

Item	Question	Government Response
1	In the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) Architecture Guidebook dtd 14 DEC 09, several documents are discussed/referenced within the text. Will the "ORS CONOPS" cited in Section 2.1 and the "Operationally Responsive Space 2010/2015 (ORS) Ground Systems Enterprise (GSE) Capabilities for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR)" document cited in Section 3.5 be made available?	See Amendment 02, ORS GSE Caps for ISR will be new reference doc. The ORS CONOPS is not available for this RFP and is not required for the proposals.
2	Section 2.4.1 cites a Government Reference Document for SAR. Is this the same document released with the Draft RFP?	No, it is not the same documents, it is the Tier-2 Enabler (T2E) Mission Government Reference Document made available in Amendment 2.
3	Additionally, figure 4-1 indicates several documents exist in draft form. Will these documents be made available?	These draft documents will be made available as required after contract award.
4	Section 3.3.4.1.1 states "Self-configuration of modular components and software applications is not an initial requirement but should be considered as a trade for this and future iterations." Will ORS accept a software design that is a mix of self-configured modular components, and pre-configured modular components – where pre-configuration is performed during design and development phase of a tier-3 spacecraft?	The analysis and trades can be presented in the proposal to show the value of the approach
5	It also states "For the notional topology, the functions of modular components and software applications are presented as "Services" defined by "Service Descriptions" (e.g. Web Service Definition Language "WSDL" or equivalent) describing the function or data provided along with a complete protocol for access. Service Descriptions are managed by the "Service Registry" as the single source for tracking available Services that will provide functions and/or data to the satellite." Where is the standard common dictionary of terms documented that ORS wishes to use so that services can describe themselves in a standard way?	The dictionary will be created over the life of the contract.
6	We were expecting more detailed design information with the release of this updated architecture document. Is there another document in work with more detailed design requirements for a Tier-3 solution? Will the results of the BAA efforts be released prior to the RFP release?	Yes, the BAA study results have been made available as additional reference documents in Amendment 1.
7	It seems that what had been called "Task Order 2 - SAR Payload" has been entirely removed from the solicitation. Is the intent, then, for ORS to only procure an MSV bus through this solicitation, with the payload being a separate procurement?	The Multi Mission Modular Payload Development Task Order has been provided in the RFP Amendment 02.
8	Also, in the Draft RFP materials, there had been a table listing a number of other specific types of missions with which the MSV had to be compatible -- I now don't see this table in the SOW's or Task Orders -- has that requirement (listing specific types of missions) gone away?	The table listing the specific types of missions is/has always been located in the ORS Reference Guide Book.
9	One of the key documents called out in the RFP is the "ORS Architecture Guidebook", which we have. But within that document, in Section 2.4 ("Mission References"), another set of documents is referenced, specifically: "Government Reference Document for SAR"; "Government Reference Document for EO/IR"; "Government Reference Document for HSI" and several others (all are called out in section 2.4 of the ORS Architecture Guidebook). My question is -- how do I obtain those various "Government Reference Documents"?	These draft documents will be made available as required after contract award, with the exception of an Tier-2 Enabler (SAR) Mission Ref Doc which was made available with Amendment 02.
10	Does the OCI clause apply to major subcontractors on both RRSW and MSV? i.e., can you be a major subcontractor on both?	Yes.

Item	Question	Government Response
11	What is the anticipated solicitation date for the first Payload?	The Payload task order has been issued with Final RFP in Amendment 02.
12	Is the Sarsat Payload still anticipated to be the first Payload?	Yes, the first Payload TO will be for a SAR payload
13	What is the anticipated launch date for ORS-2?	Refer to RFP, as the RFP provides an estimated period of performance for the Bus and Payload task orders.
14	In order to be a Payload provider, must you be identified as a Payload Provider on one of the selected MSV IDIQ offerors?	Yes.
15	Why was the Payload TO removed from the solicitation released on February 1 st ?	The Payload TO was initially removed as it required additional technical review of the requirements. See RFP Amendment 02 for re-insertion of the Payload TO
16	As we have noted that the recently released (1 Feb 2010) solicitation for the "RAPID RESPONSE SPACE WORKS AND MODULAR SPACE VEHICLES RRSW-MSV" did not contain a payload task order, could the government please advise us regarding any current plans, and their time frame, for acquisition of a payload.	The Payload TO was initially removed as it required additional technical review of the requirements. See RFP Amendment 02 for re-insertion of the Payload TO
17	The question we have is related to B.6 Limitation of Indirect Costs. The clause says that the limitation is applicable to any other Government contract. Are we to interpret this to mean that it applies, not only to any contract or Task Orders that may be awarded as a result of this solicitation, but also to all Government contracts we have in the Corporation?	The clause and ceilings only apply to this contract. However, the clause explains that costs that exceed the ceiling and are uncompensated on this contract cannot be rolled into indirect cost pools and charged on other Government contracts.
18	In the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) Architecture Guidebook dated 14 DEC 09, several documents are discussed/referenced within the text. The "ORS CONOPS" cited in Section 2.1 and the "Operationally Responsive Space 2010/2015 (ORS) Ground Systems Enterprise (GSE) Capabilities for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR)" document cited in Section 3.5 are critical to understanding the Government's desired approach and required in order to form a credible bid.	See RFP Amendment 1, ORS 2110/2015 Ground System Enterprise (GSE) Capabilities for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance reference doc. The ORS CONOPS is not available for this RFP and is not required for proposal submission.
19	In the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) Architecture Guidebook dtd 14 DEC 09 Section 2.4.1 cites a Government Reference Document for SAR. Is this the same document released with the Draft RFP? If not, please provide this document.	No, it is not the same documents, it is the Tier-2 Enabler (T2E) Mission Government Reference Document made available in Amendment 2.
20	In the ORS Modular Space Vehicle (MSV) Multi-Mission Modular Bus Development Task Order SOW, Section 1.1 Objective states "...The ORS Office has selected this MSV mission to be a stressing mission (capable of supporting a Synthetic Aperture RADAR (SAR) payload..." Does this mean the deliverable for this task order is an MSV bus configured for the LEO orbit as described in the Government Reference Document for SAR?	Yes, The MSV Bus TO is for a LEO orbit. See RFP Amendment 2 for the addition of the Payload TO and Mission Ref Doc
21	There is no specific statement regarding the Government Furnished Equipment for this effort. Typically, items like crypto keys, CDL, etc are GFE. Can we assume for MSV that items typically GFE on our other contracts will be provided as GFE?	No GFE at this time. Contractors are to propose any necessary equipment/materials for performance of the contract in their proposal.
22	In the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) Architecture Guidebook dtd 14 DEC 09 figure 4-1 indicates several documents exist in draft form. Will these documents be made available?	These draft documents will be made available as required after contract award.

Item	Question	Government Response
23	Section 3.3.4.1.1 states "Self-configuration of modular components and software applications is not an initial requirement but should be considered as a trade for this and future iterations." Will ORS accept a software design that is a mix of self-configured modular components, and pre-configured modular components, where re-configuration is performed during the design and development phase of a tier-3 spacecraft?	The analysis and trades can be presented in the proposal to show the value of the approach.
24	Section 3.3.4.1.1 states "For the notional topology, the functions of modular components and software applications are presented as "Services" defined by "Service Descriptions" (e.g. Web Service Definition Language "WSDL" or equivalent) describing the function or data provided along with a complete protocol for access. Service Descriptions are managed by the "Service Registry" as the single source for tracking available Services that will provide functions and/or data to the satellite." Where is the standard common dictionary of terms documented that ORS wishes to use so that services can describe themselves in a standard way?	The dictionary will be created over the life of the contract.
25	We were expecting more detailed design information with the release of this updated architecture document. Will the results of the BAA efforts be provided as stated at the Industry day? We believe this is important in assisting in providing an accurate cost basis.	No, there is not another document with detailed requirements for Tier-3 solutions. Yes, BAA study results were provided as additional references in RFP Amendment 1.
26	Basic SOW pg 7, para 4.7, Standup and Operate SOW pg 12, para 4.7, Execute End-to-End SOW pg 7, para 4.7 Do the EVMS clauses apply to both the RRSW and MSV efforts? If they apply to the RRSW effort, do you anticipate something less than full EVMS compliance due to the relatively small dollar value of the effort? It would seem the cost of implementing and maintaining an EVMS on RRSW would be out of proportion with the scope of the effort. Also the quick turn around desired on TO's between call up and delivery of an SV does not lend itself to an EVMS environment. By the time we would report on the EVMS metrics, the SV would be out the door. And the program management effort to build up of EVMS for each TO would be expensive relative to the cost of the labor to execute the tasks.	EVMS will apply to the MSV Bus and Payload TOs as they will likely exceed \$20M. EVMS will not apply to Standup and Operate TO or the End-to-End TO. EVMS clause will remain in the RRSW Basic Sow as a future RRSW TO may require EVMS.
27	Is there an approximate SRR date that is expressed in terms of months post ATP for the Stand-up and Operate Task Order that the Govt is using for planning purposes (SRR is referenced in the RRSW "Execute End-to-End ORS Mission Task Order" paragraph 3.1.1)?	There is no reference to System Requirements Review (SRR) in the Stand-up and Operate TO. ORS will include specifics for SRR in the final version of the Execute End-to-End Mission TO.
28	Execute End-to-End SOW pg 8, para 5.1 through 5.1.3, Paragraphs 5.1 through 5.1.3 seem be out of place since they refer to MSV Space Vehicle Payload. Please clarify.	This TO is a sample for a full integration of bus and payload.
29	M3 pg 155, para b.5.ii E&F, Retention of Personnel and Continuation of Operations: Were these two paragraphs not deleted (as stated in the Questions and Answers) an oversight? Since the RRSW contract is not considered a follow-on contract, the retention of personnel and continuation of operations do not seem to be a relevant factor for source selection.	These paragraphs will be deleted in a future RFP Amendment..

Item	Question	Government Response
30	L.12 pg 110, para b.9.ii, Retention of Personnel and Continuation of Operations: Were these two paragraphs not deleted (as stated in the Questions and Answers) an oversight? Since the RRSW contract is not considered a follow-on contract, the retention of personnel and continuation of operations do not seem to be a relevant factor for source selection.	These paragraphs will be deleted in a future RFP Amendment.
31	L.12 pg 112, para c(5) Specific Instructions, paragraph (c) Cost/Price Proposal (Volume III), subparagraph (5) Specific Content, item (ii) states, "...the offeror is also required to provide the proposed costs for each Task Order broken down to Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) Level 3." However, per 4.12 Work Breakdown Structure of the RRSW Standup and Operate Task Order, "[t]he contractor shall develop and maintain a contract WBS to be delivered 30 days after award, and then update as required." Since the WBS is a post-award deliverable, would it be appropriate to price at the 3rd layer of the SOW?	WBS shall be provided with proposal and updated in accordance with contractual requirements.
32	J, pg 8, para b.6(a) and b.8(a) Limitation of Indirect Costs and Supplemental Task Ordering Procedures: Section J.1(a) Attachment 7, entitled "Direct Labor Rates, Fringe Rates, Indirect Rates, Fixed Fee, and Ceiling Rate Matrices," which set the ceilings for direct and indirect rates on TOs. We are not able to locate the attachment, and it doesn't seem to be referenced in the Task Ordering Procedures. Are Section B.6 and B.8 inaccurate, or was Attachment 7 not included unintentionally? Please clarify.	Attachment 7 "Direct Labor Rates, Fringe Rates, Indirect Rates, Fixed Fee, and Ceiling Rate Matrices" is an attachment that is proposed by the Offeror and incorporate into the contract at award.
33	J, pg 8, para b.6(a) Limitation of Indirect Costs: As written, the following statement establishes indirect ceiling rates for all Government contracts the Contractor may have. We believe the underlined phrase in this sentence should be deleted as it is not relevant to this contract. "(a) Within each of the Contractor's fiscal years, the Contractor shall not charge or be reimbursed by the Government, under this or any other Government contract, for indirect costs in excess of the individual indirect expense dollars derived by the application of the indirect cost ceiling rates to the appropriate base(s) as set forth in Section J.1(a) Attachment 7, entitled 'Direct Labor Rates, Fringe Rates, Indirect Rates, Fixed Fee, and Ceiling Rate Matrices.'"	Rate ceilings will remain on fringe benefits, overhead and G&A and will apply to all subcontractors as well as prime contractors. Section B.6.(b) provides the contractor with a means to adjust the ceilings if a cost increases that is beyond its control, for example, an increase in the FICA rate and/or wage base. Also, adding the contractor's recommendation as paragraph B.6.(b)(iii) would allow those contractors with forward pricing rate agreements to subsequently change their rates and therefore defeat the purpose of imposing rate ceilings. Contractors need to take into consideration how its indirect expenses may change during the period of performance and then determine ceilings accordingly.
34	G.3 pg 19, para c(1): Section G.3 has a section for the Offeror's DCAA contact information. Should the Offeror include this section/information in the cover letter?	The DCAA contract information should be included in the cost proposal.
35	I, page 46, 48, 52.219-4, 52.227-23; Hubzone; Rights to Proposal Data: There are clauses in Section I that state "To Be Completed by Offeror." Should the Offeror include this section/information in the cover letter?	Sections that state "To Be Completed By Offeror" are to be completed by the offeror and submitted with their model contract.
36	Can industry interpret correctly that clause H.13 paragraph (c) of the RRSW RFP does NOT disqualify a contractor from performing in a major subcontractor role on both RRSW and MSV; under the assumption that any potential OCI issues are effectively identified and mitigated to the Government's satisfaction in an OCI plan?	Yes, the assumption is correct.

Item	Question	Government Response
37	<p>Past Performance; pg 108; "Per Section L page 108, item (b), past performance is required for the Offeror and major subcontractors who will receive =>\$500K per task order and who have a relevant contract of >\$1M in the past 5 years or ongoing. Item (1) states the maximum number of relevant contracts is 6. What is the requirement if an Offeror has >5 major subcontractors that meet these requirements?"; Recommend Page 108 item (b) (1) be changed to "A list of not more than 6 of the most relevant contracts from the Offeror and all major subcontractors, each in excess of"; Recommend page 109 item (9) last part of the sentence "...for all relevant contracts" be changed to "for those (up to 6) relevant contracts chosen in item (b) (1) above."; Recommend M.3(b)(5) first sentence be replaced with "The Offeror will be evaluated on information described in this section for the maximum of 6 relevant contracts to be provided as described in Section L.12(b)(1)."; Recommend the phrase "as described in Section L.12(b)(1)" be added to the end of the sentence in L.12(b)(10)(ii) and L.12(b)(10)(iii).</p>	<p>Comment noted. RFP will not be changed. "A list of not more than 6 relevant contracts" is a required for the prime and each major subcontractor proposed. For example, if you proposed 3 major subs, then you could have up to six relevant contracts for the prime and six relevant contracts for each major subcontractor for a total maximum of 24 relevant contracts.</p>
38	<p>Under Vol. I, Section (iii), Multi-Mission Modular Bus Development Task Order / A. Management and Business Approach / 1. Management Structure and Authorities / d. (p. 121 of RFP, Section L): Question: What specifically is meant by "Describe the structural connections or associations of the entities responsible for this work with any corporate or division organizations, any subcontractors and other successful MSV and RRSW contract awardees? Describe the applicability of the above to the work described in the Task Order and on innovativeness in terms of efficiency and effectiveness?"</p>	<p>In your proposed organizational structure, describe how you will be managing relationships with your subcontractors.</p>
39	<p>Under Vol. I, Section (iii), Multi-Mission Modular Bus Development Task Order / A. Technical Plan / 2. Compliance with Mission Objectives / a. Schedule Constraints (p. 124 of RFP, Section L): It states "The Offeror shall present its bus's ability to comply with the stated schedules objectives or provide adequate justification for deviation". Question: What specifically is meant by "stated schedules objectives?"</p>	<p>In the Bus TO, stated schedule objectives are presented. Section L, will evaluate these "stated schedule objectives"</p>
40	<p>In J.1 (a) Attachment 5 of the RRSW/MSV solicitation, the number 1. Supplies/Services to be provided on page identifies items 1,2 and 3, however in section 4 Period of Performance on page 4 has the corresponding items numbered 1, 4, and 5. Question: Is there any significance to difference in numbering between these corresponding line items, and if so, what are they?</p>	<p>This was a typo. All number sections should be sequential, i.e. 1,2,3, no numbers omitted.</p>
41	<p>The RFP Introduction states the NAICS Code for both RRSW and MSV as 541712 with a size standard of 1,000. In addition, FAR Clauses 52.219-4, Notice of Price Evaluation Preference for Hubzone Small Business Concerns, and 52.219-28, Post-Award Small Business Program Representation are also cited. Question: Please clarify that all businesses, regardless of size, may respond to this solicitation subject to the provisions of small business price evaluation and related procedures.</p>	<p>Yes. This solicitation is not set aside for small businesses.</p>
42	<p>The RFP Specific Highlights, Item 5, Section I: Contract Clauses references Clause only goes to clause I.10. Question: Is there supposed to be a Clause I.12 with a requirement of Top Secret? If so, please provide the specifics of what is required (access, storage, etc) for this solicitation.</p>	<p>Clause I.12 was removed from the Final RFP. There is not a requirement for Top Secret.</p>

Item	Question	Government Response
43	Please clarify in ORSBS-002-GBS ISET General Bus Standard on page 35 sec 6.3.2.2 Rates and Waveforms. There appears to be a discrepancy between 2 kbps and 2 Mbps. "When in contact with the spacecraft command and control network under all operations, both nominal and anomalous, the SB shall support a command uplink of 2 kbps for all attitudes and orbits of the SB. [B-27] : When in contact with the spacecraft command and control network under all operations, both nominal and anomalous, the SB shall support a command uplink of 2 Mbps for all attitudes and orbits of the SB. [B-427]"	ORS B-27 is properly stated as the "2kbps uplink". B-427 incorrectly states "uplink" and should read: "...the SB shall support a command downlink of 2 Mbps for all altitudes and orbits of the SB."
44	Is there an update to the ORSBS-002-GBS ISET General Bus Standard R3.1? The last revision was in April 2008.	The Apr 08 ISET GBS R3.1 document is the baseline document for this acquisition
45	Additionally, we request the following documents in support of our proposal effort in response to RFP NNA09308164R: 1) 7681990 (Revision F) interface specification [B-358]; a. Referenced in ORSBS-002-GBS ISET General Bus Standard on page 34 sec 6.3.1.3 Rates and Waveforms. "The TR shall include NSA approved encryption/decryption algorithms per NSA regulations. [B-69] , "The SB TR interface with the spacecraft command and control network shall implement a Multi-Platform Common Data Link (MP-CDL) waveform as defined in the 7681990 (Revision F) interface specification. [B-358] Frequency bands selection associated with use of the MP-CDL for in theater operations will need to be specified by the procuring agent." b. Question: What is the specifications for encryption? NSA approves Type 1, Type 2 and other types of encryption, which all require different hardware. 2) Mission Requirements and Concept of Operations (CONOPS), ORSBS-001; a. Referenced in ORSBS-002-GBS ISET General Bus Standard on page 36 sec 6.3.3 Spacecraft Operations Center (SOC) Interface. "Refer to the Mission Requirements and Concept of Operations (CONOPS), ORSBS-001, for details".	No additional will be provided. This information is not necessary in submitting a proposal.
46	First, what is the maximum duration of Task Orders issued in the last year of the contract and can they run past the contract end date? Second, on page 92, it suggests the page count for Management Approach is 40 pages and on page 91 it is 50 pages total. Also, is there a guideline for the number of key person resumes in the Management Approach? Page 92 indicates resumes are not part of the page count.	TO performance periods may extend for up to one year past the end of the contract ordering period as stated in NFS 1816.505-72. The page counts were updated in RFP Amendment 02. Key personnel resumes are limited to 3 pages per individual.
47	In the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) Architecture Guidebook dated 14 DEC 09, there is inconsistency with what documents are referenced in the document and what has been provided. For example the Integrated Systems Engineering Team (ISET) General Bus Standard, Revision R3, December 2007 where we have been provided R3.1 April 2008. The Integrated Systems Engineering Team (ISET) Payload Developers' Guide, is listed as Revision R3, December 2007 where we have been provided R3.2 August 2008. Please clarify which version of these documents are to be used as the basis of this procurement.	Current ISET documents provided are the baseline reference documents for this solicitation.

Item	Question	Government Response
48	Section L.13.(a).(2).(ii).A.4 on page 124 of the RFP states "The Offeror shall express its plan to comply with existing RRSW processes and will work to develop new processes to meet mission requirements. ". We do not believe there are any existing RRSW "existing" processes. Please identify the Governments intent on this statement.	The Government's intent is for the contractor to adapt existing standard aerospace processes and develop new ones specific to the RRSW . The RFP reference documents provide a framework to start this process.
49	We have not found the requirements for the response time for a task order RFP stated in the proposal. Please advise on the requirements for task order RFP response time.	Current task order responses are due with this RFP, future task order response times will be stated in the task order RFP.
50	There seems to be inconsistency in the RFP from what is requested in section L versus M in regards to the MSV Technical Plan as follows: a. Section L Instructions: L.13.a.2.iii.A.2.g g. Multi-mission modularity Compatibility - The Offeror shall detail how rapidly reconfigurable & modular (both Hardware and flight software) its payload architecture is to accommodate multiple missions with limited non-reoccurring engineering (NRE) on a RRSW rapid response timeline.; b. Section M Evaluation Factors: M.4.a.2.iii.A.2.g g. Multi-mission modularity Compatibility -- Is the Offeror's proposed bus architecture rapidly reconfigurable & modular (both Hardware and flight software) to accommodate the full range of envisioned. Should we presume that section L should refer to the Bus architecture	An Amendment will be issued to correct Section L (L.13.a.2.iii.A.2.g) to replace 'Payload' with 'Bus'.
51	In the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) Architecture Guidebook dated 14 DEC 09, Figure 4-1 a "Bus Developers Guide is referenced as being in "Draft" form. Will this document be made available as has the Payload Developers Guide?	No, the "Bus Developers Guide" and "Payload Developers Guide" will not be available until after contract award.
52	TO1 & TO2 & DRLs: A Demonstration Plan is called out in both the TO1 and TO2 DRLs but the scope only appears to be addressed in the TO2 SOW – is a Demonstration Plan necessary for TO1?	The Government's intent is for the RRSW Standup and Operate TO provide a general Demonstration Plan that is not linked to a specific DRL and can be refined for specific missions.
53	TO1 & TO2 & DRLs: The scope of the Demonstration Plan in TO2 (para 3.1.2) appears to be different than the description in the DRL. In fact the description in the DRL appears to be more appropriate for TO1 scope (but there is no effort included for a Demonstration Plan in TO1). Can you please clarify?	The Government's intent is for the RRSW Standup and Operate TO to provide a general Demonstration Plan that is not linked to a specific DRL and can be refined for specific missions. Additionally, the Execute End to End Mission TO's intent is to detail the specifics for a mission, specifically linked to the DRL.
54	Will the Government accept Federal Express Delivery or must the Proposal packages be hand-delivered?	Yes, they can be delivered via Fed Ex or any other private carrier, USPS or hand delivered, so long as it arrives by the proposal time and due date.
55	Attach 002, Pg 138 says Exhibit 2 costs shown by WBS are to be consistent with your approved estimating system and traceability to the cost summaries for each Task Order shown on Exhibit 2. Indirect cost rates used in this exhibit should be the ceiling rates proposed in Exhibit 4. Clarify that only Exhibit 4 shall calculate costs with ceiling rates and that the other Exhibits shall calculate costs using forward pricing rates.	The ceiling rates proposed in Exhibit 4 are to be used to calculate all costs for the proposed effort shown on the other exhibits. Forward pricing rates are not to be used to calculate costs unless the forward pricing rates are also the ceiling rates.
56	Attach 002, Sect L.13: What is the definition of Contract Year pricing? Does it mean if the contract starts in June 2010 then the Contract Year is June 2010 to May 2011? Do you want costs inflated or base year dollars?	A contract year is one year beginning on the date of contract award. Therefore, if the contract began on June 1, 2010, completion of the first year would occur on May 31, 2011. As stated on Page 138 of the RFP, labor costs should be escalated at an annual rate of 3.0% unless justification is provided for using an alternate rate.

Item	Question	Government Response
57	ORS Architecture Handbook, Page 19: Please provide the ORS GSE ISR document referenced in the ORS Architecture Handbook.	This document was made available with Amendment 1.
58	Earlier files existed on the SARSat Payload and Bus with a description (MSV TO-02 SARSat Payload and MSV TO-03 SARSat Bus) . Is it possible to obtain these files. the link from the fbo link does not point correctly to anything on the nasa.gov site.	<p>No those files are no longer available. All files necessary for proposal submission can be found at the URL below. Also provided is a link were you can sign up for email notifications, so that as soon as an amendment or anything else is posted regarding the solicitation, you will be notified.</p> <p>URL for RFP http://prod.nais.nasa.gov/cgi-bin/eps/bizops.cgi?gr=D&pin=21#138264</p> <p>URL for email notifications http://procurement.nasa.gov/cgi-bin/nens/index.cgi</p>
59	<p>L.11 (c) has a statement as follows: "The commitment letter/s and resume/s for key personnel are not counted as part of the 40 page limitation under Management Approach."</p> <p>Does this 40 page limitation mean that the answer to (1) Management Approach is 40 pages followed by 20 pages for the Basic SOW; 10 pages for the ISA Task Order; and 20 pages for the Bus Development TO - for a total of 90 pages + the OCI response, resumes (of not more than 3 pages each) and commitment letters (of not more than one page each)? If not, please explain the apparent difference between 40 pages stated in L.11(c) and the total of 50 pages stated in the table in L.11(a).</p>	Page counts were updated in RFP Amendment 2.
60	Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) Architecture Guidebook 3.3.3.2.3 Tier 1 Toolkit Online Tasking and Tracking Service. Has the Tier 1 Toolkit "Online Tasking and Tracking Website" been developed already and will it be GFE at contract award?	Tier 1 Toolkit is in draft form, however it will not be available until after contract award and is not necessary for proposal submission.
61	What is the defined starting point for the End-to-End demonstration task order? Have the hardware and software been processed through an initial level of receiving integration and test, disassembled and placed on a shelf? Or, at the start of the Task Order are the components brand new to the RRSW?	The End-to-End Demo TO is currently just a Sample TO at this time. The Government's intent is to request proposals on the Final End-to-End Demo TO after both the MSV Bus and MSV Payload TOs are awarded.
62	Section I 1852.234-1. If an offeror needs to submit its comprehensive plan for EVMS guidelines to fulfill paragraph (b) of this FAR clause, can it be submitted as an attachment to the cover letter?	Yes.
63	L.12 Proposal Preparation - Specific Instructions (page 113). In J.1(a) Attachment 2, Stand Up and Operate Task Order it indicates in 4.12 that a WBS is to be delivered 30 days after award. Please confirm that pricing task orders to Level 3 WBS listed in L.12 (5) (ii) (page 113) applies to task orders proposed after award?	The pricing to Level 3 for WBS is due with the proposal and the initial update to this WBS will be required 30 days after award
64	When are Past Performance questionnaires due?	Questionnaires are due by the same date as proposal submission.

Item	Question	Government Response
65	L.9(b)(4) and L.12.(b)(9)(iv)H. The list of management system audits and dates are required both within the Cover Letter and in the Past Performance Volume. Are they required in both locations? Suggest the Offeror is required to include the list only within the Cover Letter section.	The list of management system audits and dates required by the cover letter in L.9 is for the prime only. The RFP will be changed in a future RFP Amendment to make the requirement in L.12 for major subcontractors only.
66	<p>RRSWBasicSOW4.15.2. Request the Government clarify:</p> <p>"4.15.2 The contractor shall provide the following documents in support of IA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System Security Plan (SSP), as required by the Government • System Security Plan (SSP), as required by the Government • Program Protection Implementation Plan (PPIP), delivered 120 days after award, then annually • IA Controls Artifacts <p>• Accreditation Boundary Drawing(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System Description • Hardware List • Software List." <p>Is the Government asking for a Security Support Plan (SSP) as identified in DODI 5200.39-R or a unit-level System Security Plan (SSP)? If a unit-level SSP, please provide a sample document, as these tend to be unique documents based on the Service or organization needs.</p> 	RRSW Basic SOW 4.15.2. only requests System Security Plan (SSP) while RRSW Stand Up and Operate TO 4.15.2. requests both System Security Plan (SSP) and Program Protection Implementation Plan (PPIP). The Government will be looking for a unit-level SSP, as defined in the TO. A sample will be made available after award of contract.
67	The Program Protection Implementation Plan (PPIP) and System Security Plan are usually elements of the overall Security Support Plan. Does the Government have an existing Security Support Plan, or, alternatively, intend to use either the Kirtland AFB or AFRL SSPs? If so, can Offerors obtain copies of the intended RRSW overarching SSP prior to proposal submittal?	The Government will make templates/guides for development of the PPIP and SSP available after award of contract.
68	<p>RRSW Basic SOW 4.15.2. Within item:</p> <p>"4.15.2 The contractor shall provide the following documents in support of IA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System Security Plan (SSP), as required by the Government • System Security Plan (SSP), as required by the Government ..." <p>Should the second bullet read "Security Support Plan (SSP)", instead of repeat "System Security Plan (SSP)"?</p>	The wording for SSP is correct as stated in the RRSW Basic SOW.
69	RRSW Basic SOW 4.15.2 . We request the Government to identify the specific "system" that will need to be incorporated into the unit-level SSP and PPIP? For example, please identify communication systems, such as NIPRNet, SIPRNet, and CWAN/GWAN, and equipment, such as unclassified or classified engineering tables and lab equipment.	Each individual system in the RRSW will require an SSP, but this information is not necessary for proposal submission.
70	RFP B.6(a). Please consider striking "or any other Government contract" as we can only negotiate indirect rate ceilings for each individual contract. Any contractual obligations a Contractor enters into in the past or future can not be bound by the terms of this particular agreement.	Comment noted. The clause and ceilings only apply to this contract. However, the clause explains that costs that exceed the ceiling and are uncompensated on this contract cannot be rolled into indirect cost pools and charged on other Government contracts.
71	Article L.8 New Mexico Gross Receipts Tax (NMGRT). Please confirm that NMGRT is an allowable cost that the Contractor will be reimbursed, if it is applicable to the work performed under the contract.	Yes, if the cost is allowable, allocable, and reasonable. There is current New Mexico ruling on the NMGRT and is available as a reference document in a future RFP Amendments.

Item	Question	Government Response
72	Please provide the estimated date of contract award for pricing purposes.	The standard lead time is 180 days from proposal receipt.
73	The ARC Data Requirements List includes both NASA 533 reporting (Items 001 – 003) and a Contract Cost Reporting (items 016 and 017). Please explain the need for both sets of reporting requirements. Would it be possible to structure the reports to eliminate the need for one set of the reports?	DRLs 016 and 017 only apply to EVMS and therefore must be submitted separately.
74	Section L.9 (b)(5) directs Contractors to submit proposals to the address specified in Block 9 of the SF33; however, this address on the SF33 appears to be incomplete. Please provide the complete address so Offerors can ensure proper delivery.	The address on the SF 33 is revised on the RFP Amendment 02.
75	Request the Government to provide the following documents in an editable format (i.e. - Microsoft Word) for inclusion in the proposal response: § Standard Form (SF) 33 § Section H § Standard Form (SF) 3881 § Section K	These documents are not available in Microsoft Word. Handwritten responses are acceptable.
76	What is the contract ceiling or expected maximum ordering value for RRSW alone?	The Contract ceiling for the RRSW is shared with the MSV
77	H.2. What is the anticipated turn-around time between Requests for Task Order Proposals release and Task Order Proposal submittals under RRSW? (i.e. -- How long will Offerors have to prepare the official Task Order Proposals?)	Tasks issued after contract award will have varied proposal submission due dates which will be stated in each task order RFP.
78	H.13(b). Please further define and expand on the meaning of "consolidating architecture evolution for standards updates". What tasks does this term encompass?	This statement encompasses the entire contract.
79	L.12(b)(9)(iv) Should the "Other Information" be included for each of the submitted six relevant contracts? Or should it be provided for each Contractor and Major Subcontractor?	"A list of not more than 6 relevant contracts" is a required for the prime and each major subcontractor proposed. For example, if you proposed 3 major subs, then you could have up to six relevant contracts for the prime and six relevant contracts for each major subcontractor for a total maximum of 24 relevant contracts. The "Other Information" would then be required for all 24 contracts.
80	In the Government responses to DRAFT RFP Industry questions, the responses to Questions #65, #66, and #67 were that the "bullet would be removed." However, in the FINAL RFP, none of the referenced bullets were removed. Will the Government reconsider removing these referenced bullets? If the bullets are not removed, we kindly request the Government to answer the original questions.	These bullets will be removed from the RFP in a future RFP Amendment.

Item	Question	Government Response
81	<p>L.12(b)(3) and L.12.(b)(9)(iv)G. Both RFP paragraphs L.12(b)(3) and L.12(b)(9)(iv)G state (underlined portion):</p> <p>" ... identify and explain any serious performance problems, any termination for default, any environmental violations, and any safety violations cited."</p> <p>Is this information required in both locations in the Offeror's response? Suggest the Offeror is required to include only within the main Past Performance citation.</p>	<p>This section will be modified in a future RFP Amendment to clarify what is required by the prime and major subcontracts identified.</p>
82	<p>L.10(a). The RFP specifies page limits for individual sections of the proposal (e.g., Management Approach - Basic SOW: 20 page limit and Management Approach - Standup and Operate Task Order: 10 page limit). We respectfully request that Offerors be allowed to interpret these as guidelines and allocate page length of each proposal section within each subfactor based on our approach, provided we adhere to the subfactor page limits (i.e., Management Approach: 40 page limit and Technical Approach: 40 page limit).</p>	<p>Proposals shall follow the requirements of the Proposal Page Limitations clause as stated in the RFP.</p>
83	<p>Section L.9(b)(4) (Cover Letter) requests the following information. "List the date of the most recent reviews of your management system(s) (e.g., purchasing, accounting, property, estimating). Data must identify the type of review, including the results of the review, the cognizant Government agency making the review, systems approvals, if any, and the last date of a system approval." The same information is requested in RFP Section L.12(b). Would it be sufficient to only provide this information once in the RFP Section L.9(b)(4) (Cover Letter) ?</p>	<p>The list of management system audits and dates required by the cover letter in L.9 is for the prime only. The RFP will be changed in a future RFP Amendment to make the requirement in L.12 for major subcontractors only.</p>
84	<p>Assume we are on one RRSW and one MSV Prime Contractor.</p> <p>1. If we are on a winning RRSW Team, does our presence negatively affect the scoring of our MSV Team and impact their potential for an award?</p> <p>a. If the answer is yes, then all contractors/sub-contractors on an RRSW Team are not allowed to be on any MSV Team.</p> <p>You are either on one side of the fence or the other exclusively. Is this your intent?</p> <p>2. If we perform analysis in support of the RRSW Prime where the results are then used to develop specifications for an MSV Task Order, is our MSV Team prevented from proposing?</p>	<p>1. No. see OCI Clause H.13 2. No because in this case you are performing analysis not developing specifications. See OCI Clause H.13</p>
85	<p>1. Does the RRSW Prime develop specifications and SOW for the ORS Office? 2. Or is the ORS Office going to develop specifications and SOW? 3. Who generates the Task Orders?</p>	<p>The ORS Office will develop the specifications and the SOWs, but may receive inputs from RRSW and MSV contractors. The Government generates all task orders.</p>
86	<p>For pricing purposes, could you provide a projected start date for TO1 for RRSW?</p>	<p>The standard lead time is 180 days from proposal receipt.</p>
87	<p>Cover Letter & Attachments: The RFP does not clearly identify the "administrative-related" data and Attachments required by the Subcontractors; What contracting documentation and Attachments are required from the Subcontractors?</p>	<p>The overall proposal is the responsibility of the "Proposing Entity" as defined in Section L.9. The specific documentation and attachments required of the subcontractors will depend on the areas the prime assigns to the subcontractors. Please ensure you read the entire solicitation for applicable requirements for subcontractors.</p>

Item	Question	Government Response
88	Section L.9 (b) 4. List the date of the most recent reviews of your management systems" ... Do the Subcontractors need to provide the results of their Audit Findings Report for the systems identified?	The list of management system audits and dates required by the cover letter in L.9 is for the prime only. The RFP will be changed in a future RFP Amendment to make the requirement in L.12 for major subcontractors only.
89	<p>Page 111, Section L, Subparagraph (10), Past Performance Questionnaires. Subparts (ii) and (iii) of this section seem to be redundant; and could be interpreted to indicate that offers are to submit 12 past performance questionnaires versus 6.</p> <p>The subpart (iii) direction to send questionnaires to "customers" is also confusing, since only Contracting Officers (CO) and Contracting Officers Technical Representatives (COTR) are authorized to provide contract performance references.</p> <p>We request that the Government please clarify the requirements for past performance questionnaires to eliminate the confusion caused by these subparts.</p>	Section (ii) (iii) require questionnaires for all relevant contracts for prime and major subcontractor to be submitted by both the CO/COTR and customers. The term "customers" include contracts you have with private industry. For example, if you proposed 3 major subs, then you could have up to six relevant contracts for the prime and six relevant contracts for each major subcontractor for a total maximum of 24 relevant contracts. For those 24 relevant contracts you would send a questionnaire to both the CO/COTR and the customer of that contract identified.
90	<p>Section L.12(b)(3), page 108, and RFP Section L.12(b)(9)(iv)G, page 111. These two subsections ask for identical information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (3) "...identify and explain any serious performance problems, any termination for default, any environmental violations, and any safety violations cited." • (9)G "Describe any serious performance problems, termination for default, environmental violations or safety violations cited." <p>Since these two subsections ask for the same information, we request that the Government please delete one of these items due to the page constraint on this volume.</p>	This section will be modified in a future RFP Amendment to clarify what is required by the prime and major subcontracts identified.
91	The Government has awarded IDIQ contracts under which late proposals for Task Orders are not disqualified. Will late proposals be disqualified under this IDIQ contract?	Per FAR 15.208(b)(1), late proposals will not be considered unless the specified criteria are met.
92	The Government has awarded IDIQ contracts that require all Task Order proposals to be due within a specific number of days (e.g. 10 days from the posting of a Task Order RFP). With that in mind, how long after the posting of Task Order RFPs will proposals be due on this contract?	Tasks issued after contract award will have varied proposal submission due dates which will be stated in each task order RFP.
93	Will the Government use a secure website or portal to post Task Order RFPs, and if not, how will the Government post or distribute Task Order RFPs?	Task Order RFPs will be issued directly to RRSW/MSV prime contractor POCs.
94	How will the Government handle Task Order RFPs with just one response?	The Government will determine if the one response will meet the requirements of the RFP and award accordingly.
95	Is it correct that RRSW contractors will not develop standard architectures, but will only recommend changes to standard architectures based on the "lessons learned" from integrating and testing hardware and software in the RRSW?	Yes, the Government will control the architectures with support/ recommendations from the RRSW/MSV contractors.

Item	Question	Government Response
96	H.2 "The Contractor may incur costs under this contract in performance of task orders and task order modifications issued in accordance with this clause. No other costs are authorized unless otherwise specified in the contract or expressly authorized by the Contracting Officer." Will the contractor be able to bill the government for cost incurred in the preparation of Task Order responses issued under the RRSW Contract?	Generally, no, these costs are unallowable as a direct cost. If allowed, the Task Order RFP will so state.
97	H.21 Will the Government make available any software that is already licensed and available at the ORSO and RRSW, such as Orbital Analysis (e.g., STK), General Analysis (e.g., MATLAB/SIMULINK), Configuration Management/Control (e.g., Clearcase) and MCAD and ECAD, as well as other modeling software tools? Please provide a list of available software that the RRSW contractor may use at Government installations.	Currently ORSO and RRSW has no relevant licenses that can be shared.
98	Is the Earned Value Management System required to be in place for Task Order 1?	EVMS will apply to the MSV Bus and Payload TOs as they will likely exceed \$20M. It is not anticipated that EVMS will apply to Standup and Operate TO or the End-to-End TO.
99	DRLs 019, 020, 021, 023, 029 Draft plans are due at major program reviews that are associated with the MSV Task Order. Task Order 1 does not specify the conduct of these reviews. Recommend that these DRLs be removed from Task Order 1 and initial Drafts delivered in Task Order 2.	DRLS 019, 020, 021, 023, 029 are not part of TO#1, please read SOW paragraph 5.2 for required DRLs.
100	Basic SOW 3.4.5. Please clarify the extent to which the contractor is required to assemble, integrate and test the ground system enterprise.	The intent and scope of the RRSW Basic SOW is to be inclusive of areas, such as the ground system enterprise, that may require support in future TOs. As a work example, in the RRSW a test mock-up of the ground system enterprise could be setup to test the satellite interface to the GSA as part of a "Factory Compatibility Test" or as a system is becoming operational the installation of software adapters/translators could be something the RRSW supports.
101	Basic SOW 4.15. Please provide the Government's planned IT architecture to enable proper costing. If it is not available, please specify that the contractor is to support the Government in the development of this plan.	The Government does not have an IT architecture plan available for the RRSW. The contractor is to support the Government in the development of this plan.
102	DRL 015. An initial delivery of the PMP is not specified. Recommend Due NLT 30 days after Contract Award	Parts of the Program Plan will be submitted with the proposal and yes, the initial delivery of the Program Plan is 30 days after contract award.
103	L.11. Table on page 91 indicates a total of 50 pages for Management Approach. On page 92, first paragraph Says: " The commitment letter/s and resume/s for key personnel are not counted as part of the 40 page limitation under Management Approach. However, ..." Which total page allocation is correct for the Management Approach, 50 or 40?	This table was updated in Amendment 02.
104	B.2 "The incentive fee portion of the contract will be negotiated as applicable incentive fee task orders are issued." In both MSV task orders, page 3 paragraph 2 indicates Cost Plus Fixed Fee only. Confirm that the two MSV task orders are CPFF only.	The currently available MSV TOs are CPFF, but future MSV TOs may be CPIF.

Item	Question	Government Response
105	<p>L.10(a), footnote 2 [p. 89]L.10(a), footnote 2 [p. 89] (repeated throughout Section L) 2 In the Management Approach written response, commitment letters are limited to one page per individual; resumes are limited to 3 pages total per individual.</p> <p>Include the rationale, roles and responsibilities for proposed key personnel, along with commitment letters and resumes. May bidders provide the commitment letters and resumes in an appendix to Volume I Mission Suitability? This will prevent confusion over sequential page numbering and page limits within the main body of the volume.</p> <p>If a resume is appropriate for more than one of the three areas (basic SOW, TO 1 and TO 2), may bidders submit it once and cross-reference it elsewhere?</p>	They maybe submitted as an appendix and may be cross referenced if clearly stated.
106	<p>L.10(b)(10)(ii-iii) [p. 111] Please clarify the difference between subparagraph (ii) and subparagraph (iii). In both cases we are told to submit questionnaires for up to six relevant contracts. In (ii) there are time bounds on those contracts; in (iii) there are no bounds.</p> <p>Please clarify if we are to submit 6 or 12 questionnaires.</p> <p>Please clarify if we are to submit 6 or 12 questionnaires each for the Prime and each major subcontractor, OR 6 or 12 questionnaires for the entire team.</p>	Section (ii) (iii) require questionnaires for all relevant contracts for prime and major subcontractor to be submitted by both the CO/COTR and customers. For example, if you proposed 3 major subs, then you could have up to six relevant contracts for the prime and six relevant contracts for each major subcontractor for a total maximum of 24 relevant contracts. For those 24 relevant contracts you would send a questionnaire to both the CO/COTR and the customer of that contract identified. Additionally, past performance questionnaires are due the same date and time as proposal receipt date.
107	Please clarify if your intent is that we submit questionnaires only for those contracts cited in Volume II, or if we are to submit questionnaires for contracts other than those we cite in Volume II.	Only sited in volume II as Prime and Major subs.
108	<p>L.12(b)(1) [p. 108] and L.12(b)(10)(i) [p 111] "A list of not more than six relevant contracts (Government and/or industry contracts), each in excess of \$1,000,000 total contract value, received in the past five (5) years, or currently on-going, ..."</p> <p>"... for each active (underway at least one year) or recently completed (completed within the last five years) relevant Government agency or Industry contract ..." Please clarify – if we cite completed contracts, are they to be contracts which have been received in the past five years or completed in the past five years?</p>	The Government's intent is to evaluate past performance on contracts received or completed within the last five years as stated in the RFP.
109	L.12(b)(5) [p. 108] "Specific information is required from the Offeror and proposed major subcontractors, past and active customers as identified in subparagraph (7)A. below." There is no subparagraph (7)A. Please clarify what requirement this is referring to.	Should state in "paragraph (2) below.." This change will be made in a future RFP Amendment.
110	L.12(b)(1) [p. 108] "Industry contracts involving subcontracting to another company that may have a prime contract with some area of the Government are acceptable." Please clarify – does this statement mean that we may only cite subcontracts on U.S. Government prime contracts?	No. The intent is to give flexibility in the kinds of contracts that may be submitted.

Item	Question	Government Response
111	Section 3.5.3 [p.6] The contractor shall design and develop a reusable space vehicle shipping container compatible with launch site requirements. The contractor shall package the space vehicle as required for shipment to the launch site as directed by the government. Who is responsible for shipping to the launch site?	The Government is responsible.
112	Please clarify the contractor's role in the MAP. Does the contractor lead the effort to develop the MAP, or support the government's development of the MAP? If the contractor leads MAP development, please provide a DRL for the MAP.	The MAP will be jointly developed hand-in-hand with the Government.
113	L.9(c) [p. 88] The Mission Suitability proposal shall contain a risk analysis that identifies risk areas as well as the Offeror's recommended approaches to minimize the impact of those risks on the overall success of the requirements. The RFP requires risk discussion in specific proposal sections, such as Basic SOW, Management Structure and Authorities, and Technical and Business Management of Task Orders (TO). Does responding to these specific risk requirements fulfill the requirement cited in the column to the left?	The Mission Suitability proposal describes the requirements for risk analysis that shall be submitted in your proposal.
114	Section G – NFS 1852.245-70 1. The deviation version of the clause seems overly restrictive. Recommend Replace With “Contractor Requests For Government-Owned Equipment (1852.245-70) (Jul 1997)”	Noted. RFP remains unchanged. NASA PIC 07-09 requires deviation until NFS is changed appropriately.
115	H.11 . The language of this paragraph (the contractor is prohibited from purchasing items for direct use by the government as these items should be procured by the Government) seems to conflict with J.1(a) attachment 1, paragraphs 3,3.3.8, 3.5 and 3.6.3; and J.1(a), Attachment 2, paragraphs 3 and 3.3.8. Request clarification or correction.	The language in H.11, is talking about contractor purchasing something for Government use only. The SOWs describe procuring property that will be used during performance of the contract by the contractor and then provided to the Government.
116	Section L, Item (c) Cost/Price Proposal (Volume III) Para 5(iii)A. 1. Does this requirement for the 3% escalation recommendation apply to subcontractor's escalation? 2. If the answer to the previous question is yes, is it also applicable for lower tier subcontractors?	Yes and Yes.
117	Section L, Item (c) Cost/Price Proposal (Volume III) Para 5(ii). (5) Specific Content – (ii) Exhibit 2 requires Contract Year Pricing. 1. Please clarify whether “contract year pricing” means the contractor fiscal year, calendar year, or Government fiscal year?	A contract year is one year beginning on the date of contract award. Therefore, if the contract began on June 1, 2010, completion of the first year would occur on May 31, 2011.
118	52.244-2 Subcontracts . Would the Government delete this clause if the Prime has a Government approved purchasing system?	No.

Item	Question	Government Response
119	<p>1852.223-70 and Section L (3) Safety and Health Plan – (Subfactor). This work will be performed at Kirtland Air Force Base, Building 277, under the 377th Air Base Wing.</p> <p>1. Is it not correct that the Air Force Safety and Health Requirements apply for work performed on an Air Force Base?</p> <p>2. If Air Force Health and Safety Requirements will be applicable to the successful contractor will NASA Ames update the Health and Safety clauses, provisions, and evaluation criteria?</p>	It is not correct. Air Force Safety and Health requirements are less restrictive, therefore, NASA Safety and Health Plan requirements shall be used in performance of the contract.
120	Will the Government consider extending the proposal receipt date for thirty days?	The Government has extended the proposal receipt date in Amendments 1 and 2.
121	<p>J.1 (a) attachment 5 states in section 1.0 Scope “The scope of this SOW is intended to include the efforts needed to meet the flight mission demonstration to include: the modular bus flight hardware; integration of modular payload flight hardware; space vehicle integration, test, and validation; flight software; mission launch support; post-launch turn-on; calibration; checkout; and user handoff; and on-orbit support.” The areas highlighted are inconsistent with deliverables listed. Please clarify that this is “support” only, consistent with item #2 under SUPPLIES/SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED found on page 3 of the task order.</p>	This scope applies to all three deliverable items. The hardware and software portions are identified in item one. The majority of the SOW may be "support" but could include fixtures, adapters, software updates, fixes to the bus, etc. as supplies.
122	<p>J.1 (a) attachment 5 states in section 5.1.2 “Government acceptance of the bus hardware and software (to include delivery of updated versions of software) based on results of space vehicle testing.” Final acceptance of the Bus hardware and software is indicated to occur after space vehicle testing is performed. Wouldn't formal acceptance of the Bus take place as part of the Bus Pre Ship Review(PSR) and submittal of the DD250?</p>	It is the governments desire to keep the effort open until space vehicle testing.
123	<p>J.1 (a) attachment 5 states in section 5.1.1 – What is the criteria for acceptance of the Bus? Realizing that once the Bus is delivered to the Government facility, it will be out of the MSV contractor's control.</p>	For the MSV contract, acceptance of the bus/payloads will occur after delivery to the RRSW and after a verification of bus and/or payload functionality and tests have been completed.
124	<p>In document 138264-SOL-001-010.pdf, ARC DATA REQUIREMENTS LIST (DRL), Modular Space Vehicle, page 5 of 23, Item No. 004, Monthly Technical Progress Report, the following description is provided: “Contractor shall submit separate monthly status reports of all work accomplished during each month of contract performance. Reports shall be in narrative form and brief and informal in content. Monthly reports shall include: safety issues and reviews (including results of required walk-thru of Contractor employee areas), a brief status of progress; a discussion of issues or problems that may impede performance with potential resolutions, and recommended action items for both the Government and the Contractor.” It is unclear by what means the monthly technical progress reports are to be separate. It is by task order? Is it by some element of cost or WBS? Please clarify by what means the monthly technical progress reports are to be separately provided. Suggestion/Recommendation: A single monthly technical progress report for each task order.</p>	Separate here implies the submission is not part of the other monthly reporting submissions. The submission is completed for each task order that requires it.

Item	Question	Government Response
125	<p>In document 138264-SOL-001-010.pdf, ARC DATA REQUIREMENTS LIST (DRL), Modular Space Vehicle, page 8 of 23, Item No. 007, New Technology Report, the following description is provided: "Electronic submission via NASA's Electronic New Technology Reporting (eNTRe) web system at http://invention.nasa.gov/ is encouraged. NASA Form 1679, Disclosure of Invention and New Technology (Including Software), or equivalent, may also be used in accordance with NFS 1852.227-70, New Technology. A negative report is required even if there is no New Technology to report. A negative report is required even if there is no new technology to report. However, the frequency of these reports is "As required." Therefore, it is unclear how often a negative report might be required. Please specify the interval for the negative technology reports (providing that there is indeed no new technology to report.) Suggestion/Recommendation: We recommend that the interval for negative reports be driven either by the regular monthly or quarterly meetings and therefore be either monthly or quarterly, but not both.</p>	<p>Provide report for New Technology as required. If no report has been submitted then provide a negative report on annual basis.</p>
126	<p>In document 138264-SOL-001-008.pdf, ORS Modular Space Vehicles (MSV), Multi-Mission Modular Bus Development Task Order, J.1(a) attachment 5, page 14, section 6, Cost Estimate, the RFP identifies an estimate of the cost of a first article multi-mission bus between \$25M and \$35M and references the ORS architecture Guide Book. The Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) Architecture Guidebook, 14 December 2009, page 2, section 1.2, Goals and Objectives, states, "The end state cost goals per mission are \$60 million allocating \$40 million for the space vehicle and \$20 million for launch. These values are in 2007 dollars and are intended to reflect recurring costs." A search of the RFP sections A-M and the SOWs failed to turn up any other reference to the year of the dollars to be used in estimating cost/prices in this solicitation. There is a recommendation to use an annual inflation rate of 3% for labor costs. What year dollars should be used in responding to this solicitation? Suggestion/Recommendation: Use then-year dollars throughout unless it is more important to the government to maintain traceability to the estimates in the Architecture Guidebook.</p>	<p>Dollars should be proposed in "Then Year" which is consistent with the \$25M and \$35M references.</p>
127	<p>Section M.4.(a).(1).(i).(C).1 on page 161 of the RFP identifies that commitment letters from key personnel will be part of the evaluation of the Offeror's staffing and recruitment approach. However, the requirement for providing commitment letters from proposed key personnel has been removed from section L.13(a)(1)(i)C. 1 on page 119 of the RFP. Should section M be modified to remove the letters as part of the evaluation or should section L insert the requirement for submitting the commitment letters?</p>	<p>This is an error. Key personnel resumes and commitment letters are required. This change will be made in a future RFP Amendment.</p>
128	<p>Section M.4.(a).(1).(ii).(B).1 on page 163 of the RFP identifies that commitment letters from key personnel will be part of the evaluation of the Offeror's staffing and recruitment approach. However, the requirement for providing commitment letters from proposed key personnel has been removed from section L.13(a)(1)(ii)B. 1 on page 120 of the RFP. Should section M be modified to remove the letters as part of the evaluation or should section L insert the requirement for submitting the commitment letters?</p>	<p>This is an error. Key personnel resumes and commitment letters are required. This change will be made in a future RFP Amendment.</p>
129	<p>Section F.3 indicates the contract PoP for issuing task orders is 5 years. Is there a maximum duration for each task order? Can the PoP for a particular task order exceed the PoP of the RRSW contract?</p>	<p>TO performance periods may extend for up to one year past the end of the contract ordering period as stated in NFS 1816.505-72.</p>

Item	Question	Government Response
130	<p>Section H.13(b) states, "Contractors will not be responsible for the final development or issuance of statements of work."</p> <p>Section H.13(d) states, "If the Contractor (and team, if applicable), under the terms of this contract, or through the performance of tasks pursuant to this contract, is required to develop specifications or statements of work to be incorporated into a future competitive task order or solicitation, the Contractor shall be ineligible to perform the work described in that solicitation as a prime or subcontractor under an ensuing contract or task order."</p> <p>Will the Government remove the phrase "or statements of work" from H.13 (d)?</p>	Comment noted. RFP will not be changed.
131	Are there future plans for the RRSW contractor to bid on the Basic Contract SOW?	No.
132	Standup and Operate Task Order. What is the anticipated start date for this task order?	The standard lead time is 180 days from proposal receipt.
133	Standup and Operate Task Order. The SOW for this task order has Draft written on it. When will the final SOW be released?	That watermark will be removed in a future RFP Amendment.
134	Standup and Operate Task Order. Pricing for this task order requires the same level of pricing detail for all subcontractors and inter-organizational transfers. Would the Government consider requiring only major subcontractors and major inter-organizational transfers provide the same level of detail pricing as the prime contractor?	Yes, only major subcontractors and major interorganizational transfers should provide the same level of pricing detail. However, the Government reserves the right to request additional details at any time.
135	Section J.1(a) Attachment 1, para 3.1.1.1, Section J.1(a) Attachment 2, para 3.1.1.1. How low a level will the Government like to see trade study report?	Note: Section J.1(a) Attachment 1, para 3.1.1.1 does not exist. The level of detail for a Trade Study Report will depend upon the information & specifics required by each trade study.
136	Section J.1(a) Attachment 1, para 3.1.2-3.1.3; Section J.1(a) Attachment 2, para 3.1.2-3.1.3 Is there an existing template for the SEMP and the RMP, or will the contractor develop their own?	The contractor will develop their own SEMP and RMP.
137	Section J.1(a) Attachment 1, para 3.1.4; Section J.1(a) Attachment 2, para 3.1.4 If the contractor supports the development of the mission assurance plan, who has primary responsibility for it?	The Government will be the primary controller of the Mission Assurance Plan.
138	Section J.1(a) Attachment 1, para 3.1.5; Section J.1(a) Attachment 2, para 3.1.5 Will there be a prescribed toolset for the configuration control function, or will the contractor define their own toolset/system?	Note: The requirement for configuration control function is actually found in Section J.1(a) Attachment 2, para 3.1.6. Contractors shall propose their own toolset/system, but the Government will control the function.
139	Section J.1(a) Attachment 1, para 3.2.2; Section J.1(a) Attachment 2, para 3.2.2 Do the RRSW responsibilities end with the completion of early on-orbit ops?	No, the RRSW responsibilities do not end with the completion of early on-orbit ops. The RRSW contractor still has responsibilities for anomaly resolution and support which occur while a space vehicle is operational.
140	Section J.1(a) Attachment 1, para 3.2.4; Section J.1(a) Attachment 2, para 3.2.4 What are the primary distinctions between the launch-on-demand and launch-on-schedule scenarios, particularly as pertains to planning and ops?	Launch-on-schedule is the steady state operations for RRSW. Launch-on-demand is the expected surge capability.

Item	Question	Government Response
141	Section J.1(a) Attachment 1, para 3.2.7; Section J.1(a) Attachment 2, para 3.2.7 What is the scope of the support tasks for wargame planning and analysis? Will this involve simulation development?	This support could include support of multiple wargames per year providing simulation of ORS mission kit capabilities. Yes, it will involve simulation development.
142	Section J.1(a) Attachment 1, para 3.3.6; Section J.1(a) Attachment 2, para 3.3.6 What is meant by “simulation training capability”? Suggest the word “simulation” be deleted from the first reference.	"Simulation" will not be deleted from the reference. Simulation training capability includes hands-on hardware & software training which will follow test & evaluation best practices/procedures.
143	Section J.1(a) Attachment 1, para 5.2 What are the specific documents or DRLs that the contractor is required to deliver?	There are no deliverables against the Basic SOW. Note: Each TO will identify specific DRLs required for that TO.
144	Section J.1(a) Attachment 2, para 5.2 Why is there no deliverable for the ILS Plan? Suggest creating a specific report for the ILS Plan.	The Government's intent is to have a future TO which will include a requirement for an ILS Plan.
145	Section L.10(b) Would the Government consider revising the font restriction to a text size no smaller than Arial 9 point for detailed graphics?	No. The RFP states standard Government requirements regarding font size.
146	Section L.12; Section M.5 In L.12, the final RFP proposal preparation instructions for RRSW include the statement, “Proposals shall be submitted in a format that follows the format of the factors and their subfactors.” In L.12(a)(1)(i)A., the instructions state, “The Offeror’s proposal shall contain the information in the elements listed below and be organized in a similar outline.” M.5 provides a table that identifies the elements of each mission suitability subfactor. Does “...format that follows the format of...” and “...organized in a similar outline...” imply the Section L.12 subfactor elements (each of which includes a numbered or lettered list of supporting detail) must be addressed in the order shown within the respective numbered and lettered lists?	Yes.
147	Section L.12(a)(1)(i)A.1.i; Section L.12(a)(1)(iii)A.1.(e) Should the requirement in L.12(a)(1)(i)A.1. Management Structure and Authorities, para i and L.12 (a)(1)(ii) A.1. Management Structure and Authorities, para e be the same? If so, which should be the same as which?	No, the paragraphs should not be the same. It is the Governments intent to have contractors describe their management approach in the Basic SOW while we are looking for specifics in the Task Orders.
148	Section L.12(a)(1)(i)A.1.e Quote: “Explain proposed approach to identifying and managing Mission Assurance requirements for operational satellites within ORS constraints.” Which constraints are ORS referring to? Does it refer generally to direction from ORS, or are they the constraints referred to in the SOWs and TOs?	The constraints are generally referring to the ORS mission, vision, requirements, and CONOPs, as identified in the ORS Architecture Guidebook.
149	Section L.12(b)(9)(iv)A-I Must the contractor provide “Other Information” (i.e., info about predecessor companies, awards and certs, and date of most recent reviews, etc.) within each referenced contract from the same company? Is it permissible to provide the information one time for a given company instead of repeating the information in the description of another contract from the same company?	The information shall be provided for each relevant contract identified. If the contract is repeated as a relevant contract, then the information shall be repeated.

Item	Question	Government Response
150	Section M.2.b.(2) Quote from last phrase in "Very High Level of Confidence" field in table: "One or more significant strengths exist. No significant weaknesses exist." Not that we had any specified weaknesses in the past, but this seems a bit double jeopardy in the sense that what if a company had identified weaknesses in the performance of a past contract, but then has since rectified them, learning from past mistakes? Will the Government penalize that company for the past deficiencies although they may have mitigated them to date?	Past Performance will be evaluated under the Past Performance volume, while strengths and weaknesses are given under the evaluation of the Mission Suitability volume.
151	Section M.3.(a).(1).(i).A.1.a Quote: "How innovative, efficient, and effective is the Offeror's proposed management structure, functions, and authority system for the work to be performed under the SOW, as well as, the structural connections or associations of the entities responsible for this work with any corporate or division organizations, particularly with MSV contract awardees?" Statement is not clear: How can we comment on our interaction with MSV contract awardees if (a) the contract has not yet been awarded, and (b) we are not allowed to have the same Prime for both contracts (and maybe not have major subcontractors that can perform the work framed in RRSW)? Are we to propose a notional concept of collaboration with a notional MSV awardee? Clarification? Same comment concerning other TOs.	Yes we understand that the MSV contract awardees are not yet selected or known and that contractor proposals will include notional concepts in this area.
152	Section M for TO3 is missing. When will it be supplied?	Yes, in a future amendment.
153	What is the anticipated ATP for the ORS MSV Bus Task Order? What is the anticipated ATP for the ORS MSV Payload Task Order?	At contract award
154	As related to the cost volume, what is the definition of contract year?	A contract year is one year beginning on the date of contract award. Therefore, if the contract began on June 1, 2010, completion of the first year would occur on May 31, 2011.
155	The last sentence of DRL 002 for both RRSW and MSV says: "Variances <u>under and exceeding 10 percent</u> shall be explained. " If it says "under and exceeding", then we will be obligated to explain EVERY variance. Is this what you really want?	Yes

Item	Question	Government Response
156	<p>The agency's issuance of Amendment 02 dated 3/11/2010, made unclear the hierarchy of requirements. Of significant note is the updated MSV Section L which states on page 126 under MSV Bus technical plan: "The Offerer's proposal shall demonstrate an understanding of the problem, <u>comply with the objectives of the program stated in the ORS Architecture Guidebook, T2E Government Reference Document</u>, and offer a sound approach." The "Tier-2 Enabler (T2E) Mission Government Reference Document 04 March 2010" describes a system that is not in conformance with the Architecture Guidebook, ISET GBS, and PDG. Examples are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peak Payload power 1200W versus 700W; • Multiple SPA-S interfaces ganged for power to the payload versus a single 25A circuit; • The GBS in section 5.4 states, "The SB shall support removal and installation of the battery at any time prior to LV fairing encapsulation without disassembly of primary structure." In contrast, the T2E provides diagrams indicating that the batteries are mounted internal to the Bus. These requirements are inconsistent. • Architecture Guidebook states 450Kg for SV. In contrast, the T2E states 400Kg. 	<p>The "Tier-2 Enabler (T2E) Mission Government Reference Document 04 March 2010" takes precedence over all other guidebooks for the enabler mission.</p>
157	<p>What is the order of precedence among RFP documents for the different Task Orders? Recommend that the order of precedence be clearly stated in each Task Order.</p>	<p>The precedence is following the the Tier-2 Enabler (T2E) Mission Government Reference Document which was derived from the other reference documents in no prioritized order.</p>
158	<p>It appears the Government has already accepted deviations to the ISET Specs. Please define all deviations the Government has already accepted.</p>	<p>These are trades that will be evaluated.</p>
159	<p>For what other areas of the ISET specs has the Government discussed deviations with potential offerors and either not accepted them, or otherwise indicated the Government's preference is to remain consistent with the ISET Specs?</p>	<p>We are looking for the contractor to provide the best solution that best conforms to the standard recognizing that trades are possible and will need to be justified.</p>
160	<p>Will proposed Bus architectures be evaluated against the ISET Specs or the Government Baseline in the Tier-2 Enabler (T2E) Mission Government Reference Document? If both, then which will take precedence in the event of a conflict?</p>	<p>The "Tier-2 Enabler (T2E) Mission Government Reference Document 04 March 2010" takes precedence over all other guidebooks for the enabler mission.</p>
161	<p>The Bus Task Order does not explicitly state the Electrical and Mechanical ground support deliverables. The ISET GBS states in Section 6.4.1 that "[a] standard set of EGSE shall be provided at the SVIF for ground processing of the SB" and further states "[s]pecific details of the interface are to be provided by the Joint ORS Office". It is not clear what Electrical Ground Support Equipment is required at the RRSW and launch range. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Propose EGSE necessary to develop the bus. RRSW will provide the range EGSE.</p>
162	<p>Is there a preferred AI&T ground system (defined interface) architecture that the Government is expecting at the RRSW? Please provide clarity on the EGSE deliverable requirements and AI&T ground system interfaces.</p>	<p>No there is not a preferred AI&T ground system. The RRSW will make it compatible with Mission Service Interface.</p>

Item	Question	Government Response
163	The Tier 2E document in section 4.1.8 (Assembly, Integration, and Test) states an envisioned FLATSAT (Figure 4-12) architecture. Further, this section states "A delivered test station supporting the Rapid Response Test Environment should" a) provide test control, power and data interfaces, b) support any combination of actual Hardware, software and/or simulations, depending on the test need, c) support Subsystem to SV I&T level and d) Ops testing and training support. Therefore the T2E document is implying that a FLATSAT is a deliverable and that it must have this functionality. The Bus Task Order does not explicitly state that a FLATSAT is a deliverable. Please clarify if a FLATSAT is a deliverable under the Bus Task Order.	Accommodations to train the RRSW rapid AI&T team is a deliverable.
164	The Tier 2E document lists a number of reference documents which have been provided to offerors, with the exception of the "ORS Satellite Structures.doc". Will this document be made available to all offerors?	The "ORS Satellite Structures.doc is the " Development of a Satellite Structural Architecture for Operationally Responsive Space" was made available in Amendment 1.
165	Section M for SARSat Payload T Order is missing. When will it be supplied? The ability to respond to the RFP as it pertains to the SARSat Payload Task will be impacted day for day if this is not provided by 3/24/2010.	Section L for the T2E Mission Payload was provided in Amendment 2. Section M is just providing you information on how we will evaluate what you provide us from your response to section L. Section M will be provided in a future amendment.
166	"For teams consisting of a prime contractor, a 1st tier subcontractor and several 2nd tier subcontractors, is each subcontractor (both 1st and 2nd tier) that falls within the definition of a "major subcontractor" required to submit a past performance citation? "	Yes major subcontractors must submit past performance.
167	Section G.2 – Does the government intend to reimburse fee based on the direct and indirect Cost(s) incurred each month multiplied by the actual fee percentage or does the government intended to pre-determine the amount of fee to be reimbursed each month, independent of the direct and indirect costs incurred?	Based upon percentage of work completed as stated in Clause G.2.
168	H.3 Competition For Task Orders, in summary, says that Task Orders will be competitive, based on evaluation on an individual basis in accordance with criteria stated in the Task Order RFP. Does the government intended to award the task orders based on the proposals submitted with the initial IDIQ proposal, or does the government contemplate issuing additional Task Order RFP's to the awarded IDIQ contractors?	Yes
169	Section L.11(b) – Specifics a 12pt Arial font requirement for written pages. The Arial font family requires more space to per character then other fonts of the same size (as demonstrated below). Do to the page limitations in both the Management and Technical sections, imposing a font as large as Arial could cause vital information to be left out because of space limitations. Industry requests relief from this font requirement to ensure the Government receives as much vital information as possible with-in the page limitation. Industry recommends at a minimum that Calibri font be substituted for the Arial font.	No

Item	Question	Government Response
170	Section L.11(b) – Specifics a 10pt Arial font requirement for Diagrams, Charts, Tables, and Photographs. The Arial font family requires more space to per character than other fonts of the same size (as demonstrated below). Do to the page limitations in both the Management and Technical sections, imposing a font as large as Arial could cause vital information to be left out because of space limitations. Industry requests relief from this font requirement to ensure the Government receives as much vital information as possible with-in the page limitation. Industry requests that the minimum font size for these types of figures to be reduced to 6pts.	No
171	Section M for TO3 is missing. When does the Government expect to release it?	Yes, in a future amendment.
172	Can we expect to have answers to questions submitted since the release of the solicitation before the due date of the proposal?	The Q&As will be posted in a future amendment.
173	As related to the cost volume, what is the definition of contract year?	A contract year is one year beginning on the date of contract award. Therefore, if the contract began on June 1, 2010, completion of the first year would occur on May 31, 2011.
174	What is the anticipated ATP for the ORS MSV Bus and Payload Task Orders? This impacts long lead procurement schedules and therefore has potential to impact pricing.	At contract award