No.	Category	Section	Page Number	Industry Question/Comment	Answer
1	Other			Do you have an estimated ceiling value for the Cargo Mission Contract 4 (CMC4) for Johnson Space Center at Houston, TX	The IDIQ portion of the contract has a ceiling value of $100 million, and the Underlimit portion of the contract has a ceiling value of $80 million. The ceiling value of core work is dependent on the contractor's proposed approach and skill mix.
2	Schedule	DRD CMC-PM-01	J-26	Cargo Mission Contract Management Plan, Contents, #3, references Contract Manager. Was this supposed to be Program Manager?	DRD CMC-PM-01 will be updated to reflect Program Manager with the release of the Final RFP.
3	Section L Proposal Instructions	Attachment L-8 WLI, Table L-8-8	36	Do the return mass WLI indicators accurately reflect the work scope expected for the number of flights returning?	Attachment L-8,Table L-8-8, will be revised with release of the final RFP to reflect the expected downmass vehicles during the listed fiscal years.
4	Section L Proposal Instructions	Attachment L-8 WLI, 1.5 Configuration and Data Management	1	Table L-8-1.1 CM WLI should have a frequency of per year. Additional work for Manifesting starting in 2025 requires a CR for each VV IDRD Annex 1 Post Flight Change Request referenced in Section 5.1 of the WLI. Should it be included as part of the CR total?	Table L-8-1.1 will be updated to frequency per year with the release of the Final RFP.
5	Section L Proposal Instructions	Attachment L-8 WLI, 2.0 Safety and Mission Assurance	1	Table L-8-2.1 CM WLI should have a frequency of per year.	Table L-8-2.1 will be updated to frequency per year with the release of the Final RFP.
6	Section L Proposal Instructions	Attachment L-8 WLI, 3.3.5 Laptops and Accessories	8	Section is titled "Laptops and Cables" and includes WLI for Rodent habitat systems, air tanks, and PWD/xPWD. We recommend these systems are identified under a different sustaining category(is) as they are not Laptop/Cable hardware.	Table L-8-3.7 will be moved to the top of Section 3.3 Hardware Processing with the release of the Final RFP. The table is applicable to all subsections below it.
7	Section L Proposal Instructions	Attachment L-8 WLI, Section 6.1.7.1, 6.1.7.2, 6.1.7.4-6.1.7.10	47-49	Each section identifies the number of data fields that are defined as the responsibility of CMC but also is defined by the Manifesting Group (as if two separate entities). Does distinction need to be made to clarify that the Manifest Group will be part of CMC starting in 2025? Possibly clarify the intent of separation or the processes associated with the data types.	Attachment L-8, Sections 6.1.7.1, 6.1.7.2, 6.1.7.4-6.1.7.10, will be revised with release of the Final RFP to reflect that the fields are derived from the manifest process.
8	Section L Proposal Instructions	Attachment L-8 WLI, Section 6.2.6 Virtual Cargo Review	53-54	Output states: "CMC will publish compiled bag level Virtual Cargo Review Imagery and Video and notify the community via distribution list. CMC will define a deadline to submit all Virtual Cargo Review inputs as to not impact bag packing and turnover to the next level integrator and notify the community via a distribution list." Is the requirement for video and imagery after packing with opportunity for stakeholder impacts intended for Exploration Programs only?	Attachment L-8, Section 6.2.6 will be updated with release of the Final RFP to reflect that imagery and/or video is acceptable for meeting the requirement.

9	Section L Proposal Instructions	Attachment L-11 Key Personnel	n/a	Item 6(b) references IMOC III. Can the Government confirm this should be CMC4?	Will be updated with the release of the Final RFP to reflect CMC4.
10	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.14, Table L.14-1	L-9, L-10	TOPIC: Mission Suitability and Past Performance Page Limits: The page limit of 60 pages for the Mission Suitability Volume is insufficient for offerors to provide the level of detail required by Section L Instructions L.18.1 Overall Management Approach (MA/SF1) and L.18.2 Technical Approach (TA/SF2), which is essential for NASA's proper evaluation and scoring of offerors' MS proposals. Similarly, the page limit of 10 pages for the Past Performance Factor is insufficient for offerors to provide the information required by Section L Instruction L.19 Past Performance Factor, particularly Paragraphs (d) and (e), for up to five (5) past contracts, which is critical to evaluate the relevancy of an offeror's individual and team past experience for accurate LOC ratings. QUESTION/COMMENT: Will NASA increase the page limits to 100 pages and 20 pages for the Mission Suitability and Past Performance Volumes, respectively, to enable offerors to provide the information required by the Section L instructions in a manner that will ensure a proper evaluation that meets NASA source selection objectives?	The page limit for Mission Suitability Factor - Volume I will remain 60 pages in the Final RFP. The TCP apprach will not be included in the 60 pages but will have a 10 page limitation per submission, with the release of the Final RFP. The page limit for Past Performance Factor - Volume II will be increased from 10 pages to 15 pages with release of the Final RFP.
11	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.14, Table L.14-1; L.19 PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR - VOLUME II	L-11; L-27	Table L.14-1, Volume II. Past Performance, Supporting Material requires: "Small Business Participation Statements and Consent Letters"; however, Section L.19(k) requires only a small business participation statement from the prime offeror: "The prime offeror shall provide a statement of small business participation (targets, record, and type of work subcontracted) over the last three years on work that is relevant to this effort, with special emphasis on the division of the company which will perform the proposed contract." Please confirm that consent letters are only required if the prime offeror is utilizing a teaming partner's past performance as one or more of its past performance references.	Consent Letters are required if the offeror is referencing a subcontractor's past performance in their Past Performance Volume.
12	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.14, Table L.14-1	L-9	Due to the amount of data needed in the TCP, we recommend this sub-section be excluded from page count.	See answer for Question 10 above.

13	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.17 (2) JPI 52.215-113 Proposal Formatting Instructions (Dec 2019)	L-14	Would the Government allow offerors to use a compressed Arial font no smaller than 12 point text size for text in diagrams, charts, tables, artwork and photographs to improve readability?	See L.17 for proposal formatting instructions.
14	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.17 MA2. Total Compensation Approach; L.19(e) Past Performance factor	L-17	Please confirm the definition of major subcontractor. Section L.18.1.MA2 refers to "the definition for a significant/major subcontractor established in the Price or Cost Volume instructions", however, these instructions were not provided in the DRFP. Section L.19(e) states a "major subcontractor is defined as any team member (e.g., subcontractor or inter-divisional organization) with an estimated total contract value that equals or exceeds $30,000,000 over the life of the contract."	The definition of a major subcontractor will be updated with release of the Final RFP to be consistent. A major subcontractor is defined as any team member (e.g., subcontractor or inter-divisional organization) with an estimated total contract value that equals or exceeds $30,000,000 over the life of the contract.
15	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.18.1 MA.2, Total Compensation Approach	L-17	Section L.18.1.MA2. states "This requirement also applies to each proposed subcontractor determined to be significant/major, in accordance with the definition for a significant/major subcontractor established in the Price or Cost Volume instructions, and which provide at least 10 percent of the total estimated professional direct labor hours or work year equivalents (WYEs)." Should this be an "or" statement?	The definition of a significant/major subcontractor for the Total Compensation Approach (Section L.18.1 MA2) will be updated with release of the Final RFP to be consistent with the definition of a significant/major subcontractor in Section L.19 Past Performance Factor and Section L.20 Cost Volume.
16	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.18.1 MA.2, Total Compensation Approach	L-17	For proposed subcontractors that are significant/major that are required to submit a Total Compensation Plan: Are the subcontractors directed to submit their TCP to the government? If so, what is the page limit (if any) for subcontractors' unique TCP?	Subcontractors may submit their required proposal information separately using the instructions in Provision L.16 EFSS Box. The Offeror shall ensure subcontractor submissions are made no later than the date and time specified for proposal submission and comply with all solicitation instructions. The TCP Approach will be limited to 10 pages, per submission, with the release of the Final RFP.
17	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.18.2-G (BOE)	L-20	Due to the amount of data needed to provide a compliant response with the requested level of detail for all hours proposed, we recommend that all BOEs be excluded from page count.	Section L-18.2 Paragraph G will be edited to clarify that a narrative is required for the top level SOW requirement (WBS Level 1) to support Technical Resources in Attachment L-7. A narrative is not required for WBS Levels 2 and 3.

18	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.18.2-G (BOE); Attachment L-8 (WLI)	L-20	How does the Government intend for contractor to price technical/requirements definition for new work for each Program under task orders and IDIQ associated with implementation of the Buy and Fly Process? We recommend the final RFP include an estimated number of IDIQ/Under limit projects per year that will be executed in SOW 7.0. Adding the WLI will allow for assessing required technical definition required prior to ATP.	With release of the final RFP, Attachment L-08 Worload Indicators (WLI) will provide historical data regarding discrete tasks to assist in the understanding of IDIQ and Underlimit projects per year.
19	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.19 (d)	L-25	Is a subcontractor in this paragraph defined as those submitting contract past performance information or is it all subcontractors participating as part of a team?	See answer to Questions 11 and 14 above.
20	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.19 (I), Environment Data; Safety and Health Data	L-26	Does this requirement apply to all contracts performed by the offeror and subcontractors within the last 5 years or does it only apply to past performance references?	See Section L.19(i) which states, "For all work performed during the past 5 years…"
21	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.19(b), Attachment L-11 Key Personnel	L-24 and attachment	Both indicates that a resume is required for the Program Manager. Is a resume required for the Deputy Program Manager if we propose one as key?	See Attachment L-11 for resume requirements.

22	Section L Proposal Instructions	L.20; Attachments L-02.1, L-02.2, L-02.3; M.6	Cover Letter; L-27; M-9	The Government currently plans release of the Final RFP on 11/30/23 and has identified that submission will be 40 days later, which would indicate submission as very early January 2024. The Government states that due to the contract's total period of performance is TBD, and that the period of performance greatly affects the Cost and Price factor, sections L.20 and M.6, and Attachments L-02.1, L-02.2, and L-02.3 are marked reserved. Would the Government please reconsider and provide an updated Draft RFP to include proposal instructions/guidelines for Section L.20 Cost and Price Factor - Volume III? Additionally, would the Government consider releasing a draft of Attachments L-02.1, L-02.2, and L-02.3, where the PoP is consistent with, at least in the interim, Attachment L-07 TRST? While the PoP greatly affects the total price, there are many instructions that would allow Offerors to anticipate/prepare for the amount of detail required for a compliant submission. Given that the submission date will be early January 2024, this significantly reduces the response time for the Cost/Price Volume due to the holidays, where, due to unavoidable circumstances, some businesses are simply not available. Not being able to efficiently and effectively utilize the Draft RFP to guide an Offerors planned response, review pricing template formats and validate formulas, Offerors are at a significant disadvantage with regard to the response time.	The Reserved sections of the Draft RFP were posted on November 16, 2023, for offeror review and comment. The planned Final RFP posting date was revised to December 14, 2023, and the offeror due date was adjusted to allow sufficient time for responses to the solicitation.
23	Section M Evaluation Criteria	Section M.3, Source Evaluation Board Evaluation Factors for Award	M-2	The evaluation factor ranking did not provide the relationship importance of the three factors (Cost, MS, PP) to one another. Can the Government clarify the importance of Cost (as an independent factor) in relation to Mission Suitability and Past Performance also as independent factors?	Evaluation factors are ranked as statend in Section M.3.
24	Unnecessary or inefficient requirements	SOW Section 5.3.7.3 Stowage Provisions	C-51	SOW references Stowage Provisions "pick list" as being identified in CMC3-HDW-000003, CMC Stowage Provisions List and Assessment. That document does not contain the "pick list". We recommend the SOW include an Attachment that documents the “pick list” with part numbers and quantities allowable by Program.	The reference to the "pick list" for stowage provisions will be clarified in the final RFP.
25	Unique terms and conditions	Section I Contract Clauses	I-2, I-5	FAR clauses 52.208-4, 52.208-5, 52.208-6, 52.208-7, and 52.228-8 are clauses that apply to solicitations and contracts that are for the lease of motor vehicles. Please confirm whether these clauses apply to CMC4.	CMC4 allows for the contractor to lease a Government vehicle. It is not required, but it is also not restricted.

26	Other	B.11 FULLY BURDENED RATE TABLE	B-8	Since under limit projects do not increase contract value but rather pull from the established pool as budgetary estimates, could the rate table used for the under limit tasks be updated yearly to align with the most current on board staff?	Section B.11 of the contract will not be changed with release of the Final RFP.
27	Other	Section J (all)	All	Page numbers in Section J start to repeat at Appendix D of DRD-CMC-PC-01. Recommend renumbering this section to avoid confusion.	This page numbering issue will be corrected with release of the Final RFP
28	Other	Attachment J-10 Government Provided Software	J-127-129 (Table 5.B)	Is there additional Government Provided Software that should be sustained by CMC in table 5.B (Government Provided Apps) as part of the additional scope for Manifesting, Waste Management, On-orbit Stowage, Consumables Tracking, and JCCT, or is the contractor expected to develop new applications prior to transition in 2025?	Attachment J-10, Government Provided Software, Table 5-C, will be updated to include the MIDAS Prime Software Application. Other tools and datasets may become available during the transistion period. Offerror's should include assumptions made to derive their basis of estimate as indicated in L.18.2 - TA1.G, BOE.
29	Other			Can Section 7 of the SOW for CMC4 be broken out into a separate acquisition using a multi-award IDIQ contract?	Due to the type of activities anticipated to be performed under Section 7 of the SOW, it is not feasible to break out this activity into a separate acquisition. No changes will be made in the Final RFP.
30	Section L Proposal Instructions	L	8	Section L.13 states a Secret National Security Facility Clearance at proposal submission, but the SOW states that the contractor shall "obtain and maintain" the clearance. Please clarify whether the facility clearance is required at proposal or must be obtained after award.	Offerors must possess a minimum of Secret National Security Facility Clearance Level (FCL) at proposal submission. Section 1.11 of the SOW will be changed with the release of the Final RFP to clarify this. In addition, the requirement will be updated with the release of the Final RFP to state, "Offerors shall possess a SECRET clearance at proposal submission for performance of this contract, and the successful offeror shall obtain a TOP SECRET National Security FCL within 12 months after the contract start date. This clearance shall be maintained throughout the life of the contract."
31	Section L Proposal Instructions	L	27	When does the Government intend to provide information for Section L.20 Cost and Price Factor?	See answer for Question 23 above.
32	Section L Proposal Instructions	L	16	Will the Government reject any innovations and efficiencies proposed?	The government will evaluate proposed innovations and efficiencies per Section M.4.2-TA1 - Specific Technical Understanding and Resources. Accepted innovations and efficiencies will be documented per DRD-PR-09, Innovations and Efficiencies Plan after contract award.

33	Section L Proposal Instructions	L	24	H.7 identifies Deputy Program Manager as Key Personnel if proposed, but L.19(b) only identifies the Program Manager for past performance. Does L.19(b) also applies to the Deputy PM?	See answer for Question 21 above.
34	Section L Proposal Instructions	L	17	Can the government provide Cost Volume instructions to determine the definition for significant/major subcontractor prior to the final RFP release? L.18.1, MA2, states "proposed subcontractor determined to be significant/major, in accordance with the definition for a significant/major subcontractor established in the Price or Cost Volume instructions, and which provide at least 10 percent of the total estimated professional direct labor hours or work year equivalents (WYEs)", is this going to be consistent with the definition of a major subcontractor in Section L.19(e) (total contract value that equals or exceeds $30,000,000 over the life of the contract)? Are there two criteria to considered?, one applicable to TCP and one one to past performance?	See answer for Question 14 above.
35	Section L Proposal Instructions	L	9	Is the signficant/major subcontractor TCP, required per L.18.1-MA2, also part of the total page count for Mission Suitability? We recommend that the Government considers TCP for the offerror and subcontractors not be included in the total page count for Mission Suitability Factor.	See answer for Questions 12 and 16 above.
36	Other	J	36	DRD CMC-PM-06 - Phase-in Plan, Part 1 #7 requires "Approach for transferring all existing software licenses and ownership from the incumbent to the CMC4 contractor (if applicable)" but J-10 - Government Provided Software, the paragraph preceeding Table 5-C states "Note: software licenses are not transferrable." Then, Attachment L-08, WLI Table L-8-3.9 shows some licences are transferrable. Can this be clarified?	The following will be updated with release of the final RFP to provide clarification regarding software licenses: 1) DRD CMC-PM-06 #7 2) Attachment J-10 Table 5C Transferrable software licenses will be specified only in Attachment L-08, Table L-8-3.9. Note: The Government will provided licenses as available through NASA enterprise software license vehicles. Per SOW 1.6.2, No purchases of commercial IT products, licenses, or services shall be made by the contractor prior to coordination and approval by the OCIO.
37	Other	C	36	Does NASA plan to add requirements in the Final RFP under sections of the SOW noted as 'Reserved'?	Any updates will be reflected in Final RFP. Any remaining SOW sections noted as 'Reserved' will remain reserved at contract award.

39	Schedule	Cover Letter	2	Is the government considering non-working holidays as part of the 40 calendar days for proposal submission?	See answer for Question 22 above.