

Solicitation
Number 80JSC023R0008
Procurement
Title Safety and Mission Assurance Contract III (SMAEC III)

No.	Category	Section	Page Number	Type	Industry Question/Comment	Answer
1	Other	L.25	409	Request for additional information	Does the Government anticipate providing average historical Direct Labor rates with the Cost/Price instructions? This will ensure all Offerors are able to adequately incorporate current incumbent salaries into the proposed cost, reducing the possibility of unrealistic rates impacting contract performance.	The Historical Direct Labor Rates will be provided with the Final RFP as part of the Technical Library.
2	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.25	409	Request for additional information	Does the Government plan on providing Section L.24 Cost and Price instructions prior to the release of the Final RFP? This will ensure offerors are able to provide feedback on the cost instructions during the Draft RFP process and enable adequate time to put together all elements of the cost approach.	Section L.24 Cost and Price instructions will be provided with the release of the Final RFP.
3	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.20	392	Other	Will the Government consider increasing the page limitation for Volume II Past Performance from 10 to 20 pages? With 4 contract citations allowed, a 10 page limit results with less than 2 pages per citation after the required contract data is provided. Two pages is not sufficient space to demonstrate the size, content, and complexity relevance of each contract to the SMAEC SOW.	The Volume II Past Performance page limitation in Table L-2 will be increased from 10 to 15 total pages with the release of the Final RFP.
4	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.20	392	Other	We appreciate the reduction in the requirements and associated page count from the previous SMAEC acquisition. However, the current page count seems insufficient to fully demonstrate our approach and understanding of the requirements. For example, after considering pages required for MA, TA2, and TA3, TA1 will be left with approximately 10 pages to demonstrate our approach and understanding to SOW sections 2, 3, and 4. Since these SOW requirements are 10 pages long, it will be difficult to provide a description of our approach and understanding with sufficient detail to allow the Government to conduct a meaningful evaluation. We suggest the Government consider an approach that was used in the SMAEC II solicitation: picking a few specific SOW elements to describe in TA1.	The solicitation Table L-2 and associated Notes will be revised to change the Volume I page count limit from 70 pages to 75 pages in the release of the Final RFP.
5	Section M Evaluation Criteria	M.4	460	Other	Will the Government consider removing this language as part of the Section M evaluation of part performance: "Within this 5 year period, more recent performance will receive greater consideration in the performance confidence assessment than those with more distant performance, assuming all other considerations to be equal." Given the consistency over the last decade in HSF programs supported by the JSC and the continued high standard of S&MA requirements across the agency, an Offeror's past performance more three years ago would still provide confidence in their ability to execute the SMAEC III requirements, especially if they can show continuous support to these programs throughout the five-year window. If this requirement remains, it provides an advantage to the incumbent contractor as they have the most recent performance on a relevant contract.	The M.4 evaluation criteria will not be changed in the Final RFP.
6	Section L Proposal Instructions	DRD-S3-020	208	Other	Will the government consider removing the Job Descriptions and Qualification requirement in DRD-S3-020 from the page count? " Job descriptions and qualifications by proposed skill levels, including mapping of the Contractor's proposed labor categories to the government-provided SLCs." The job descriptions provided in the draft RFP are approximately 9 pages in length and would take up a considerable amount of the available page count.	The solicitation Table L-2, Note 4 will be revised to exclude the requirement of DRD-S3-020, Section C.4 from the Volume I page count limit in the release of the Final RFP.
7	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.20 Volume IV	393	Clarity	Is the Government Property Management Plan due with the proposal? The reference to L.6.d appears to be an incorrect reference, should the reference be to subsection d) on page 464?	The reference will be updated to L.25.(a), 2), b) in the release of the Final RFP. Please provide accordingly per the solicitation instructions.

8	Other	Section C 4.3	26	Request for additional information	Can the Government provide a list of the Hardware assets, SMA-unique software, database, website, and applications to be maintained by the SMAEC III contractor including where each is located (on-site or contractor facility) and Operating System/Platform.	Please reference the SMAEC II Software and Database List which will be part of the revised SMAEC-III Technical Library Index as an attachment to the forthcoming RFP release.
9	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.20 Subfactor 1	392	Clarity	Are BOEs required for TA1? In Table L-2, Subfactor 1 under BOEs it lists TA1 and TA2, but there is no associated BOE requirements under L.22.1 TA.1. We suggest that no requirement for BOEs for TA1 be added to the RFP. Given the desire of Offerors to capture the incumbent workforce, this is unlikely to create a discriminating factor.	BOEs will not be required for TA.1. The requirement for a BOE for TA.1 will be removed in the release of the Final RFP.
10	Schedule	L.20 PROPOSAL ARRANGEMENT, PAGE LIMITATIONS, COPIES, AND DUE DATES	391	Other	Given the short timeframe to prepare proposals (referenced as 30 days in the cover letter), request that all volumes are submitted at the same time.	Please propose in accordance with the solicitation instructions. Volume II Past Performance is requested early but is not officially due until the proposal submittal date.
11	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.23 JPI 52.215-114 PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION	407	Clarity	Reference "In addition to the information above, Offerors, any major subcontractors, as defined above, the proposed Program Manager, and any other organizational entity (parent or affiliated company, division(s), business units, or segments of your company, which is considered to provide meaningful involvement in contract performance), shall each submit the Past Performance Questionnaire, Attachment L-8, to all of the point of contact references required in paragraph (c) above." There is not a paragraph (c) above. Please confirm which paragraph this refers to.	The paragraph (c) reference will be updated accordingly in the release of the Final RFP.
12	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.22.1 Technical Approach (TA) - Mission Suitability Subfactor 1, TA1 Requirements, TA.2 Sample Task Orders Resources, TA.3 Technical Scenario, L.22.2 Management Approach (MA) - Mission Suitability Subfactor 2	396-401	Clarity	<p>Proposal instructions in Sections TA1, TA2, TA3, and MA1 all contain nearly identical requirements for innovations and efficiencies. Since there may be innovations and efficiencies that apply to multiple areas of the contract, describing the same or similar information in sufficient detail (their implementation, risks and mitigations, historical references, etc.) would be an inefficient use of page count and would not aid in the Government's evaluation.</p> <p>Since all innovations and efficiencies are to be included as part of Continual Improvement Plan (DRD-S3-007), we suggest that the Government allow a full description of each innovation and efficiency (including the specific requirements referred to above and the requirements in the DRD), to be placed in the Continual Improvement Plan and the Section L requirements in TA1, TA2, TA3, and MA1 be modified to request that Offerors provide a detailed explanation of how the applicable innovation or efficiency benefits the specific section or SOW element, with a reference to DRD-S3-007 for the full description of the innovation or efficiency.</p>	The RFP will be updated for L.22.1 to reflect that Technical SOW Requirements addressed in the DRDs do not need to be addressed (duplicated) in the Technical Requirements narrative, in the release of the Final RFP.

13	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.22.2 Management Approach (MA) - Mission Suitability Subfactor 2	401	Clarity	Please confirm that the full response to Continual Improvement Plan (DRD-S3-007) is to be included as part of our response to MA1 and also attached to the Model Contract Section J attachments.	For all DRDs due at proposal as specified in the RFP, the complete DRD is required as part of proposal submission unless otherwise noted. Regarding DRD-S3-007, the complete DRD is due as part of the proposal.
14	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.22 MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR - VOLUME I	396	Clarity	<p>There are several instances in the RFP where differing sections contain the same or similar requirements, for example:</p> <p>Section L requirements for TA1, TA2, and MA1 all contain an identical requirement to: "Describe the processes used to accurately identify, monitor, and control technical risks...."</p> <p>Contract Management Plan (DRD-S3-001) contains a requirement to "Describe the approach to maintain the appropriate percentages of work distributed to small businesses and the various small, disadvantaged businesses throughout the life of the contract." This requirement is address in the Small Business Utilization Section of the proposal.</p> <p>In such cases, is it acceptable to provide a reference to the proposal section that best addresses such requirement in order to avoid duplicating information in multiple sections?</p>	Offerors must address each requirement in their respective Volume Subfactors. The proposal should be clear, concise, and shall include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and substantiation of all information. The proposal should not simply rephrase or restate the Government's requirements, but rather shall provide convincing rationale to address how the Offeror intends to meet these requirements.
15	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.23 JPI 52.215-114 PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION	407	Clarity	Reference "In addition to the information above, Offerors, any major subcontractors, as defined above, the proposed Program Manager , and any other organizational entity (parent or affiliated company, division(s), business units, or segments of your company, which is considered to provide meaningful involvement in contract performance), shall each submit the Past Performance Questionnaire, Attachment L-8, to all of the point of contact references required in paragraph (c) above." Please confirm if a Past Performance Questionnaire is required for the Program Manager. We suggest that this requirement be removed, as it will create confusion for the customer references, since the questions in the PPQ are primarily about the "Contractor Performance," rather than "Program Manager" performance. The Work History and References requested in Attachment L-9 would service as a more appropriate means to obtain similar data for the PM.	Proposed Program Manager requirement will be removed from Section L.23, paragraph h)in the release of the Final RFP.
16	Section L Proposal Instructions	L-1-1 Section 7.0	421	Request for additional information	Can the Government provide the document referenced in Table 2-2 of EHP-100005 EHP S&MA Plan. This will allow us to ensure our approach to coordinate and conduct Extravehicular & Human Surface Mobility Program (EHP) SMA activities remains in alignment with the EHP S&MA Plan.	The Technical Library will be updated with the available documents with the release of the Final RFP. Please reference the forthcoming revised SMAEC-III Technical Library Index.
17	ATTACHMENT L-1, SAMPLE TASK ORDERS	L-1-2 2-S3TO-ISS, ISS Program SMA Support	431	Clarity	Section 5.0 Period of Performance references 2 years of performance (CY1 and CY2); however the Product table in section 6.0 appears to only account for 1 year of performance (without specifying whether it is meant as a yearly accounting or total accounting). Please clarify.	The TA.2 Sample Task Orders L-1-1 and L-1-2 assumptions and requirements will be updated to reflect a period of performance for only Contract Year 1 in the release of the Final RFP.

18	Section L Proposal Instructions	DRD-S3-007, C.Content 2 and 3	174	Other	<p>Will the Government consider reducing the technical and management details required within Section C of DRD-S3-007 due with the proposal to only include the approach, risks, and schedule, and add an updated delivery of the DRD that is due 30-day post award that includes the remaining data? This will allow the offer to contractually include their I&Es and benefits within the DRD without undo complications to the development and evaluation of the Offeror's cost and price.</p> <p>Additionally, the "investment cost by fiscal year for each WBS element (for each labor and non-labor category), and proposed savings for each WBS element. There shall be enough detail for the Government to adequately assess the practicality and return on investment (ROI) for each suggested management improvement" will require significant page count and good limit the I&Es that are presented by the offers in the proposal.</p>	No changes are being made regarding the RFP, DRD-S3-007, Section C, Content 2 and 3. Please propose in accordance with the solicitation instructions.
19	Section L Proposal Instructions	Attachment L-1 Sample Task Orders	415	Clarity	<p>Attachment L-1 Sample Task Orders states: "Each task order is a single year Sample Task Order with two periods of performance covering Contract Years (CY) 1 and 2."</p> <p>Reviewing the individual task order SOWs, they show a 2 year period of performance. Please clarify if the assumptions on page 415 will be updated to reflect.</p>	See the answer for question #17 above.
20	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.22.2 Management Approach (MA) - Mission Suitability Subfactor 2	402	Clarity	<p>Section L, MA1 states: "Management SOW Requirements addressed in the DRDs do not need to be addressed (duplicated) in the Management Requirements narrative." Can the Government clarify whether this applies to all DRDs submitted with the proposal and not just the two listed in section MA1 (Contract Management Plan (DRD-S3-001) and Continual Improvement Plan (DRD-S3-007))? For example, SOW Section 1 refers to DRD-S3-018, DRDS3-014, and others. If those requirements are already addressed elsewhere in the proposal, are we able to reference that section of the proposal?</p>	The RFP will be updated for L.22.2 to reflect that Management SOW Requirements addressed in the DRDs do not need to be addressed (duplicated) in the Management Requirements narrative, in the release of the Final RFP.
21	Other	JSC DATA REQUIREMENTS DESCRIPTION (DRD), DRD-S3-012 – Total Compensation SUBMISSION: i.Initial: Due with proposal as part of the Cost/Price Volume.	199	Clarity	<p>DRD-S3-012 states that the TCP is part of the Cost/Price Volume. However, both Table L-2 and MA.2 state that the TCP is part of Volume I Mission Suitability.</p> <p>Additionally, M.3.2 Staffing and Critical Skills Plan and Total Compensation Approach states that the TCP will be evaluated under Mission Suitability Subfactor 2.</p> <p>Question: Please confirm that Offerors should submit their TCP as part of Volume 1 Mission Suitability. If so, please correct DRD-S3-012 F. Submission: i.Initial: to "Due with proposal as part of Volume I Mission Suitability."</p> <p>-- If this assumption is not correct, please update Table L-2 and MA.2 accordingly.</p> <p>-- If the Government desires the TCP to be part of both volumes, please update DRD-S3-012 and ensure the instructions are provided in the Cost/Price volume.</p>	<p>The TCP is due with the proposal and is to be submitted in both Mission Suitability and Cost/Price Volumes.</p> <p>Part 8B paragraph 3 of DRD-S3-012 states that "The Total Compensation Plan, Incumbent Retention and Pay (IRAP) and Fringe Benefits Analysis of Compensation Plan (FBACP) Templates shall be required as part of the TCP." of those three items, "The IRAP and FBACP templates shall be provided as part of the Cost/Price Volume of the proposal and will be evaluated as part of the Total Compensation Plan."</p> <p>The DRD-S3-012, Part F(i) will be updated to reflect submission of the TCP to be part of the Volume I Mission Suitability (Narrative TCP) and the Cost/Price Volume (IRAP and FBACP templates, which are included in the EPM), in the release of the Final RFP.</p>

22	Section L Proposal Instructions	Table L-2: Overview of Proposal Volumes, Page Limitations, Copies, and Format Volume II Past Performance	396/470	Other	Question: Would the Government consider increasing the page limit for Past Performance Description to 20 pages to allow offerors the ability to fully respond details about the contracts' recency, relevance and performance and address the "content" requested (scope of services, work, requirements, or supplies)?	Please see the Answer to question #3.
23	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.9 & DRD-S2-012	382	Clarity	DRD-S3-012 evaluates the reasonableness of compensation for service contracts in accordance with FAR 52.222-46 and JPI 1852.231-71. FAR 52.222-46 requires evaluation of compensation for all professional employees who will work under the contract (requiring all subcontractors providing professional employees to submit a TCP). L9. JPI 1852.231-71(d) requires "all service subcontractors provide, as part of their proposal, the information identified in (a) through (c) of this provision for cost reimbursement or noncompetitive fixed-price type subcontracts when the cumulative estimated value of the service subcontracts under the proposed prime contract is in excess of: (1) 10 percent of the contract's total potential value (including options and the phase-in period); and (2) The threshold for requiring certified cost or pricing data as set forth in FAR 15.403-4. Question: As currently written, it is interpreted that JPI 1852.231-71(d) takes precedence of FAR 52.222-46 and TCP's are not required for all proposed subcontractors providing professional services. Furthermore, it is interpreted that the term "noncompetitive" refers to subcontracts which do not meet the definitions of adequate price competition as set forth in FAR 15.403-1. Please confirm this assumption is correct; or, please update the directions pertaining to subcontract TCP requirements.	Procurement Class Deviation (PCD) 23-02 effective June 22, 2023 provides a class deviation from the NFS requirements regarding requirements for evaluation of professional employees, specifically NFS 1831.205-671, Solicitation provision, and 1852.231-71, Determination of Compensation Reasonableness. In accordance with PCD 23-02, JPI 1852.231-71 will be removed from DRD-S3-012 and this DRD will be evaluated in accordance with FAR 52.222-46 in the release of the Final RFP.
24	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.20 & DRD-S2-012	392, 394 & 187	Clarity	Subfactor 2 Total Compensation Plan (DRD-S3-012) page limit includes that of Note 3 which reads 15 pages per team member, not included in 70-page count limit. DRD-S3-012 form limits TCP's to 10 pages for prime and each teammate. Question: Recommend DRD-S3-012 be updated to reflect the 15 page limit consistent with Section L, Table L-2, Note 3. Question: For prime, subcontractors, and team members who chose to combine data into one TCP IAW DRD-S2-012, recommend increasing the page limit to 50 pages or unlimited, to account for increased data.	The solicitation Table L-2, Note 3 will be revised to change the DRD-S3-012 page count limit from 15 pages to 10 pages in the release of the Final RFP. Note 3 will be further revised to state the following: "The page limit for the TCP is 10 pages for the Prime and 10 pages for each major subcontractor. For joint ventures, the page limit is 10 pages per team member. The prime, major subcontractors, and team members are permitted to combine data into one TCP, and the page limit for the combined TCP will be 10 pages per team member," in the release of the Final RFP.
25	Section L Proposal Instructions	DRD-S3-012	184	Request for additional information	The DRD-S3-012 States the following: The IRAP and FBACP templates shall be provided as part of the Cost/Price Volume of the proposal and will be evaluated as part of the Total Compensation Plan. The TCP should be consistent with both templates. Question: The IRAP and FBACP templates have not been provided as part of the Attachment L-3, Excel Pricing Model (EPM) but are referenced in the DRD-S3-0129 as being required as the Part 1 submission of the Cost/Price Volume submission. Will the government please clarify whether these templates are required and if so, please provide the template?	The IRAP and FBACP templates will be provided in the EPM as part of the Final RFP.
26	Other	Appendix 2 Contract Fee Distribution		Clarity	Question: Will there be an award fee evaluation period for the 6 months Extension of Services period as listed in section L.17? If so, please update the sample table on page 241/470.	In the event FAR Clause 52.217-8 Extension of Services is exercised, the table listed in section L.17 will be updated accordingly at that time.

27	Other	B.7 (a) (1) IDIQ	11	Clarity	Question: Can the Government confirm the requirement for the contractor to provide a physical facility for employees not working on-site, for a minimum of 3 days a week?	There is not a requirement in the SMAEC III RFP for the contractor to provide a physical facility for employees not working on-site, for a minimum of 3 days a week.
28	Unique terms and conditions	H.6.c 1852.235-71 Key personnel and Facilities	57	Request for additional information	Question: What is the definition of a key facility?	The phrase "List of Key Facilities" will be updated to reflect "List of Facilities" in the Final RFP Section H.6.c.
29	Unique terms and conditions	DRD-S3-001 6) Location Plan	137	Request for additional information	Question: In describing the staffing location plans for on-site and off-site approaches, would the Government consider issuing a more explicit requirement for a physical location where the workforce that is not located at a Government facility will work?	Please see the Answer provided for Question #27. This revised language shall be forthcoming in the Final RFP, Section C SOW: "In addition, resident and local site support may be a hybrid of both on-site and off-site via telework, as required by the Task Orders (TOs) as defined below. The contractor shall consistently and effectively utilize the onsite JSC and WSTF space allocated in the contract for contractor use in the performance of the SMAEC III contract. In addition, the contractor shall support customer requirements to provide SMA products and services physically on-site at JSC as required to perform work prescribed in the Task Orders awarded under the SMAEC III contract." This revised language shall be forthcoming in the Final RFP, DRD-S3-001, Section 6 Location Plan: "6) Location Plan i. Describe the staffing location plans. Include discussion of anticipated lease agreement, if any. ii. Discuss any other issues related to logistics management.
30	Section L Proposal Instructions	L-1-1 1-S3TO-EVA, extravehicular Activity (EVA) SMA Support 4.0 AND 4.1	417	Clarity	The 4.0 Task Description refers to the contractor providing support to pre-flight and post-flight activities and on-orbit operations including integrated operations safety assessments however, the SOW References do not include 2.1.7 Real-time Mission Support. Question: If on-orbit operations constitute Real-Time Mission Support, recommend adding 2.1.7 to the SOW reference sections.	The Final RFP Sample Task Order L-1-1, Section 4.1 will be updated to reflect the SOW reference section 2.1.7.
31	Section L Proposal Instructions	L-1-2 2-S3TO- ISS, ISS Program SMA Support 4.1	424	Clarity	The 4.1 SOW References do not include Section 2.2 SMA Technical Authority Support however 4.2.1 describes requirements for Technical Authority Support. Question: For clarity, would the Government consider including a reference to 2.2 in this area?	The Final RFP Sample Task Order L-1-2, Section 4.1 will be updated to reflect the SOW reference section 2.2.
32	Other	DRD-S3-003 Integrated Technical Management Report; Paragraph F. Submission, 2. Frequency:	141	Clarity	Question: Does the government intend for the performance meeting and the report submission to be on the same day, 15 working days of the end of the accounting month?	It is not a mandatory requirement that the report submission and meeting will be held on the same day, but rather the meeting will be held within the last 15 days of the accounting month.

33	Other	H.11 External Customer Effort; SOW 3.2 (c)	63 (H.11); 24 (SOW 3.2)	Clarity	SOW 3.2 (c) states "Identify and secure external customers..." and Section H, H.11 states "...all contractor efforts associated with attracting and securing agreements for external customers...shall be accounted for under the Baseline effort of the contract (see SOW Section 3.2)" Question: Can the government confirm that all costs associated with SOW 3.2 will be issued as cost-reimbursable task orders?	The phrase "Baseline effort" will be removed and replaced with "an issued Task Order" in Section H.11 to identify that costs associated with tasks for SOW 3.2 will be issued under a Task Order, in the release of the Final RFP.
34	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.23 Past Performance	408	Clarity	Environmental data and Safety and Health Data: "copies of any and all environmental non-compliance correspondence and citations from federal, state or local agencies..." . Question: Is this intended for all contracts or just those cited for past performance? Safety and Health Data - "copies of any and all OSHA citations..." Again, for all contracts or only for those cited in past performance?	It is the Offeror's responsibility to submit all required information in accordance with the solicitation. Please refer to Section L.23.j, "For all work performed during the past three years, offerors shall provide the following:..."
35	Other	Attachment L-4, GRE - Table 2	436	Clarity	On the GRE, both the QAS2-OT and QAS3-OT lines are listed twice each, with each containing a different value. Question: Is this an editorial oversight and the values should be combined, or does the government intend some distinguishing factor by separating the values?	The RFP Attachment L-4 GRE Table will be revised to remove all instances of Overtime (OT) SLCs, however the total WYE for the summary did not change, in the release of the Final RFP.
36	Sample Task Order (RTO) requirements	Attachment L-1, Sample Task Orders, Sample TO 1-S3TO-EVA	420	Grammatical	In the EVA Sample Task Order (1-S3TO-EVA), both Subtask 5 and Subtask 6 are listed as paragraph number 4.6. Question: Will the government correct numbering to move Subtask 6 to para. 4.7 in the final RFP for ease of reference and communication of BOE information in the proposal material?	The RFP Sample Task Order L-1-1, Section 4.6 for Subtask 6 will be revised to reflect Section 4.7 in the release of the Final RFP.
37	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.22 Mission Suitability; L.22.1-TA.2.b Basis of Estimate (BOE)	399	Request for additional information	Question: Will the government provide plug values for Non-Labor Resources (NLR) to be applied in the Sample Task Order pricing?	There is not a requirement in the solicitation to price the Sample Task Orders.
38	Other	B.7 Fully Burdened Rate Table (B-1) for Pricing Task Orders	9	Clarity	While the GRE includes specific allocations for Overtime associated with OT-QAS2, OT-QAS3, and OT-Tech 4, the Fully Burdened Rate table does not include those lines. Question: Does the government plan to add those so specific rates can be reflected?	Please see the Answer provided for Question #35.
39	Section M Evaluation Criteria	B7	11	Request for additional information	Without details about the timing, size, duration, and scope of all of the potential Task Orders under the IDIQ, offerors must guess at the IDIQ non-labor costs. Question: Will the Government consider providing a plug value for the NLRs for the IDIQ price evaluation in order to allow for a fair, streamlined evaluation across all offerors?	The values for the NLRs will be provided in the forthcoming EPM in the Final RFP.
40	Section M Evaluation Criteria			Request for additional information	Question: Will the government provide a draft of the EPM, cost volume instructions, and cost evaluation in section M to allow all offerors time to review and provide the Government with feedback prior to final RFP release, and thus reduce potential questions in response thereto?	The EPM will be provided in the Final RFP.
41	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.25(a)(1)(a)	413/470		L.25(a)(1)(a) states that the DRD-S3-018 OCI mitigation plan is required only if an OCI concern is identified. It also states that the DRD-S3-018 OCI Mitigation plan will be evaluated as part of Vol IV if no OCI concern is identified. Question: Will the government please identify when an OCI mitigation plan must be submitted?	The Initial OCI Plan is due with initial proposal if an OCI concern has been identified. If no OCI concern was identified during the initial proposal timeframe, then the Initial OCI Plan will be required if a company makes competitive range or is the apparent awardee. The Final OCI Plan would be due in accordance with the DRD-S3-018.
42	Other	C - 4.0, 4.1	25	Clarity	There is no mention of Office of Strategic Infrastructure (OSI) risk management in this section. Question: Will that be covered elsewhere or should it be included here? In addition, section 4.0 mentions JSC Center being included but JSC Center is not included in 4.1.a. Should JSC Center level risk management be included?	The RFP SOW, Section 4.1 will be revised to broaden the requirements to support any NASA customer that will be defined at the Task Order level in the release of the Final RFP.

43	Other				<p>SBU-1 paragraph (b), assuming the stated goals are represented as a percentage of total contract value, the draft RFP goals represented in SBU-1 paragraph (b) exceed current DOD, SBA & NFS 1819.201 recommended goals.</p> <p>Question: Please verify the percentage values, and if they should align with NASA, DOD, and SBA goals: SB 32.0%, SDB 5%, HUBZ 3%, WOSB 5%, HBCU/MSI 1.5%?</p>	Section L.22.3, SBU.1 will not be changed in the release of the Final RFP. Please propose in accordance with the solicitation instructions.
44	Section L Proposal Instructions			Request for additional information	<p>Question: Can the government please update table B-1 to allow for the potential in varying rates during 2nd and 3rd shifts?</p>	Table B-1 will not be changed in the release of the Final RFP. Please propose in accordance with the solicitation instructions.
45	Other	Table B-1	10	Request for additional information	<p>Question: Request government update table B1 to allow bidders flexibility in bidding labor rates at the various support locations (WTSF, GRC, JSC).</p>	Table B-1 will not be changed in the release of the Final RFP. Please propose in accordance with the solicitation instructions.
46	Section L Proposal Instructions	Section L.20 Table L-2, Section L.22.1 TA-1	392-394, 396	Clarity	<p>Question: There appears to be a disconnect between Table L2 & Paragraph L.22.1. Is the correct interpretation of section L.22.1 that a BOE is only required for TA2?</p>	Please see the Answer provided for Question #9.