

NNA11392004R  
Question and Answer Set 1  
August 15, 2011

1. Statement of Work dated July 25, 2011 (SOW), Page 14, Section 6.0; Detailed Heat Shield Implementation Plan. Can NASA provide an example of an Implementation Plan?

Answer: No, we can't show any DHIPs provided by previous vendors because they are proprietary. NASA has never come up with our own version for our own materials. The plan should address the questions/issues stated in the RFP. Essentially starting from the beginning describe how a heatshield would be made, what equipment is required, approximate costs for procurements, testing. Describe what is required to manufacture a demo unit all the way to a qualified flight unit. Once we make awards we will work with the vendors and provide feedback to improve their deliverable prior to final submission.

2. SOW, Page 4, Section 1.2, Task 5, there is an units disconnect in the document for the chop molded test coupons are stated as ~30 cm (1 ft) thick and 350 cm (11.5 ft) diameter. The drawing on page 11 shows the coupons to be 5 in (12.7 cm) thick by 12 in (30.5 cm) diameter.

Answer: We wish for the article to be 30.5cm diameter and 12.7cm thick.

3. SOW, Page 6, Hardware Requirements List, CMCP Nose Billet Delivery date is no later than December 15, 2011 and page 11 has the date as November 30, 11 in the table. Clarify which date is correct?

Answer: The correct delivery date is December 15th, 2011. The Statement of Work will be updated.

4. Due to the "Bidders Library CD not being available with the RFP, will the proposal due date be extended?"

Answer: No, the proposal due date will not be extended.

5. The schedule for this project, as provided by the NASA Statement of work, is very fast paced with a short duration of only 3.5 months. And yet it does not seem that there is any planned follow-on effort, or any established mission needing immediate project results. That the project is fast and short will likely drive costs for bidders. Normal lead times for materials, supplies, tooling and facilitization for producing composite hardware such as the CMCP panels conflict with a delivery at 3.5 months after award. Would NASA be willing to share the reasoning why

the defined project is fast and short, and would NASA be able to accept a longer duration project of about six months.

Answer: The majority of the proposal is a paper study. With no planned follow on effort. This is to help define future programs.

6. There is no information regarding target funding limits and target period of performance.

Answer: Offerors will propose a price for each CLIN in the RFP. Period of performance is clearly stated in the SOW.

7. Are new materials acceptable as substitutes for the historical materials.

Answer: We are willing to consider new materials, of course, but we also have a need to process “heritage” material and thus need some explanation of how those requirements would be met as well.

8. Solicitation Page 2 and 7; Statement of Work, Appendix A: Is the Carbon Phenolic Specification Review to be priced in the base program or as an option?

Answer: Price the Spec review in the base program.

9. Will NASA consider a proposal that addresses only high performance materials/architecture alternates to heritage Carbon Phenolic?

Answer: The proposal must also discuss heritage CP.