for USDV just to meet the RDO NTE constraint, or to baseline for the RDO a smaller subset of hardware than are actually needed to achieve the Government's objective of protecting the delivery schedule in the event of a 1-year CLIN2 ATP slip - both of which would appear to be undesirable to the Government.</p> <p>NASA should remove this RDO constraint. The requirement that RDO parts be a subset of CLIN2 C-1 long-lead parts, in conjunction with the existing limitation that the baseline C-1 long-lead price not exceed 10% of the CLIN2 price, should be sufficient for the Government's purpose. Alternatively, NASA could remove the existing RDO price limitation assumption and replace it with an assumption that states, "The RDO pricing shall be phased such that the value of milestone payments in the first 365 days of the delivery order does not exceed 10% of the total CLIN2 price."</p>	
27	80JSC23R0003 USDV RFP Amendment 4	Att. L-04B CLIN 4 RDO	L-85	<p>L-04B states: "If this delivery order is awarded, there are no changes to CLIN2 Work Plan Completion Dates in Attachment J-30, Work Plans, nor changes to USDV delivery date in Clause F.3."</p> <p>However, in Attachment J-30, System Integration Review and AI&amp;T progress review milestones are both defined relative to SAR (SAR-x months). SAR is defined relative to CLIN 2 ATP (CLIN 2 ATP plus (OFI)</p>	<p>Amendment 6 will update Attachment L-04B CLIN 4 Representative Delivery Order to the following:</p> <p>1. Update Assumption 3 to state: If this delivery order is awarded, there are no changes to CLIN2 Work Plan Milestone C2-5 Shipment to Acceptance Destination Completion Dates in Attachment J-30, Work Plans, nor changes to USDV delivery date in Clause F.3 FAR 52.211-9 DESIRED</p>

80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

				<p>months). However, the purpose of the RDO is that the Shipment to Acceptance Destination, as defined in F.3, is not delayed by the CLIN 2 ATP slip. Thus, slipping CLIN 2 ATP by 1 year, as is the premise of the RDO, creates an illogical scenario where System Integration Review, AI&amp;T Progress Review, and System Acceptance Review would all slip contractually by one year, but the shipment to acceptance destination would not.</p> <p>It appears NASA's actual intent is to preserve, to the extent possible, the major CLIN 2 milestones and USDV delivery date in the event CLIN 2 ATP is delayed by a year. If so, the RFP should be amended to state that, in the RDO scenario, the dates for SIR, APR, and SAR must be the same as they would have been if CLIN 2 had not been delayed.</p> <p>Please clarify if this is the correct interpretation of NASA's intent, and please update the work plan instructions accordingly to clarify if so.</p>	<p>AND REQUIRED TIME OF DELIVERY</p> <p>2.Update Instruction 5 to state: When filling in the OFIs for the CLIN2 Work Plan modification, no changes shall be made to the Contractual Due Date (Assignment +/- Months) columns for the System Integration, AI&amp;T Progress and System Acceptance milestones such that the dates the Offeror proposed in the baseline Attachment J-30 Work Plans must stay the same as if CLIN 2 ATP was not delayed 365 days as a result of this LLP Delivery Order (i.e. if an Offeror proposes in the baseline J-30 Work Plan to complete System Integration milestone at CLIN 2 ATP + 36 months, then the Delivery Order shall update the J-30 Work Plan to complete System Integration milestone at CLIN 2 ATP + 24 months). The Offeror shall fill in the OFI for the payment percentages and payment amount columns with the price of this delivery order removed from the CLIN2 price and Work Plan.</p>
28	Attachment L-01C Minor Subcontract or Template Amendment 4	Attachm ent L-01C Instructi ons and TOC tab	Attachm ent L-01C General Instructi ons #5 and #8	RFP L.26.1(b)(4) states "Minor Subcontractor (s), as used in this provision, is a subcontractor other than the Major Subcontractor that will perform a percentage of the contract allocated workload in offerors fully integrated Attachment L-01A, L-01B, or L-01D "SubK Cost Details..."", and L.26.1(c)(4) states	See answer to question 18 above.



80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

				<p>Attachment L-01C is required by all minor subcontractors.</p> <p>However, General Instructions #5 and #8 in Attachment L-01C seem to contradict this instruction. General Instruction #5 quotes the definition of a Minor Subcontractor as "subcontractor other than the Major Subcontractor that will perform a percentage of the contract allocated workload in Attachment L-01 USDV Hybrid Cost Price Template "SubK Cost Details (CPIF)" tab", and General Instruction #8 references attachments L-01A and L-01D, but not L-01B.</p> <p>Please clarify: Is Attachment L-01C required of all minor subcontractors, including from Firm Fixed Price (Attachment L-01B) bidders, or only from cost plus or hybrid bidders?</p>	
29	80JSC023R0003 Amendment 5	Attachment L-01C	N/A	<p>The 'Attachment L-01C Minor Subcontractor' template seems to only provide the ability for our minor subcontractors to enter their labor information.</p> <p>How should they enter their non-labor inputs? Additionally, since the template only includes a CLIN 1 tab, please confirm that minor subcontractors are not expected to use this template for their pricing inputs in other CLINs.</p>	<p>The Government provided Attachment L-01C is intended to collect minor subcontractor's fully burdened labor rates and its labor rate details and does not include non-labor resources. The prime offeror is responsible for providing, to the Government, a fully comprehensive proposal submittal, by cost element, for all team members, including minor subcontractors. The prime offeror's Attachments L-01A, L-01B, or L-01D shall collect all cost element requirements including the non-labor resources for minor</p>

80JSC020R0003 RFP Amendment 4 Question and Answer

					<p>subcontractors in a comprehensive manner.</p> <p>In respect to minor subcontractors responding to CLIN 1 tab name, this was an oversight by the Government, Attachment L-01C will be updated in Amendment 6 to include tabs for CLINs 1, 2 and 2A.</p>
30	Attachment L-03 Technical Resources Template Amendment 3	Attachment L-03 Technical Resources Template	N/A	There are summation errors in the TRT. Tab "TRT-CLIN4 RTO," summation column BC does not include SOW 2.4-2.8 or 2.10 in its calculation.	Attachment L-03 Technical Resources Template will be updated in Amendment 6 to correct these errors.
31	Attachment L-03 Technical Resources Template Amendment 3	Attachment L-03 Technical Resources Template	N/A	There are summation errors in the TRT. Tab "TRT-CLIN4 RTO" does not include SOW 6.2.9. Is this intentional?	Attachment L-03 Technical Resources Template will be updated in Amendment 6 to correct this error.