

RAPID III FINAL RFP NNG10207304R QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Topic Area	Quest #	RIII Doc	Sect.	Page	Question - Issue	GSFC Response
4.3	1	SOW	Sec. 4.3.4		<p>It is understood that the basic proposal has in charge the Core System Engineering ( 4.3.2), the core Spacecraft Implementation and Verification (4.3.4 ...4.3.4.1) while the Observatory Integration and Testing is an optional activity ( see 4.3.4.4. ) to be implemented to the extent defined in the DO to be provided by the governmental Customer at a later stage.</p> <p>If the above interpretation is correct, is there a milestone for the completion of the Core Spacecraft activity?</p> <p>In the list of reviews (4.3.1.4.2) there is no a “Core Spacecraft Acceptance Review”, can it be associated with the IIRR?</p>	<p>This interpretation is not correct.</p> <p>Observatory I&amp;T is <b>not</b> optional. The offeror shall provide the spacecraft inclusive of <b>all</b> work described in SOW, Section 4.0. Although it is true that each mission specific delivery order will identify specific spacecraft and observatory I&amp;T requirements they are considered a modification on the baseline offered under the contract.</p> <p>The IIRR serves the purpose of the milestone for completion of the Core Spacecraft activity. However it is not an acceptance review in terms of a buy off of the systems. The Spacecraft acceptance is done at the observatory level after successful on-orbit checkout and completion of the Observatory Acceptance Review (OAR). (See SOW, Section 4.3.1.4.2 and Section 4.3.7.3.)</p>
	2	SOW	Sec, 4.1		<p>“The effort to integrate one or more payload instrument(s) with the mission specific core spacecraft and qualify the combined payload instrument(s) and mission specific core spacecraft in accordance with the DO” is inside the Standard Services definition (4.1); these do not seem to include the System Engineering level activity to produce the Observatory design and test requirement.</p> <p>If this interpretation is correct, it is assumed that the Observatory Test requirement and Test Plan will be eventually quoted by the contractor, after the DO has been received by the governmental Customer at a later stage.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>	<p>This interpretation is not correct.</p> <p>A significant amount of engineering, including design, performance capability and testing, should be included in the core spacecraft offering based on the heritage design. The offeror should define, in their proposal, the baseline capability of the offered spacecraft and a verification plan that is in compliance with the MAR requirements.</p> <p>The delivery order for a specific mission may include modified requirements for design and test. The engineering associated with these mission specific modifications will be identified and priced in the contractor’s response to the RFO for the DO.</p> <p>In addition, see answer to question 1.</p>
SDMS	3	SOW	Sec. 4.3.6.3		<p>It seems that the SDMS and SDMS maintenance are part of the standard services to be offered in this answer to the RAPID III RFP. It is understood that the contractor shall commit to maintain the SDMS in his facility.</p> <p>Please confirm</p>	<p>Yes, you are correct on both assumptions.</p>

RAPID III FINAL RFP NNG10207304R QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Topic Area	Quest #	RIII Doc	Sect.	Page	Question - Issue	GSFC Response
Non Standard Services	4	SOW	Sec. 4.2		<p>It seems that all NON Standard Services are not to be quoted in this answer to the RAPID III RFP but in a later stage when the specific DO is available</p> <p>Please confirm</p>	<p>Yes, you are correct. In accordance with Clause B.1 of the RFP, contract line items number 4 and 5 for Non-Standard Services, offerors shall not propose prices for the Master Contract.</p>
Observatory I&T	5	SOW	Sec. 4.3.4.4		<p>To the extent defined in the mission specific DO, the Contractor shall plan and conduct integration of the Core Spacecraft and payload instrument(s) to form an Observatory. The Contractor shall plan, manage, and execute Observatory level interface verification, system test, environmental test, and support mission payload specific tests as defined in the DO.</p> <p>Should the contractor assume a reference standard P/L for the definition of system test and required facilities? Should this approach also be applicable for the relevant quotation?</p>	<p>As indicated in the answers to Questions 1 &amp; 2, the contractor shall include in their offering a baseline level of verification, environmental testing, and payload specific tests that meets the requirements of the MAR and are described in their proposal.</p> <p>Yes, the contractor shall assume a reference standard instrument-payload is included in their observatory when defining their test and required facilities. These should be described in the offeror's proposal and included in the price.</p>
Test as you Fly	6	MAR	RSDO-GR-1.09		<p>Spacecraft/Observatory level testing shall follow a, "Test as You Fly (TYF) - Fly as You Test" approach, throughout all applicable lifecycles.</p> <p>The applicability of the requirement is understood as a common general test approach methodology for the definition of the configuration of the items under test.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p>	<p>The answer to your questions depends on your definition of "configuration." Configuration should include the test articles, the test environment, the test conditions, nominal and off-nominal conditions reasonably expected during launch and on-orbit operations. (Reference GSFC-STD-1000, Rev E, rule 1.09 for further clarification.)</p>

RAPID III FINAL RFP NNG10207304R QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Topic Area	Quest #	RIII Doc	Sect.	Page	Question - Issue	GSFC Response
Power capacity Full Sun	7	CDRL 1 Encl. 1	ID 1.2.2.2		Is this quantity the power available at Power Supply Electronics (PSE) output?	CDRL 1, Enclosure 1, is not intended to be a list of requirements, but is a format for offerors to provide the performance characteristics of the baseline spacecraft offered under the contract.  Yes, it is the quantity of power available at the output of the power supply electronics. The offeror should define performance characteristics in terms of their unique design and describe how the performance is achieved.
Total Impulse Capability	8	CDRL 1 Encl. 1	ID 1.2.3.6		Is it referring to Total Impulse = N*s or to Specific Impulse = m/sec?	It refers to Specific Impulse (m/sec).
P/L Error Sensor Signal	9	CDRL 1 Encl. 1	ID 1.2.4.3		Is Control System Capable of Accepting P/L Error Sensor Signal?  Please clarify: what P/L Error Sensor Signal are referred to?	P/L Error Sensor Signal is only applicable if the offered spacecraft has this capability.  This data would only be filled in if your offered spacecraft has such a capability.
Subsystem Details	10				The Core Spacecraft we will propose provides some configurable elements.  Is it preferred to provide a single and complete table for any Platform option or that we indicate the optional inside the same core spacecraft table?	Offered options should be described separate from the core spacecraft.  For spacecraft options being offered refer to the RFP, Section L.22.2.(d) Appendix D (see pages 87-88 of the Final RFP).
PSE Power Switching Module	11	CDRL 1 Encl. 1 Part 2	ID 2.2.2		It is not clear the kind of switching module: is it a SA regulator, or power distribution lines switches?	(See response to Question 7.) The design is as proposed by the offeror. The component list described in CDRL 1, Enclosure 1, Part 2, is for example. The elements of your offered system may be different.
Heritage	12	RFP	Sections B-L		“The offeror shall construe the term “heritage” to mean a spacecraft design that has a successful flight history. Successful flight history is defined as having successfully completed on orbit checkout.”  Does spacecraft design mean the S/C core architecture and interfaces or each single equipment and S/W components?	The heritage spacecraft refers to a complete spacecraft design that has successfully flown.

RAPID III FINAL RFP NNG10207304R QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Topic Area	Quest #	RIII Doc	Sect.	Page	Question - Issue	GSFC Response
Flight Heritage	13				Is the Flight heritage required for the options?  How should options be considered qualified but not still flown?	The description of each option shall include the basis for performance claims, either through analysis or demonstrated flight history.  (See RFP, Section L.22.2.(d) Appendix D (pages 87-88 of the Final RFP).
Additional Information to be furnished	14		Sec. L 21(c)(2)		Contract Administration  Info for government audit agency are required also from non US companies or is this point not applicable?	It is not applicable.
Additional Information to be furnished	15		Sec. L 21(c)(4)		4) Tax Identification Number  Is this point applicable to non-US companies	It is not applicable.
Additional Information to be furnished	16		Sec. L 21(c)(5)		Other information to be provided  Is this point applicable to non-US companies?	This is applicable for all offerors.
Offer Volume	17		Sec. L 21 (d)		(d) Delivery Order Information  We understand that delivery order information are not required at this stage.  Please confirm.	Delivery order information is not required. (See response to Question 25.)
Table B.1	18	RFP	Section L23 (b)(1)		We understand that the Table of Sez. B1 – Supplies and/or services to be provided, includes the rules about Price for all typologies of core spacecraft and options, but we are not obliged to provide all.  Please Confirm  What is exactly meant with “not separately priced”	(We assume that all typologies of core spacecraft and options refers to all possible combinations.) You are not obliged to provide prices for all possible core spacecraft combinations.  All items identified as “not separately priced” are to be included in the NTE price of each core spacecraft in line Item 1.  Any proposed options should be priced in line Item 2.
Non-Standard Services	19	RFP	Section L23 (b)(2)		We understand that to provide labor rates (table included in Section B.5, RATES FOR NON STANDARD SERVICES) for each of the proposed labor categories (including hourly labor rate and the application of all appropriate indirect expenses and profit and provide the pricing methodology describing the proposed rates) to be used only in case the DO provided in a later stage should include NOT STANDARD SERVICES.	Yes.

RAPID III FINAL RFP NNG10207304R QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Topic Area	Quest #	RIII Doc	Sect.	Page	Question - Issue	GSFC Response
Evidence of ability to secure collateral	20	RFP	Section L; b-4)		<p><i>“The offeror shall provide evidence of its ability to secure collateral for Government financing of future delivery orders against the contract. In accordance with FAR Part 32, acceptable forms of security used individually or in combination include, but are not limited to:</i></p> <p><i>Irrevocable letter of credit from a federally insured financial institution;</i></p> <p><i>Bond from a surety, acceptable in accordance with FAR Part 28; or</i></p> <p><i>Guarantee of repayment from a person or corporation of demonstrated liquid net worth, connected by significant ownership to the contractor.</i></p> <p><i>The final form of security for each delivery order shall be proposed by the offeror in a form acceptable to the Contracting Officer at the time the delivery order is competed and will be specified in the resulting delivery order under the contract.</i></p> <p><i>Explain any deviations/exceptions taken with respect to the price section. Any deviations or exceptions must be supported by sufficient amplification and justification to permit evaluation.”</i></p> <p>Could you please comment on this clause:</p> <p>A. In which way the offeror shall provide evidence of its ability to secure collateral for Government financing?</p>	<p>A. FAR Part 32.202-4 identifies the acceptable forms of security. The method of providing evidence is up to the offeror.</p>

RAPID III FINAL RFP NNG10207304R QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Topic Area	Quest #	RIII Doc	Sect.	Page	Question - Issue	GSFC Response
Cont.	20 Cont				<p>B. Are the three bullet above applicable to a non-US company?</p> <p>C. If it is so what is required to be provided in the proposal to certify the “corporation of demonstrated liquid net worth, connected by significant ownership to the contractor”?</p> <p>D. Is this referring to a Parent Company Guarantee?</p> <p>E. Will it be needed to be established at the beginning of the contract?</p>	<p>B. Yes, these bullets are applicable to a non-US company.</p> <p>C. Any information that provides evidence of an offeror’s ability to secure collateral for financing of future Dos that meets the requirements of FAR 32.202-4.</p> <p>D. Not necessarily, but it could be a Parent Company if applicable to your case.</p> <p>E. Actual security would be provided in the response to an RFO for a DO.</p>
	21		Section B.1		<p>Are all requirements/clauses/documentation entirely applicable also to non-US Companies?</p> <p>Examples: - “Organizational Conflicts of Interest Avoidance Plan” provision “Small Business Subcontracting Plan” and relevant applicable laws/rules</p>	<p>No, in accordance with the specific FAR prescriptions, some clauses are not applicable. Offerors are advised to examine the FAR prescription for the specific clauses in question.</p>
Effective Ordering Period	22		F.4		<p>What is exactly meant with “the effective ordering period of this contract shall be five years from the initial RAPID III contract effective date”?</p>	<p>The effective ordering period (EOP) is 5 years starting on the date the 1<sup>st</sup> master contract is signed. All other master contract awards, including those resulting from On-Ramps, will be subject to the original EOP. Therefore all master contract awards will expire at the same time as the original master contracts.</p>

RAPID III FINAL RFP NNG10207304R QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Topic Area	Quest #	RIII Doc	Sect.	Page	Question - Issue	GSFC Response
Buy American Act, 52.225-1 & 52.225-5, Trade Agreements	23	RFP	I.41		<p><u>52.225-1 BUY AMERICAN ACT – SUPPLIES (FEB 2009)</u>                      FAR 25.403, World Trade Organization Government Procurement Agreement and Free Trade Agreements, provides that eligible products from WTO GPA and FTA countries are entitled to the non-discriminatory treatment specified in FAR 25.402(a)(1).</p> <p>Because delivery orders under the Contract are likely to exceed \$194,000, on what grounds is NASA discriminating against eligible products by including in the RFP only 52.225-1, Buy American Act – Supplies, and not 52.225-5, Trade Agreements, as well?</p>	The RFP will be amended to add Clause 52.225-5.
50 kg/50 W Min.	24		Sec. L.22 (2)(c)(6)		<p><b><u>50 kg/ 50 W Minimum Payload Capability</u></b>                      RFP Section L.22 (2)(c)(6) and Section M.3 (C)(6) include a spacecraft minimum payload mass capability of 50Kg and a minimum payload power capability of 50W.</p> <p>We request the 50Kg/50W payload capability requirement is removed from the RFP so that we are able to include a smaller platform in our Rapid III submission.</p>	<p>The Government will not be removing this requirement.</p> <p>The 50/50 capability requirement was established to ensure participation of spacecraft of a size that would be procured for NASA missions. Spacecraft submitted under Rapid III may show upgraded capability if the heritage S/C is below these limits.</p>
DO Only info	25	RFP			<p>Are we correct in assuming that for the sections in the RFP that are labeled "Applies Only at the Delivery Order Level", we don't have to respond to those in the Proposal.</p> <p>We're assuming that those are things that we'll have to address after receiving a S/C Order, but not before (e.g. now, in the Proposal)</p>	Yes. When 'Applies Only at the Delivery Order Level' is indicated, that information needs to be provided in response to an RFO for a delivery order. It is not required with proposal delivery.

RAPID III FINAL RFP NNG10207304R QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Topic Area	Quest #	RIII Doc	Sect.	Page	Question - Issue	GSFC Response
Formatting & Font instructions	26	RFP	Sec. L20(b)(2)		<p>Is it correct to assume that these formatting and font instructions only apply to the page limited portion of the proposal and not to the Appendices and Attachments? Many of the required Appendices and Attachments already exist in contractor format and complying with the above paragraph would require reformatting these documents and regenerating tables and graphics that do not meet the 10 point font requirement.</p> <p>It can also be implied from Paragraph 1.3 c) of Attachment D, Contract Data Requirements List, that customer formats would be acceptable, at least for the CDRLs.</p>	<p>Regarding the Appendices in L.20(b)(2) that are not page limited, existing Contractor documents that are provided in support of the Appendices do not have to be reformatted or regenerated.</p> <p>Yes, Paragraph I.3 c) of Attachment, Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL), refers only to CDRL items.</p>
MAR Compliance	27	RFP	L.22		<p>There appears to be a conflict between the evaluation criteria, the instructions in the DID for CDRL MA1-1 and the instructions in Section L.22. It appears the Mission Assurance Implementation Plan that is submitted with the proposal does not contain a <i>plan</i> to implement the MAR. In other words, the MAIP document that is required to be submitted with the offeror's proposal consists of three items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Rapid III MAR Compliance Matrix (Enclosure 2)</li> <li>2. MAIP Appendix A (Acronyms and Glossary)</li> <li>3. MAIP Appendix B (Applicable and Reference Documents)</li> </ol> <p>Since the MAIP does not contain an implementation plan, but rather a compliance matrix, what is the purpose of an acronym list and a list of reference documents?</p>	<p>The instructions in the DID for CDRL MA 1-1 state that this DID is mission specific and is to be delivered with a Delivery Order proposal. Therefore, it is not applicable to the proposal for the master contract award. Reference "Place/Time/Purpose of delivery" entry in CDRL MA 1-1. Also reference RFP, Attachment D, Rapid III CDRL, Section 1.2 d) that indicates "the Mission Assurance Implementation Plan (MAIP), to be supplied with the Core Proposal is defined in Section L.22 and not defined by CDRL MA 1-1 (MAIP) in the MAR."</p> <p>For the purposes of this contract proposal, we limited the requested information to the items listed in Section L.22, Appendix C, MAIP.</p> <p>The MAIP does require implementation plans to be supplied in the Compliance Matrix in those cases where the heritage system would not have been in compliance with the MAR.</p> <p>The acronym list is required to be supplied by offerors to clarify terminology utilized in responding to Appendix C. The list of reference documents is required to be supplied by offerors to identify documents that contractors reference in their response to Appendix C.</p>

RAPID III FINAL RFP NNG10207304R QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Topic Area	Quest #	RIII Doc	Sect.	Page	Question - Issue	GSFC Response
MAR Compliance	28	RFP	L.22		Since the MAIP does not contain an implementation plan, how will the government evaluate the offeror's ability to achieve full compliance with all requirements in the MAR?	The offeror's ability to achieve full compliance with the requirements in the MAR will be evaluated on the basis of their response in the Compliance Matrix.
MAR Compliance	29	RFP	L.22		Also how will MAIP appendices A&B be evaluated for adequacy and completeness since these Appendices consist of an acronym list and list of reference documents.	MAIP Appendices A & B will be evaluated for adequacy and completeness with respect to the references the offeror makes in their compliance matrix.