International Space Station (ISS) Commercial Resupply Services 2 (CRS2) Draft Request for Proposal (DRFP) NNJ14507542R Questions and Answers Posting #1

1. Q. In order to better leverage the services that NASA is procuring, as well as to further utilize space station as a launch pad for commercial low-earth orbit, I wonder if the ability of NASA to have the cargo ships be directed to any existing commercial platforms in similar orbit and inclination, on a per needed basis, where possible post ISS delivery, could be included as part of the eventual SOW? This would, for no additional funding, position the NASA ISS services as supporting both the current Program and any eventual follow-on. Most useful for raising funds from the commercial sector for a commercial platform. Thanks for your consideration.

   A. NASA will evaluate the suggestion.

2. Q. In order to better leverage the services that NASA is procuring, I wonder if small business set-asides could be required for the winner(s) to fund commercial ventures focused on low-earth orbit utilization?

   A. NASA will evaluate the suggestion.

3. Q. The subject synopsis dated June 16, 2014 requested that prospective bidders submit notification of their intent to submit proposals to your office. The synopsis and DRFP do not appear to include a date for when you need this information. Can you please clarify the date by which this notification of intent to bid is desired?

   A. There is not a hard due date for the letter to be submitted. Submission of a letter of intent is not a requirement for an offeror to be able to propose to the Request for Proposal (RFP). Early notice is appreciated.

4. Q. Similar to the CRS1 contract award, will NASA satisfy the minimum order quantity with the initial Task Order award?

   A. Yes, NASA intends to satisfy the minimum order quantity with the initial Task Order award.

5. Q. Paragraph (a) refers to Clause II.A.19 NASA INSIGHT AND APPROVAL, which does not make a reference to FAR 52.246-4 – Inspection of Services – Fixed Price. Is this an oversight?
   A. The reference in Paragraph (a) for the location of the FAR 52.246-4 should have been to FAR 52.252-2 Clauses Incorporated by Reference, which is Clause II.A.31 in the DRFP.

6. Q. Clause II, paragraph (a) refers to Clause II.A.37. We are unable to locate Clause II.A.37 in the Draft RFP Terms and Conditions. Please provide the content of this clause.
   A. The reference for the location of the Changes clause should be to Clause II.A.31 which is FAR 52.252-2 Clauses Incorporated by Reference.

7. Q. Clause II, paragraph (i) Payment (1) Items Accepted, states that "payment shall be made for items accepted by the Government that have been delivered to the delivery destinations set forth in this contract". Likewise, Page 13, Clause II.A.1.2 states that "interim payments are contract financing payments that are not payment for accepted items". Please clarify what items are being accepted by NASA.
   A. An "accepted item", as referred to in Clause II.A.1 is the completion of Cargo Resupply Service missions. As the individual milestones are not completion of a mission, they are considered interim payments.

8. Q. For Clause II, paragraph (j) Risk of Loss, please clarify the Risk of Loss as it relates to "supplies" being provided under the contract (i.e. what supplies are provided to NASA, and when is the Contractor relieved of risk of loss or damage?).
   A. There are no supplies being provided to the government under this contract. Supplies in paragraph (j) is not referencing the "cargo" to be delivered to, returned, or disposed of, from the ISS under this contract.

9. Q. For Clause II, paragraph (n) Title, please specify which items, if any, under the contract will be furnished to NASA.
   A. NASA does not intend to claim Title to any items under CRS2. Paragraph (n) will be deleted to clarify this.

10. Q. Clause II.A.1.2, Paragraph 1.2 states that "These interim payments are contract financing payments that are not payment for accepted items." Please clarify which milestone payments in Tables II.A.1-1 and 1-2 are "interim payments".
    A. Mission Level Milestone Payments #2-7 in Table II.A.1-1 are interim payments. All Integration Certification Milestone payments in Table II.A.1-2 are interim payments.

11. Q. Clause II.A.4, in order to obtain a launch license, the contractor must obtain cross-waiver agreements from all users and customers at every tier (reference NFS 1852.228-76), which includes NASA's payloads that are stowed as cargo inside the cargo transport bags. Since the contractors do not have insight into what is stowed inside the cargo transport bags, NASA must provide the contractor with specific payload information and additional data so that the contractor can submit a request for a waiver to the cross-waiver requirement. Please confirm that NASA will provide the contractor with the necessary data no later than L-3 months so the contractor can comply with the FAA processing timeline requirements.
    A. Yes, NASA intends to provide the contractor with the necessary data per an agreed to timeline for the contractor to comply with the FAA requirements.

12. Q. Clause II.A.7, please clarify the implementation of this clause as it appears financing payments are already specified in Clause II.A.1, Table II.A.1-1: Mission Payment Schedule.
    A. Clause II.A.1 alone does not fully implement all requirements of FAR 52.232-29. FAR 52.232-29 provides additional restrictions on the financing payments. (ex. (f) Limitation on frequency of financing payments. Contractor financing payments shall be provided no more frequently than monthly.)

13. Q. Clause II.A.7 paragraph (b) Special terms regarding termination for cause, when are the interim contract financing payments liquidated?
    A. If a termination for cause were warranted contract financing payments would cease at the point of the termination for cause. The specific facts of the incident would determine the specific resolution of when and how interim contract financing payments would be liquidated.

14. Q. Clause II.A.10 paragraph (a), is there a conflict in the end date of the ordering period of December 31, 2024 with Clause II.A.12 INDEFINITE QUANTITY, paragraph (d), which states that "the contractor shall not be required to make any deliveries under this contract after December 31, 2024"?
    A. There is no conflict with the two dates. NASA would not order any services that could not be delivered prior to the December 31, 2024 date.

15. Q. Clause I.A.3, contractor requests that it be allowed to propose more than 4 standard mission types to give NASA greater variety in selecting what mission types they elect to place on contract. Update RFP at end of Section I.A.3 to add "Sub-CLIN 0001N Standard Mission N - Offerors allowed to propose additional mission options beyond the 4 shown above." Change RFP text under Table I.A.3-1 from "...within their 4 standard missions" to "... within their standard missions". This requirement shows up in multiple sections of the Draft RFP (e.g. VI.A.22. Price Proposal Instructions).
    A. The limit of 4 standard mission types was driven by the desire to minimize offeror price by having standard vehicles that could be produced repeatedly and the need to be able to perform a comparative pricing evaluation for various services. NASA feels that the offeror can adequately provide options for the services requested in 4 standard mission types.

16. Q. Table I.A.3-1, the minimum requirements listed in the Draft RFP for return cargo per mission are significant increases over what has been historically carried on the current CRS1 return vehicle missions. Contractor requests that NASA change the 2500kg minimum pressurized return per mission requirement to 1200 kg minimum pressurized return per mission. This requirement appears in multiple areas in the Draft RFP (e.g. Table I.A.3-1, STATEMENT OF WORK Section 2.2, etc).
    A. The CRS2 requirements are an increase from the CRS1 requirements. A reduction to 1200kg is not sufficient to meet the program needs.

17. Q. Table I.A.3-1, there are three line items in the Table that refer to a "24 hour scrub turnaround" time; however this requirement does not appear anywhere else in the text of the Draft RFP. Please delete the words "and 24 hour scrub turnaround" in these three line items to be consistent with the LAUNCH SCRUB TURNAROUND requirements in Section 2.9.1.3.3 in the STATEMENT OF WORK.
    A. The RFP will be clarified to correct the scrub turn around language.

18. Q. II.A.25 paragraph (a) states that "the Contractor shall optimize the use of TDRSS and limit the Single Access (SA) to critical operations such as system check-out, critical maneuvers, and proximity rendezvous operations. Will contractors need to operate portions of the mission in TDRSS S-Band MA mode? Is this restriction meant to restrict just S-band SA (SSA)?
    A. NASA is not dictating that the contractor use MA (Multiple Access) vs SA. Whether MA or SA is used, appropriate SSP 50808 requirements apply. If using SA, the contractor is limited to using it only for the critical operations listed. There are no limitations on when MA can be used. The RFP will be clarified.

19. Q. For SOW 2.0.6, update RFP to confirm that NASA will provide all required RF frequency licenses for contractor use of NASA required C2V2 communication system (including C2V2 hardware provided by contractor).
    A. NASA does not intend to provide the licenses for contractor hardware. There are two parts for Frequency Licensee approval by the Federal Communications Commission and National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA). Part one is frequency selection and there is no action for the offeror as NASA has already selected the frequency and states the frequencies in the applicable references in SSP 50808. However, for the second part, the contractor will have to meet the NTIA requirements for their visiting vehicle communication system (radio, antenna, etc).

20. Q. SOW 4.1 Formal Reviews, is a draft submission of the presentation material acceptable one week prior to the Review with the final version provided at the Review?
    A. No, as stated in the RFP, "the contractor shall submit a final electronic copy of the presentation materials to NASA at least one (1) week before the review is held." NASA requires a final delivery so the presentation materials can be reviewed by technical experts before the review so they can pass on any questions or concerns to those personnel attending the review.

21. Q. DRD Table V.B-4 CRS 4-3, suggest changing Initial Due Date to L-4 months (from L-8 months) in order to accommodate NASA's request for cargo flexibility.
    A. NASA will evaluate this suggestion.

22. Q. DRD Table V.B-1 CRS 1-7, Table V.B-1 (page 117) indicates this plan is due with the proposal. The DRD description indicates the plan is due at Contract Award plus 30 days. What is the correct initial due date?
    A. The correct initial due date is with the proposal. DRD will be updated accordingly.

23. Q. Attachment V.I., suggest removing the following language from the definition: ""For pressurized cargo, this definition only includes systems racks and International Standard Payload Racks (ISPRs); other racks are excluded". ISPRs and systems racks are not mentioned elsewhere in the RFP nor in the associated requirements specifications.
    A. Correction will be made.

24. Q. Attachment V.I., suggest the time reference of 4 hours be reconciled with other stated RFP requirements to ensure consistency.
    A. Reference will be changed to be consistent with other stated RFP return requirements.

25. Q. VI.A.18 Proposal Preparation paragraph (iv), reference to Section VI (Evaluation) should be changed to Section VII Evaluation.
    A. Reference will be changed.

26. Q. VI.A.23 paragraph (d) 21, clarify that the consent letters are not included in the Past Performance Volume 25 page limitation.
    A. Clarification will be made to show that the letters are not included in the page limitation.

27. Q. VII.B, paragraph (b) states, “The offeror’s ability to provide a more comprehensive compliment of capabilities, such as the ability to meet the annual ISS resupply need in four (4) flights per year on the dates required by NASA..." Please define NASA's "annual ISS resupply need” and delivery dates.
    A. NASA’s annual resupply need, as defined in the industry day charts, ranges from 14,250 to 16,750 kg of pressurized upmass per year and 1,500 to 4,000 kg of unpressurized upmass per year. NASA’s delivery dates will be defined at ATP for each mission. The intent of this statement was to indicate that NASA requires flights to fly on time when dates are chosen at ATP.

28. Q. Incumbent Offerors have a clear advantage with regard to evaluation Subfactor T2 Initial ISS Integration Certification. Please describe the approaches NASA is planning to take to ensure equal evaluation between incumbents and new providers in this area.
    A. Under Subfactor T2 offerors will be evaluated based on their plans and schedule. NASA has provided information on the ISS integration requirements to ensure all offerors have a common understanding of the requirements. The inclusion of the ISS Integration milestones into CRS2 is for the benefit of any offeror who will need to integrate new or modified vehicles to the ISS to meet the requirements of the RFP.

29. Q. Is it a requirement for the first flight of the CRS2 program to be launch in 2017 or can the first launch occur later?

    A. No, the first flight of the CRS2 program is not required to be launched in 2017. However, the ISS Program does have a requirement for Cargo Resupply Missions in 2017 which must be satisfied. An offeror who is able to provide services to meet the program requirements beginning in 2017 would be more advantageous to the Government.

30. Q. Draft RFP Section VI.A.7 Invitation to Propose Financing Terms (a) states "The financing terms proposed by the offeror shall be a factor in the evaluation of the offeror's proposal." Section VII Evaluation does not describe financing terms as being one of the evaluation factors or subfactors. Please clarify the role that proposed financing terms will have in the evaluation of the proposal.
    A. Section VI.A.7 which calls out FAR clause 52.232-31 was added to allow offerors to propose the milestone payment plan with the conditions defined in section II.A.1 for the missions. Evaluation of this proposed plan is described in section VII.B paragraph M2.

31. Q. Draft RFP Section VI, page 207 (e) states "Multiple offers. Offerors are encouraged to submit multiple offers presenting alternative terms and conditions or commercial items for satisfying the requirements of this solicitation. Each offer submitted will be evaluated separately." If an Offeror elects to submit multiple offers what is NASA's preferred approach for submission relative to compliance with the Draft RFP instructions? Should an Offeror submit multiple proposals?
    A. This will be corrected. Offerors should not submit multiple proposals. Proposals with alternative terms and conditions will not be allowed per section VI.A.21 paragraph 4. Deviations and/or Exceptions. RFP will be clarified to clearly state this.

32. Q. Are any requirements listed in the draft RFP that pertain to the Past Performance Volume excluded from the 25 page count limitation? In order to comply with requirements such as environmental and safety data that require "copies of any and all…"an Offeror may not be able to also be compliant with the 25 page count limitation.
    A. Yes, section (j) and the Consent Letters will not be included in the page count limitations. This will be updated in the RFP.

33. Q. Table V.B-2 states that Integrated Schedules have an initial due date of T.O. Award + 30 days, whereas DRD CRS 2-2 states that the first submission date is to plan to be provided with proposal. Which is correct T.O. Award + 30 days, or with Proposal? If the answer is with the proposal, please clarify Integrated Schedules submission approach relative to the draft RFP instructions.
    A. DRD CRS 2-2 is to be provided at T.O. Award + 30 days. The DRD will be updated to reflect the correction.

34. Q. DRD CRS 1-7 OCI Plan states: 10. FIRST SUBMISSION DATE: Contract Award plus 30 days. Table V.B-1 states: initial due date - with proposal. Is it due with the proposal, or 30 days after the contract award? If the answer is with the proposal, please clarify OCI Plan submission approach relative to the draft RFP instructions.
    A. OCI plan is due with the proposal. The RFP DRD CRS 1-7 will be corrected and instructions will be clarified.

35. Q. SOW 2.5.1 states: Unpressurized cargo upmass shall be delivered ranging from 500 to 1500kg per flight. Table I.A.3-1 states 800 to 1500kg per flight instead. Is it 500 to 1500, or 800 to 1500?
    A. The correct range is 500 to 1500 kg. Table I.A.3-1 will be corrected.

36. Q. Draft RFP Section I.A.3 states "Offerors are required to provide 1) pressurized upmass, 2) pressurized return or pressurized disposal or both, 3) unpressurized upmass and disposal. Offerors have the option to provide accelerated pressurized return in lieu of pressurized return. Offerors can meet the required and optional capabilities by mixing them in any manner they choose within their 4 standard missions." Pease confirm that unpressurized cargo is required not on every flight but at least on one flight per year.
    A. Unpressurized cargo is not required on every flight. Unpressurized cargo may be offered by itself or mixed with pressurized cargo on the same flight.

37. Q. For our milestone planning purposes now that the proposal submission date is mid-Nov 2014, what should we use as NASA's anticipated award date? What is the earliest after award that an Offeror may expect the initial ATP be issued?
    A. NASA's anticipated award date is the end of April, 2015. ATP of an element of any Task Order awarded is intended to begin within 30 days of contract award. ATP of mission is also dependent on integration tasks and other factors.

38. Q. We respectively suggest that the Technical Appendix page limitation is such that the complex documents; the Mission Integration and Operations Management Plan and the Work Plan will require summarization to fit the page limitation such that significant meaningful content will be excluded. We recommend increasing the page limitation of the Technical Appendix from 50 to 100 pages.
    A. NASA will evaluate the suggestion.

39. Q. We respectfully suggest that the sections of the proposal which are page limited be prepared and submitted using non-compressed Times New Roman font with single-spaced 12 point body text, and that text in diagrams, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs should be non-compressed Arial font no smaller than 8 point text size to maximize readability while improving page usage efficiency. For example, allowing 8 point text in art provides greater latitude in providing effective graphical illustrations. We have significant lessons learned that show this to be an optimal approach.
    A. NASA will evaluate the suggestion.

40. Q. Is there a standard Work Breakdown Structure that NASA plans to use for this activity that Offerors should be aware of?
    A. There is not a standard Work Breakdown Structure planned.

41. Q. How will NASA take into account more capable vehicles when evaluating price? I.e. A vehicle that returns cargo versus one that disposes of cargo?
    A. The additional capabilities of a vehicle will not be evaluated in the pricing evaluation. It will be evaluated in T1. System Capabilities and Summary of Performance section. The Source Selection Authority will go by the relative order of importance of evaluation factors to weigh the price vs. benefits of proposed capability sets.

42. Q. What is the total annual upmass for pressurized cargo that will be used in the pricing evaluation?
    A. 15,000 kg. RFP will be updated to reflect this.

43. Q. Please clarify if 2017 is a goal or a requirement for CLIN 0001A? Since CLINs 0001B-D represent incremental capability, can these capabilities be bid to start in later years?
    A. The first flight of the CRS2 program is not required to be launched in 2017. However, the ISS Program does have a requirement for Cargo Resupply Missions in 2017 which must be satisfied. An offeror who is able to provide services to meet the program requirements beginning in 2017 would be more advantageous to the Government. CLINs 0001B-D are their own mission type and are not necessarily incrementally adjusted capabilities of CLIN 0001A. The capabilities of the mission types of CLINs 0001A-D must meet the contract requirements, but the lead time or availability date of any of the mission types is at the discretion of the offeror.

44. Q. Where exactly does the early access cargo hand-off occur? Will NASA personnel be in the vicinity of the Landing Site to allow early turn-over or will it be up to the Offeror to take the cargo to the NASA personnel at some other location?
A. Hand-off will be at the contractor's post landing facility as required in Attachment V.M.

45. Q. Are the 50 page appendices for Technical and Management outside of the 175 allotted for Mission Suitability making the page count total including appendices 275 pages; or is each appendix a subset of its subject section, making the page count total, including appendices, 175 pages?
A. Page counts will be clarified in the final RFP.

46. Q. The dRFP incorporates by reference NFS 1852.228-76 (OCT 2012) CROSS-WAIVER OF LIABILITY FOR INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION ACTIVITIES without modification. At paragraph (c)(4)(i) of the referenced clause claims between "the Government and its own contractors" are made exempt from the cross-waiver provisions. NASA amended the CRS1 RFP and the resulting contracts (at II.A.22) included deviations making the cross-waiver reciprocal between Government and its own contractors. A reciprocal cross-waiver for damage to ISS is required, as insurance for damage to ISS is not available in meaningful amounts. How does NASA intend to make the ISS Cross-Waiver reciprocal between the Government and its own contractors?
A. NASA anticipates modifying clause NFS 1852.228-76 to be similar to the modified version of the clause in the current CRS1 contracts.

47. Q. Would a lapse in the indemnification provisions of the CSLA, during the period when a mission is actually performed, result in a material change to contract subject to equitable price and performance adjustment?
A. No.

48. Q. Does NASA intend to be treated the same as any non-governmental customer (e.g. accept risk of loss of cargo) under the CSLA cross-waiver covering damage to its cargo during launch and re-entry activities?
A. NASA is considering this issue.

49. Q. Does NASA intend that transported cargo be covered by the provisions of ISS Cross-Waiver of Liability for ISS Activities?
A. Yes

50. Q. Table V.B-1 CRS 1-7 OCI Avoidance Plan specifies that an initial version of the OCI Avoidance Plan is due “with the proposal” (page 117). However, DRD CRS 1-7 (page 135) specifies the first submission date as “Contract Award plus 30 days." Please clarify the due date for the initial submission of DRD CRS 1-7 OCI Avoidance Plan.
A. The correct initial due date is with the proposal. DRD will be updated accordingly.

51. Q. Table V.B-2 CRS 2-2 Integrated Schedules specifies that an initial version of the Integrated Schedules is due at “T.O. Award + 30 days” (page 118). However, DRD CRS 2-2 (page 140) specifies the first submission date as “Plan to be provided with proposal." Please clarify the due date for the initial submission of DRD CRS 2-2 Integrated Schedules.

A. DRD CRS 2-2 is to be provided at T.O. Award + 30 days. The DRD will be updated to reflect the correction.

52. Q. Where are the Data Types defined for the various documents and products?
A. Data type designation was not used and will be removed from the DRD format.

53. Q. Please clarify if Exhibit 3 Key Personnel resumes are included in the Management Volume page limit (50 pages).
A. Key personnel resumes are not included in the Management volume page limit. RFP will be updated to reflect this.

54. Q. II.A.7, in order to finance the procurement of long lead items, and to preserve the Launch on Need (LON) capability for all missions awarded under the initial Task Order, it will be necessary to incorporate interim milestone payments at the Task Order level in addition to individual mission milestone payments at the Work Plan level. Will NASA provide such financing at the Task Order level?
A. NASA will evaluate the offeror’s approach to meeting the LON capability including the approach for financing of this capability. Table II.A.1-1: Mission Payment Schedule, only identifies the minimum milestones. An offeror has the ability to propose additional milestones.

55. Q. Attachment V.A. Section 3.1, What criteria will NASA use to determine whether there has been a change in a Contractor‘s Visiting Vehicle and/or Launch Vehicle configuration that would trigger recertification of ISS Integration?
A. For ISS Visiting Vehicles and/or launch vehicles that have not previously flown to ISS in the same configuration as they would for CRS2, Initial ISS Integration Certification must be performed for the initial CRS2 flight and shall cover the base integration of the Standard Mission types that are awarded under CRS2. This establishes the Baseline for the Contractor’s Standard Mission type(s) through their initial flight. Changes after the initial flight are addressed as Changes to Baseline or Mission Unique changes as appropriate, and shall be accounted for accordingly in the ISS Integration Certification of the missions they would be implemented on. The SOW contains definitions for “Changes to Baseline” and “Mission Unique” in Attachment V. I.

56. Q. Table V.J.1 indicates that the “NASA Docking System (Item #6) is available as Government Furnished Property, presumably for those offerors that are providing a docking capability (per Table I.A.3.1 on page 4). Will NASA consider also adding the Common Berthing Mechanism (CBM) as Government Furnished Property for those offerors that propose a berthing capability?
A. No, the CBM is available commercially and NASA will not provide it as GFP. The NASA Docking System may be available and availability will be clarified in the RFP.

57. Q. II.A.25, paragraph (c) indicates NASA will make available the design data and acceptance test requirements for Items 1 – 3 (i.e. C2V2, FRAM & CBM). Similar to the schedule provided for the items in Paragraph (b), can NASA specify the available dates for these items?
A. FRAM, CBM, and C2V2 interface data is available and will be posted in the technical library.

58. Q. II paragraph (p), please explain why this “*Limitation of Liability”* provision was deleted.
A. The paragraph was deleted as the wording did not cover any express warranty intent of NASA. Damages, defects, or deficiencies and their contract implications are addressed in the *Cross Waiver of Liability for International Space Station Activities*, and *Mission Success Determination, Investigation, and Corrective Actions* clauses.

59. Q. II paragraph (a) Inspection and Acceptance, Please clarify if the Government's rights and remedies under paragraph (e) of FAR 52.246-4 Inspection of Supplies – Fixed Price takes precedence over paragraph 2.3 Procedures of Clause II.A.2 MISSION SUCCESS DETERMINATION, INVESTIGATION AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS in the event of a failed mission.
    A. For the Delivery and Mission Completion, paragraph 2.3 of II.A.2 takes precedence over paragraph (e) of *FAR 52.246-4 Inspection of Services*. Paragraph 2.3 provides procedures on how the acceptance of the services is determined.

60. Q. II paragraph (m) Termination for Cause, Please clarify if the Government's rights and remedies under this clause take precedence over paragraph 2.3 Procedures of Clause II.A. 2 MISSION SUCCESS DETERMINATION, INVESTIGATION AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS in the event of a failed mission.
    A. Section II.A.2 is for determination of mission success. In the event of a failed mission, it would depend on the scope of the failure to determine whether termination for cause would be warranted or not.

61. Q. II.A.31, 52.245-1 Alternate 1, Paragraph (h)(1) of the clause prescribes that the Contractor assumes the risk of, and shall be responsible for, any loss, theft, damage or destruction of Government property upon its delivery to the Contractor as Government-Furnished Property. Is Government-furnished cargo provided to the Contractor for delivery to the ISS subject to this clause?
    A. No, cargo provided to the contractor for installation in their vehicle for delivery to ISS is not considered Government Furnished Property and is not subject to this clause.

62. Q. Minimum Requirements paragraph 1.2, This paragraph requires the Contractor to "produce….a Commercial Resupply Service that is an end product" and that a service qualifies as a "domestic end product" only if "The costs of its components mined, produced, or manufactured in the Unites States exceeds 50% of the cost of all the components." Since the Resupply Service is the "end product", please confirm that all domestic costs associated with providing that service (i.e. component acquisition, integration, test, and operations costs in the U.S.) will be included in the calculation of the domestic cost requirement.
    A. If the costs of US acquisition, integration, test and operations are required to produce or manufacture the end product, then they would be included in the calculation of the domestic cost requirement.

63. Q. Minimum Requirements paragraph 1.4, this paragraph states that the offeror will comply with INKSNA and that no payments will be made to Russian entities in connection with the ISS after December 31, 2011. Please confirm that this date should be December 31, 2020.
A. The date should be December 31, 2020. RFP will be updated to reflect this.

64. Q. VI.A.23 paragraph (d), please confirm that the information requested in this section is for the Offeror's five relevant contracts (not the Offeror's major team members/subcontractors).
A. The 5 relevant contracts are to be the offeror's contracts, not the major team members or subcontracts. In addition to the five from the offeror, the offeror may provide the information for relevant contracts for any major team members or subcontractors.

65. Q. VI.A.23 paragraph (d)21, Please confirm that consent letters are to be executed by each major subcontractors/team members identified in paragraph (a).
A. Yes, each major subcontractor/team member is to complete a consent letter.

66. Q. VI.A.23 paragraph (j), Please confirm that the data required in this section applies to only the Offeror's company information and is not required for each of the Offeror's relevant contracts identified in paragraph (a).
A. The information is required for the Offeror's company and each qualifying major team member, not for the contracts identified in paragraph (a).

67. Q. VI.A.23 paragraph (d)(15)(iii), The MS Office 2010 requirement drives software upgrades. When testing the MS Office 2010 Word application (i.e. opening a 2007 Word documents through MS Office 2010), we found no differences between the two versions. Suggest the instructions be changed to: "… Microsoft Office 2007 applications (Word, Power Point and Excel) or newer."
A. NASA will evaluate the suggestion.

68. Q. Attachment V.M., for launch services not conducted at KSC, the facility requirements specified in Section 2 appear to be overly prescriptive for the amount of life science cargo identified in table I.A.3-1. Please update this section to identify the minimum requirements for the various types of life science cargo to meet NASA's needs.
A. Updates to Attachment V.M. PAYLOAD PROCESSING CAPABILITIES REQUIRED AT LAUNCH SITE are being considered to identify minimum requirements.