ATTACHMENT 4

Questions and Answers

Note: Some questions have been edited for clarity. All questions have been addressed.

Question 1: If Industry serves as prime, how will Patent Rights be determined?

Answer 1: Patent rights will be determined in accordance with FAR clauses 52.227-11 or 1852.227-70. The appropriate FAR clauses will be incorporated into any resulting contract.

Question 2: The terms and conditions of a reimbursable SAA with NASA (to access capabilities and facilities) are not compatible with a Firm-Fixed contract. How does NASA envision facilitating access to Government unique capabilities under this NRA?

Answer 2: Reference 8.2 of the NRA for Partnership Office contacts at various NASA centers. These offices will facilitate agreements for use of Government capabilities.

Question 3: Section 5.2 of the NRA is titled "Focused Advanced Development Topics most suitable for Academia" and says that these topics are suitable for the capabilities, resources, and experience of academic institutions. Are these topics strictly limited to academic institutions or may industry submit proposals regarding these topics and/or partner with academic institutions to submit proposals on these topics?

Answer 3: The topics provided in Section 5.2 of Appendix A titled "Focused Advanced Development Topics most suitable for Academia" are provided as guidance only. Therefore, if industry chooses to propose to these topics or partner with academic institutions that is allowed. Conversely, academia is not limited to proposing only on topics provided in Section 5.2 of Appendix A. The topic areas represent potential proposal areas, but are not meant to exclude other innovative concepts to evolve the baseline SLS vehicle to its full capability.

Question 4: Long range magnetic levitation has been made possible by recent developments in near-field lens technology. Is the new propulsion technology something that might be considered for funding under NNM12ZPS002N?

Answer 4: 4.2.6 of the NRA describes the technical scope of this solicitation. Appendix A, Section 5.0 provides <u>guidance</u> on topic areas, specifically it states, "The technical areas below represent potential proposal areas, but are not meant to exclude other innovative concepts to evolve the baseline SLS vehicle to its full capability."

Question 5: Academic institutions are eligible to submit a proposal but Government agencies cannot. Can a US Government academic institution submit a proposal?

Answer 5: Reference the Executive Summary and 3.1 of the NRA that has been hereby revised to reflect the following paragraph:

Participation in this program is open to all categories of United States (US) organizations, including educational institutions, industry, and nonprofit/not-for-profit institutions (see 1.4 of *the NASA Guidebook for Proposers Responding to a NASA Research Announcement* for Organization Type description of institutions). US Government academic institutions which offer scientific, technological, engineering, and mathematics degrees are eligible to propose. However, all other Federal Government agencies, Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs), and NASA Centers [including the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL)] or their employees may <u>not</u> propose to this NRA unless functioning as permissible as a supplier, consultant, or subcontractor through separate contract vehicles or agreements. NASA employees, as well as JPL employees, are <u>not</u> permitted to be key personnel on these proposals.

Question 6: Can a non-academic Offeror submit a STEM proposal? Would they propose as an academic proposal or would it compete with the technical industry proposals or is there going to be a separate STEM mechanism?

Answer 6: Section 1.4.1 of the *NASA Guidebook for Proposers Responding to a NASA Research Announcement* defines 'Proposing Organization Types'. Only those Offerors meeting the definition of 'Educational Organization' per the Guidebook will be eligible for academic awards.

A benefit from including academia in this solicitation is to support the national and agency goal of improving STEM education, this NRA does not have separate goals relative to STEM education.

Question 7: Since the metrics of this NRA are affordability, reliability/safety, and performance:

a Will the SLS projected baselines for these metrics be published in the NRA so that return-on-investment can be computed to establish the value proposition of the proposal?

b If so, will there be details such as:

i. annual fixed cost and variable launch cost as a function of annual launch rate
ii. anticipated maximum/minimum launch rate
iii. assumed component reliabilities and methodology for integrated P-LOC/P-LOM
iv. Is performance just the LEO payload or can the performance be mission payload that includes the iCPS orbital performance.

c Is the iCPS included in Block 1 or Block 1A SLS where additions or modifications to these systems can be proposed to improve mission affordability, reliability/safety, and performance?

Answer 7:

a. We do not intend to provide the projected baselines for these metrics within the solicitation. It is anticipated that the Offeror will provide a qualitative assessment of these metrics.

b. See answer (a) above. Also, refer to 4.2.8.5.1.5 of the solicitation, which states that Offerors shall describe all ground rules and assumptions. In addition, this solicitation is interested in developing the work required for the launch vehicle to reach or exceed the required system performance capabilities that enable it to achieve specific orbital insertions.

Guidance may be found in SLS-SPEC-032 (Space Launch System Program Launch Vehicle Specification), specifically 3.2.2 [SLS.1 and SLS.2] and 3.2.16 [SLS.31] (see below for details).

3.2.2 System Capability Requirements

[SLS.1] SLS Lift Capability – Block 1

The SLS Block 1 vehicle shall deliver a minimum of 62.8 tons <**TBR-004**> (57 metric tons) of payload to an insertion target of –50 × 975 nm (–93 × 1806 km) <**TBR-005**> at 28.5 degrees inclination and an insertion altitude of 87.3 nm (162 km).

Rationale: Analysis of the two ESD 10012 Tactical Timeframe DRMs (Uncrewed BEO Lunar Fly-by and Crewed BEO Lunar Orbit) indicates an SLS Block 1 lift capability of 57 metric tons to this orbit is required to achieve these missions. This lift capability includes MPCV, all associated MPCV systems, the ICPS, and the ICPS-to-MPCV adapter. The lift capability does not include the launch vehicle to spacecraft adapter mass, which must also be carried to the target orbit.

[SLS.2] SLS Lift Capability – Block 1A
The SLS Block 1A vehicle shall deliver a minimum of 115.8 tons (105 metric tons) of payload to an insertion target of –47 × 130 nm (–87 × 241 km) at 28.5 degrees inclination and an insertion altitude of 77 nm (143 km).
Rationale: Modified Level I Requirement. Design Reference Mission analysis indicates that launch vehicles in the 100 metric ton class are necessary to enable early missions. An early lift capability of 105 metric tons allows the architecture to conduct missions to LEO, HEO, GEO, cis-Lunar space, the Lunar surface, and Near Earth Asteroids affordably.

3.2.16 Programmatic Requirements
[SLS.31] Launch Rate
SLS shall support up to 3 launches in a year.
Rationale: Level I Requirement. Exploration DRMs include 1 to 3 launches per mission. The maximum rate of 3 launches per year is not intended to drive SLS production, which is based on one launch every other year.

c. The iCPS is only included in the Block 1 vehicle configuration.

Question 8: Will representative Design Reference Mission(s) be included in the NRA or are mission capabilities/possibilities for Block 1 and 1A a suitable subject for the proposal?

Answer 8: DRMs are not available, however guidance may be found in SLS-SPEC-032, Rev A (Space Launch System Program Launch Vehicle Specification).

[**SLS.2**] SLS Lift Capability – Block 1A
The SLS Block 1A vehicle shall deliver a minimum of 115.8 tons (105 metric tons) of payload to an insertion target of –47 × 130 nm (–87 × 241 km) at 28.5 degrees inclination and an insertion altitude of 77 nm (143 km).
Rationale: Modified Level I Requirement. Design Reference Mission analysis indicates that launch vehicles in the 100 metric ton class are necessary to enable early missions. An early lift capability of 105 metric tons allows the architecture to conduct missions to LEO, HEO, GEO, cis-Lunar space, the Lunar surface, and Near Earth Asteroids affordably.

Question 9: Are there restrictions on the technologies/TRLs that can be included in the proposal or are only high TRL technologies being evaluated for this NRA?

Answer 9: There are no restrictions on TRL, however, this NRA is focusing on evolving Block 1 to Block 1A.

See 4.2.6 of the NRA which states: "The technical scope of this NRA is defined by the SLS descriptions provided in Appendices A, B, and C. Additionally, to be considered within the technical scope of this NRA, proposed work efforts should be at a maturity level capable of supporting timely implementation into the Block 1A vehicle configuration."

Question 10: Will NASA permit not-for-profit institutions [i.e.501.c(3)] organized for scientific and educational purposes to submit proposals for academic award? Also, will NASA allow for cost contracting with not-for-profit institutions for this NRA?

Answer 10: Section 1.4.1 of the *NASA Guidebook for Proposers Responding to a NASA Research Announcement* defines 'Proposing Organization Types'. Only those Offerors meeting the definition of 'Educational Organization' per the Guidebook will be eligible for academic awards.

Yes, the appropriate contract vehicle will be negotiated following selections.

Question 11: The NRA funding and period of performance are defined for a 3 yr period. Yet, the intended utilization of the adv. dev. efforts is targeted for the Block 1A vehicle which will launch after 2021. How does NASA intend to evaluate an upgrade to the vehicle for an Offeror's approach for integrating and phasing the upgrade into the SLS configuration considering the schedule gap between efforts conducted under this NRA and the Block 1A development?

Answer 11: Please see the revision of 4.2.8.5.2.2 in the NRA that states, "Offerors shall… discuss the impact of implementation on other systems, subsystems, interfaces, or operations in support of the Block 1A vehicle configuration." As well as the analogous revision of 5.1.1.2.2 in the NRA that states, "The Government will evaluate the impacts of implementation on other systems, subsystems, interfaces, or operations."

Also, please see the reference below from Appendix A, Section 4.0:
The SLS Advanced Development Office (ADO) is developing, in parallel with the existing program, vehicle enhancements to evolve the SLS elements and configurations. The phasing and prioritization of the block upgrades will be based on funding, mission and payload schedules, agency resources, and the maturity of the proposed SLS upgrades. The block upgrades will be planned to minimize disruption and maximize benefits. Block upgrades may or may not coincide with a major transition of capabilities (Block 1 to 1A to 2).

Question 12: What is the limitation on individual awards to industry?

Answer 12: This NRA does not establish limits on individual awards made to industry; although, as stated in 5.1.1.3 of the NRA, the Government will evaluate the overall price reasonableness, completeness, and extent to which the Offeror complied with the expected funding allocations in this NRA.

Question 13: How will NASA evaluate Offeror contributions such as efforts conducted through Offeror internal research and development?

Answer 13: All contributions of corporate resources will be considered under reasonableness of price. Reference 5.1.1.3 of the NRA. Also, please see Appendix F, line 10 for identification of all contributions for the Model Contract, and Appendix G, line 6 for identification of all contributions for the Model Grant.

Question 14: If planning on partnering or teaming with NASA, will an Offeror be allowed to communicate with NASA/MSFC personnel who are on the team once the communication blackout period begins? And how will the communication for the proposal development be handled once the blackout period begins?

Answer 14: Yes, as referenced in 8.2 of the NRA, the NASA Partnership Offices are available to coordinate and collaborate with industry to support various development activities including during the blackout period.

Question 15: Multiple technical areas of interest have been identified; however, these topics are not easily combined into a single, standalone work effort and are better suited as individual efforts submitted separately. Is an Offeror limited to a single proposal? Will proposals be adversely evaluated if they submit more than one? Are there negative consequences to submitting more than one? Would it be preferable to submit a single proposal with multiple work efforts?

Answer 15: The NRA statement that “each Offeror is encouraged to submit only one proposal” is not a requirement of this NRA. Proposal submittals will be at the discretion of the Offeror.

Submittal of more than one proposal is not an evaluation factor. Reference 5.0 in the NRA.

As stated in the NRA, each proposal shall describe only one standalone work effort. A "standalone work effort" describes an effort that includes a cohesive set of technical objectives, which as a whole, works toward a common concept or upgrade (definition can be found in the Executive Summary and 4.2.7.1 of the NRA).

Question 16: Would NASA consider altering the eligibility requirements in the NRA to include "non-profits formed by academic institutions"?

Answer 16: Section 1.4.1 of the *NASA Guidebook for Proposers Responding to a NASA Research Announcement* defines 'Proposing Organization Types'. Only those Offerors meeting the definition of 'Educational Organization' per the Guidebook will be considered eligible for academic awards. The eligibility requirements will not be changed.

Question 17: Would a contractor using NRA funding be permitted to charge directly to the contract the cost of components purchased from such a non-U.S. source where the component is "off-the-shelf" but used in furtherance of the prime contractor's performance of the contract? Further, does NASA intend to restrict foreign participation in design activity for the follow-on SLS procurement?

Answer 17: Yes, Reference the Executive Summary, 1.2.4 and 3.1 of the NRA which states, "funded participation by non-U.S. organizations and Foreign Governments is limited to the direct purchase of supplies and/or services, which do not constitute research except as allowed by NASA FAR Supplement 1852.235-72."

Follow-on activity is not part of this NRA.

Question 18: Are all tasks related to the Non-Propulsive Payload Element (NPE) outside the scope of this NRA? Are NPE tasks considered outside the scope of this NRA limited to preliminary design of the NPE components? Does the statement describing the NPE design as an in-house effort mean that any propositions regarding NPE elements such as payload fairing, adapters, other NPE dry structures, etc are NOT to be proposed?

Answer 18: No. The NPE consists of the cargo payload adapter (CPA) and fairing. Please reference Appendix A, Section 2.3 which has been revised to state, "The CPA is an in-house design effort and is considered outside the scope of this solicitation; however, the Block 1A fairing is considered within the scope of this solicitation".

Question 19: The word "Significantly" (in the Current and Pending Support section) could be interpreted to be somewhat subjective. In addition, Industry may not have exact details as to what another competitors/contractor are actually on contract and funded to execute.

Would NASA consider rewording this to read "It will be incumbent on the offeror to clearly delineate the differences in their NRA proposal submittal against similar work efforts being performed by the Government on another on-going similar work effort to the best of your understanding of the other work being performed"?

Answer 19: Review 4.2.8.5.2.4 of the NRA, because the language is hereby reworded to state, "Offerors shall not submit a work effort that is significantly similar to a previously awarded or currently funded NASA, or other Federal Governmental agency, solicitation which has been submitted by the Offeror."

Question 20: It is implied that the SLS Launch Vehicle is required to be human rated. Will all of the Non Propulsive Elements be required to be human rated? Will the Government consider defining which specific elements will be required to be human rated and which ones will not be human rated in the final NRA release?

Answer 20: For crewed missions, the SLS, Orion-MPCV, and launch pad elements work together as a human-rated system architecture. The SLS is human rated with abort capabilities for configurations of the integrated stack with the Orion-MPCV.

Question 21: Will NASA provide rationale for the additional proposal guidance item that states Offerors are encouraged to only submit one proposal? Would NASA consider receiving multiple proposals from one company but each proposal has to have a standalone work effort?

Answer 21: Refer to question/answer 15.

Question 22: Would NASA consider broadening the solicitation to one Offeror with up to 3 work efforts? This would be similar to the Advanced Booster NRA.

Answer 22: This change will not be included in the Final NRA. Refer to question/answer 15.

Question 23: During the industry day briefing, it was "suggested" that each company submit only one NRA response to NNM12ZPS002N. Would it be acceptable to submit 2 NRA responses?

Answer 23: Refer to question/answer 15.

Question 24: Will NASA provide feedback to the Request for Information NNM12ZPS002N responses in time for suppliers to incorporate their comments within the pending NRA response? If so, will specific feedback be provided to the submitting company specific to each individual RFI Response?

Answer 24: Responses to the RFI were considered during formulation of the Draft and Final NRA.

Question 25: Based on the content of the model contract, is it correct to assume that Offerors are not required to have an existing GSA schedule?

Answer 25: The Advanced Development NRA does not require a GSA Schedule for submission of proposals.

Question 26: Appendix B figure 3.1.2-1 on page 18 of 88, and Appendix C Figure 3-2 on page 14 of 64 are very similar. These two figures differ in that the Appendix C Figure 3-2 includes a CPS in the figure while the Appendix B Figure 3.1.2-1 does not. Given the emphasis placed on the Affordable Upper Stage Engine (AUSE) at the Industry Day, is the CPS part of the NRA scope?

Answer 26: Please review Appendix B, SLS-SPEC-032 (Space Launch System Program Launch Vehicle Specification), as well as Figures 2, 3, and 4 in Appendix A of the solicitation, for clarification of vehicle configuration issues. SLS-PLAN-020 (Space Launch System Program Concept of Operations Document) has been removed from the final solicitation (formerly Appendix C).

This NASA Research Announcement (NRA) is not intended to solicit work efforts for a cryogenic propulsion stage (CPS). However, for work efforts addressing the Affordable Upper Stage Engine (AUSE), any content associated with a CPS should be limited to trades, analyses, and assumptions required to inform and enable AUSE efforts.

Also, with respect to the AUSE, please reference Appendix A, Section 2.5 of the solicitation which states, "The US Government has identified a need for an Affordable Upper Stage Engine Program (AUSEP). The Affordable Upper Stage Engine Program (AUSEP) Technical Requirements Specification (revised Appendix C) outlines the performance, design, development, and test requirements for the AUSE."

Question 27: Section 5.1.1.1, Factor 1: Relevance to NASA's Objectives states "Additionally, the Government will evaluate how the work effort improves or influences the SLS objectives: affordability, reliability, and performance". Are proposed development project evaluated at the Core (Segment) level or the System Level? For example, a Core "Improvement" to affordability may have a detrimental performance impact at the System Level (e.g., low cost design with lower stiffness that affects vehicle controllability).

Answer 27: Reference 4.2.8.4.1 of the NRA, which states, "Proposed work efforts should advance one or more of the stated objectives while maintaining (or minimizing negative impacts to) the other objectives within a constrained fiscal schedule."
SLS objectives will be evaluated at the program/vehicle level, however, impacts should be identified and discussed at each lower level.

Question 28: Affordability has both a non-recurring or recurring aspect. What recurring usage model (missions) should be used to trade recurring vs. non-recurring costs.

Answer 28: Guidance may be found in SLS-SPEC-032, Rev A (Space Launch System Program Launch Vehicle Specification), specifically 3.2.16 [SLS.31] (see below for details).

3.2.16 Programmatic Requirements
[SLS.31] Launch Rate
SLS shall support up to 3 launches in a year.

> *Rationale: Level I Requirement. Exploration DRMs include 1 to 3 launches per mission. The maximum rate of 3 launches per year is not intended to drive SLS production, which is based on one launch every other year.*

Question 29: Will Other Transaction Agreements (OTAs) be an option for forming a contract with NASA?

Answer 29: No.

Question 30: Page 28 of the industry chart package states that "Each offeror is encouraged to submit only one proposal, which shall describe only one standalone work effort." With the proposed work scope focused on both the booster and AUSE, it may be difficult to write a single proposal that complies with that direction, effectively describes the value to NASA, and meets the page count constraints. Is it reasonable for an offeror to submit multiple proposals if the proposed work is logically divided into discrete technology categories (i.e., upper stage versus core and booster)? Will a potential offeror be penalized in the evaluation process for submitting multiple proposals or multiple tasks within a single proposal? Can NASA clarify what is meant by "standalone work effort" (i.e., can this be interpreted to be a group of related tasks defined by a single SOW)?

Answer 30: Refer to question/answer 15.

Question 31: Page 31 of the industry chart package states that "proposed work efforts should also be at a maturity level capable of supporting timely implementation into the Block 1A vehicle configuration." Can NASA provide guidance regarding what level of risk and/or TRL would be considered acceptable for candidate new technologies with potential application to Block 1A with a first flight in 2017? Will there be potential on-ramps for these new candidate technologies for later flights after 2017?

Answer 31: There are no restrictions on TRL; however, this NRA is focusing on evolving Block 1 to Block 1A. The objectives of SLS are to improve affordability, reliability, or performance through evolutionary upgrades of the baseline SLS vehicle. Proposed work efforts should advance one or more of the stated objectives while maintaining (or minimizing negative impacts to) the other objectives within a constrained fiscal schedule.

All Block 1A development flights will occur after 2017.

Question 32: <u>Section B.3 Consideration and Payment:</u> Attachment J-10 is called out in the first paragraph in B.3. Attachment J-10 is not called out in Attachment 1 Section A Part III "List of Documents, Exhibits and Other Attachments", or Section J.1 "List of Attachments". Should we expect to see an Attachment J-10 in the final NRA?

Answer 32: Section B.3, <u>Consideration and Payment</u>, paragraph B of the Model Contract has been revised to reflect the deletion of the Attachment J-10 reference.

Question 33: Special Provision H.16 "Advanced Agreement In Rights In Data": The purpose of this provision is unclear, given that both FAR 52.227-14 "Rights In Data – General" and 52.227-16 "Additional Data Requirements" are also included within the model contract.

a. If the intended purpose of H.16 paragraph (a) is to allow the Government to order any data first produced or specifically used in the performance of this contract, FAR 52.227-16 already affords the Government this right.

b. If the intended purpose of H.16 paragraphs (c) and (d) is to require the contractor to identify limited rights data or restricted computer software that will be required in order to fulfill data delivery requirements, we recommend inclusion of FAR 52.227-15 "Representation of Limited Rights Data and Restricted Computer Software" to fulfill this purpose.

c. Regarding H.16 paragraph (b), it is unclear what is meant by "categories of data". Again, FAR 52.227-14 delineates in great detail, the differences between "Limited Rights" data and "Unlimited Rights" data. Please provide examples of what additional categories of data are contemplated by paragraph (a) other than those already described within FAR 52.227-14.

General comment regarding the potential ordering additional data – FAR 52.227-16 entitles the contractor to compensation for formal delivery of data. Since formal delivery of data under 52.227-14 requires the contractor to make a formal contractual determination as to data rights/IP ownership of the data, a due diligence effort must be performed before these data may be delivered. These due diligence efforts are typically executed on a cost reimbursable basis, since it is difficult for the contractor to estimate in advance, the extent of required due diligence efforts at the time the Government exercises its rights under 52.227-16. Future cost growth in this area can therefore be avoided if all data deliverables are identified and priced at the outset of the program.

Answer 33: The only intent of H.16 is to establish a mutual understanding with respect to data rights at the beginning of the contract. While the Government does not disagree with the points raised in the question, the Government believes the consolidation of various aspects of FAR 52.227-14, 52.227-15, and 52.227-16 in one place (i.e. H.16) is beneficial and avoids misunderstandings related to data rights during contract performance. The term "category" was used to designate data expected to be developed under the contract that cannot be specifically identified at the beginning of the contract as a data "item." No change will be included in the Final NRA.

Question 34: Section B.3 paragraph A of the Model Contract includes the sentence, "Contractor's failure to perform adequately during a milestone period shall be subject to reductions in milestone payments detailed under Attachment J-10." The entire sentence seems to be a typo as there is no Attachment J-10 and Attachment J-8 makes no reference to reductions. Recommend deletion of the sentence.

Answer 34: Section B.3, Consideration and Payment, paragraph A of the Model Contract has been revised to reflect the deletion of the Attachment J-8 and J-10 reference.

Question 35: Section B.3 paragraph B also references Attachment J-10. Recommend deletion of the reference.

Answer 35: Refer to question/answer 32.

Question 36: Clause H.13 references SLS ABEDRR. Recommend deleting the reference and replacing with SLS AD.

Answer 36: Clause H.13, Applicability of Sections Clauses to Subcontracts, of the Model Contract has been revised to reflect SLS Advanced Development.

Question 37: Clause I.1, Clauses Incorporated by Reference includes FAR clause 52.219-25, Small Disadvantaged Business Participation – Disadvantaged Status and Reporting. This clause states that it is applicable if the contract contains small disadvantaged business participation targets. Given that clause H.15, Evaluation of Subcontracting Plan, does not contain targets, recommend deletion of this clause.

Answer 37: Clause I.1, Clauses Incorporated by Reference, of the Model Contract is hereby revised to reflect the deletion of Clause 52.219-25, Small Disadvantage Business Participation-Disadvantaged Status and Reporting.

Question 38: Clause I.1, Clauses Incorporated by Reference, includes FAR clause 52.223-14, Toxic Chemical Release Reporting. This clause is listed in FAR as "Removed and Reserved". Recommend deletion of this clause.

Answer 38: Clause I.1, Clauses Incorporated by Reference, of the Model Contract is hereby revised to reflect the deletion of Clause 52.223-14, Toxic Chemical Release Reporting.

Question 39: Clause I.1, Clauses Incorporated by Reference includes NFS 1852.215-78, Make or Buy Program Requirements. This clause states that a Make-or-Buy Program plan should be submitted in accordance with FAR 15-407-2. Per FAR 15.407-2, the Make-or-Buy plan is not required for R&D efforts. Recommend deletion of this clause.

Answer 39: Clause I.1, Clauses Incorporated by Reference, of the Model Contract is hereby revised to reflect the deletion of NFS 1852.215-78, Make or Buy Program Requirements.

Question 40: DRD XXXXMA-FSTR calls for submission 30 days after completion of contract. It is assumed that because Milestone #13, Delivery and Approval of Final Scientific and Technical Report; Delivery and Completion of Final Briefing, is DRD XXXXMA-FSTR that "completion of contract" means the completion of Milestone #12, Monthly Progress Report. In addition, it is assumed that the proposed period of performance should encompass Milestone #13 or the delivery of DRD XXXXMA-FSTR. Are these assumptions regarding the meaning of "completion of contract" and the period of performance correct?

Answer 40: Section B.3, Consideration and Payment, of the Model Contract has been revised to reflect the change in Milestones. Milestone 12 is now "Delivery and Approval of Final Scientific and Technical Report; Delivery and Completion of Final Briefing."

Question 41: Please provide a list of current technology development projects for SLS being conducted by NASA, academia, and industry to avoid duplicative effort.

Answer 41: Current technology development projects being conducted by NASA for SLS will not have any bearing on the evaluation of proposals for this NRA.