

Questions received in response to Draft Solicitation No. NNG14490137R, NASA Sounding Rocket Operations Contract (NSROC) III, and Government Responses—October 17, 2014.

Revisions to DRFP documents noted in “Government Response” will be included in the Final RFP documents when posted.

Industry Question	Government Response
1. Will the Government consider a standard 45-day proposal period rather than the given 30-day period?	The Government will provide for a 45-day proposal period. <u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Solicitation, Offer and Award Standard Form 33, Block 9 revised accordingly.
2. To develop a complete NSROC solution, the contractor must understand certain aspects of the existing unionized workforce. In addition to the CBA, will NASA characterize the union in terms of size, work content, recent grievances, and other issues that will have to be addressed at contract start?	The Government believes the NSROC III Statement of Work contains sufficient information for prospective Offerors to determine the size and composition of the workforce that will be needed to perform the work under the contract. At this time the Government is not aware of any Union grievances or other issues that will have to be addressed at contract start. <u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.
3. The short 30-day proposal period significantly favors incumbents who already have a proposal baseline from which to work. Will NASA consider a 45 or 60 day proposal period?	See response to item 1.
4. Slide 21 indicates launch (range) operations are not a NSROC function. Can you clarify the NSROC role regarding launch operations after final integration, testing, and staging?	The indication on Industry Day Briefing Slide 21, that launch range operations are not a NSROC function was intended to convey that operation of the launch range proper (i.e. things such as radar tracking and telemetry receiving, range safety to include aircraft and ship surveillance, control center display configuration, Range Safety Officer (RSO) and Test Director functions, etc.) are not part of the NSROC contract but are provided by the launch range where the operations are taking place. NSROC Launch Operations responsibilities are described in Section 2.2.4.3 of the SOW. However, there is an exception at WSMR where the NSROC Contractor will be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the Redstone Telemetry Receiving System, Ten Foot Telemetry Receiving System, and the Uplink Command Telemetry System as described in Section 2.1.1.6 of the SOW. Also reference Attachment B Part 1 for the equipment that will be provided as IAGP under the NSROC III contract that the NSROC III contractor will be required to maintain. <u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.
5. Will contract value assigned to a SDVOSB subcontractor also count toward meeting the VOSB goal?	Yes. <u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>6. There are a number of LJT-labeled vehicles on base. If these are associated with NSROC, are they Government-owned or Contractor-owned?</p>	<p>The LJT labeled vehicles on the base are part of the WICC contract, which is completely separate from the NSROC III contract. Installation Accountable Government Property includes short-term use of Government motor pool vehicles on an as-requested basis. The current NSROC contractor however does have several leased vehicles that are charged back to the Government under the contract. These include four Ford F250s (3 at Wallops & 1 at WSMR), two Ford Rangers (1 at Wallops and 1 at WSMR), and one Ford F-550 Flatbed (at Wallops).</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>7. Sec L.28 (2). States that Mission Suitability and Cost Volumes must follow WBS format. This seems to be in conflict with format of Sec L and M. Can you please clarify?</p>	<p>The Mission Suitability Volume shall be structured in accordance with the Mission Suitability Instructions by Subfactor detailed in solicitation provision L.28, Section 3. The Cost Volume shall be structured in accordance with the Work Breakdown Structure contained in solicitation Attachment K.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Revised solicitation provision L.28, GSFC 52.215-210 Mission Suitability Proposal Instructions, Section 2, last paragraph, accordingly.</p>
<p>8. Sec L.20 (d): Requires TCP submittal for all service subcontractors based on \$500K and greater than 10%. This is different than definition for significant sub. So does Govt want TCP from all subs or just significant subs based on definition in proposal prep section?</p>	<p>The thresholds cited in solicitation provision L.20(d) for required submission of service subcontractor information are different from both: (i) the threshold cited in solicitation provision L.25 section (a)(2) for significant subcontractors for cost proposal purposes; and (ii) the threshold cited in solicitation provision L.30 section (a) for significant subcontractors for purposes of the Past Performance Volume.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>9. RFP Section: L.28.3 Topic: Phase-in Plan Question: Does the incumbent have a phase-out plan in place? If so, can it be provided to enable offerors to address the “smooth transition with the incumbent contractor”?</p>	<p>The Phase-Out Plan for the current contract has not yet been developed and therefore cannot be provided. The NSROC II Contracting Officer will not be requesting the Phase-Out Plan until the last year of the contract.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>10. RFP Section: L.29.2.h Topic: Commercial Rocket Motors and Flight Termination System Question: In light of the in-process merger between Orbital and ATK, what steps will the government take to ensure all offerors are able to obtain competitive quotes if it is determined that Oriole rocket motors are required?</p>	<p>NASA’s solicitation and related requirements documents contemplate adequate competition. They do not mandate specific brands/models of rocket motors as requirements. NASA is not currently aware of any issue that would preclude a fair competitive environment in response to the solicitation.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>11. RFP Section: L.28.2 Mission Suitability Proposal Format Topic: WBS and Mission Suitability Volume Structure Question: The referenced RFP paragraph states that the “WBS contained in Section K of this solicitation shall be used to structure the Mission Suitability Volume.” Section L and M provide a very different structure than the WBS. Can the government please provide guidance on how offerors should reconcile the structures provided in Sections L, M, and the WBS for the Mission Suitability Volume? (We understand how to use the WBS for the cost volume.)</p>	<p>See response to item 7.</p>
<p>12. RFP Section: Enclosure 4, Areas for Innovation; 4.1 Smaller and lighter-weight support electronics, sensors, and associated structural and mechanical elements Topic: Understanding of current program efforts Question: We understand that this innovation area encompasses ongoing program efforts, including the recent sounding rocket flights that tested certain new configurations hardware/technologies. Please provide offerors with sufficient information about the ongoing efforts to enable us to propose innovations that do not duplicate current activities.</p>	<p>Offerors are directed to review the information resident in the NSROC III eLibrary, in particular the presentations from recent Sounding Rocket Working Group meetings, to obtain additional insight into this area.</p> <p>Also, the Government will provide an additional document entitled “Current Technology Developments” to prospective Offerors. Because the information contained in the document is ITAR controlled, the document will be made available to self-certified, wholly American firms requesting the information.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>13. RFP Section: Attachment A Statement of Work, Table 3 and Table 4 Topic: Commercial rocket motors and termination systems Question: Table 3 of the SOW defines the baseline mission model with launch locations and complexities. Table 4 provides payload characteristics for complexity levels but does not provide vehicle definitions or parameters such as payload mass and apogee/range to derive vehicle definitions. Please provide offerors with sufficient information to define the vehicle configurations for the baseline mission model.</p>	<p>The Government has carefully considered this request and the SOW has been modified to include an updated mission model that defines the launch date fiscal year quarter, mission complexity level (MCL), launch site location, and vehicle configuration for each mission.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Attachment A, Statement of Work, Section 2.2, Table 3, updated mission model.</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>14. RFP Section: Attachment A Statement of Work, Table 6—NSROC III Contract Baseline DRPA Model Topic: Sufficient detail to price DRPA Work Orders Question: We have reviewed the provided data on the DRPA work orders and feel that in some instances there is insufficient detail to enable accurate pricing without making assumptions. Items in question are detailed below.</p>	<p>Offerors are referred to the NSROC III eLibrary document titled “Historical Data – Mission and Vehicle Data ” tables 5 through 7 which provides Offerors the Government’s estimate of the total number of hours projected to complete each DRPA work order as well as a percentage split by functional area for how the hours should be distributed across the technical disciplines. The Government’s estimate of the technical hours and percentages is based on historical contract data, but does not include hours for management and administration functions within the DRPA work order. Offerors should review the Government’s historical data as well as the description of the DRPA work orders to assess what labor categories are required within the functional areas identified to sufficiently accomplish the DRPA work order. The Offeror should also add in any management and administrative hours necessary to accomplish the work order in accordance with their approach. Offerors are able to deviate from the Government’s estimate; however, Section L.28 (3. Mission Suitability Instructions by Subfactor, Subfactor A – Management Approach) states that “if the Offeror’s proposed staffing plan deviates from what the historical data indicates, the Offeror shall provide rationale for the deviation.”</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents: None.</u></p>
<p>14a. Reimbursable Mission Feasibility Study and Planning Activities. Please provide the number of studies and planning activities that will be performed during each contract period.</p>	<p>See response to item 14.</p>
<p>14b. Anomaly Investigation Board (AIB) Support. Should offerors assume that the number of AIB investigations on the current contract present a reasonable estimate for NSROC III?</p>	<p>See response to item 14.</p>
<p>14c. Research and Development. Please provide some basis on which offerors can estimate the frequency, duration, and complexity of these DRPA work orders.</p>	<p>See response to item 14.</p>
<p>14d. General Sounding Rocket Program Office Support. Please provide data on the frequency and complexity of these tasks. If this is not feasible, please provide historical data on the numbers and types of FTE that perform this work.</p>	<p>See response to item 14.</p>
<p>14e. WFF Aircraft Office Support. Please provide data on the frequency and complexity of these tasks. If this is not feasible, please provide historical data on the numbers and types of FTE that perform this work.</p>	<p>See response to item 14.</p>
<p>14f. WFF AETD Code 569 Support. Please provide data on the frequency and complexity of these tasks. If this is not feasible, please provide historical data on the numbers and types of FTE that perform this work.</p>	<p>See response to item 14.</p>
<p>14g. NASA Reimbursable Projects Support. Please provide data on the anticipated complexity of these tasks. The potential activities listed would vary significantly depending on which work was requested.</p>	<p>See response to item 14.</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>15. RFP Section: Attachment A Statement of Work, Table 6—NSROC III Contract Baseline DRPA Model and Section L.29.2(h); Procurement of Commercial Rocket Motors</p> <p>Topic: Impact of new rocket motor implementation on commercial purchases of rocket motors</p> <p>Question: Table 6 defines a task to implement a new rocket motor. We assume this is the Peregrine rocket motor under development by NASA. Should offerors assume that the new rocket motor will be deployed by FY 18? Should offerors estimate the additional effort associated with the first procurement of the Peregrine under the commercial rocket motor recurring DRPA work order for FY 17?</p>	<p>Offerors are advised to follow the direction in Attachment A, Statement of Work Section 2.1.1.6 (Government Property) and Solicitation Section L.28 Subfactor B to propose a commercially available rocket motor that is flight qualified per the requirements identified in SOW Section 2.1.1.6 for the base and all option periods of the NSROC III contract. Per Attachment A Statement of Work, Section 2.3, Table 6, DRPA Work Order R1, procurement of commercial sustainer rocket motors is a recurring annual activity. At the time of DRFP and RFP release the NASA developed Peregrine rocket motor does not meet the flight qualification requirement and it should not be assumed by Offerors at this time that the Peregrine will be deployed in FY18.</p> <p>The DRPA model task N1 (NASA Sustainer Rocket Motor) was added to the DRPA model in the event that the Peregrine becomes flight qualified and is a successful alternative to commercially available rocket motors during the NSROC III contract execution.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>16. What overall percentage of the work force are represented by the Union? What do the Union rules state in terms of right to work? How does this restrict or govern work practices on this contract?</p>	<p>See response to item 2.</p> <p>In addition to the CBA document in the NSROC III eLibrary, the Government directs prospective Offerors to 800-PG-8715.0.1, the Code 800 (Suborbital and Special Orbital Projects Directorate) Work-Hour Policy.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>17. Who is responsible to provide training on new or existing equipment. Who bears the cost of the training?</p>	<p>In accordance with Section 2.1.2.10 of the SOW the NSROC Contractor is responsible for providing/obtaining training, including that required for new or existing equipment. The cost of such training is an allowable expense under the contract and as such, should be included in the Offeror’s Cost Proposal.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Attachment A, SOW Section 2.1.2.10 has been updated to clarify training requirements and what types of training are allowable direct costs under the contract.</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>18. Who supplies and maintains equipment and vehicles, for day-to-day transport, lifting, stacking, shipping. Do contractors provide their own vehicles, or are they provided as Government Furnished Equipment?</p>	<p>Certain equipment (such as fork lifts, payload assembly tables, rocket motor handling carts, etc.) is provided to the NSROC Contractor as Installation Accountable Government Property (reference Attachment A, Statement of Work, Section 2.1.1.6 Government Property) and it is the NSROC Contractor’s responsibility to maintain this equipment. These items are included in Attachment B Part 1 – Equipment. Other Lifting Devices and Equipment such as stationary overhead cranes permanently affixed to buildings are provided as part of the NASA facility the NSROC contractor will occupy. The NSROC Contractor is not responsible for the maintenance and repair of these NASA facilities and maintenance and certification of this permanently installed lifting equipment will be performed as an Institutional Provided Service. Any vehicles, other than as authorized in Section G.121.C[X](7) regarding the use of GSFC motor pool vehicles, necessary for the execution of contract requirements shall be provided by the NSROC Contractor and are an allowable expense under the contract. As such, these should be included in the Offeror’s cost proposal.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>19. Section B, page 2, B.4 REFERENCE: GSFC 52.211-90 Supplies and/or Services to be Provided QUESTION: Since there is no Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL), does the table in this section substitute for a CDRL list? If yes, estimating contract costs will be more ambiguous without draft document expectations, Data Item Description requirements, distribution requirements, government approval required, etc. Recommend the Government include a CDRL in the final RFP.</p>	<p>Yes, the table in solicitation clause B.4 constitutes the Contract Data Requirements List for this contract. Data Item Description requirements, distribution requirements, government approval required, are defined in the table by item and by information in columns entitled, Description, Reference, Schedule and Delivery Method/Addressee(s).</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>20. Section L; Page 81; Para L.25 (a) (1) REFERENCE: The table on page 81 indicates that the Cost Volume should consist of “Text in MS Word”. Some required documentation, such as corporate disclosure statements, audit reports, DCAA letters, etc., are provided from the sender in “PDF” format. QUESTION: Will the government allow such documentation to be included in the proposal in PDF format?</p>	<p>Yes, required documentation such as corporate disclosure statements, audit reports, and DCAA letters may be provided in PDF format.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Solicitation provision L.25, GSFC 52.215-201, Proposal Preparation—General Instructions, table in paragraph (a)(1), revised accordingly.</p>
<p>21. Section L; Page 81; Para L.25 (a) REFERENCE: The DRFP states: “Cost proposal exhibits shall use Microsoft Excel 2003 and shall contain all formulas.” QUESTION: Will the government allow for the use of versions of Microsoft Excel that are “compatible with” Excel 2003?</p>	<p>The government will allow versions of Microsoft Excel which are compatible with Windows 7 and Office 2007.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Solicitation provision L.25, GSFC 52.215-201, Proposal Preparation—General Instructions, paragraph (a)(4), revised accordingly.</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>22. Section L; Page 81; Para L.25 (a) REFERENCE: The DRFP states: “(4) Two electronic copies of the offeror’s proposal, designating one as “back-up,” shall be submitted (in addition to the hardcopies specified above) in Microsoft Word and Excel (Windows XP) or Portable Document Format (PDF) (version 8.0 or greater).” QUESTION: Will the government allow for the use of versions of Microsoft that are “compatible with” Windows XP?</p>	<p>See response to item 21.</p>
<p>23. Section L; Page 81; L.25(5) and Page 87; L.28.2 REFERENCE: The DRFP states: “(5) The format for each proposal volume shall parallel, to the greatest extent possible, the format of the evaluation factors and subfactors contained in Section L of this solicitation.” REFERENCE: The DRFP also states: “The Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) contained in Attachment K of this solicitation shall be used to structure the Mission Suitability Volume.” QUESTION: These two instructions appear to be providing conflicting instructions for the structure of Volume II. To be compliant with the requirements in Section L and how they will be evaluated, as stated in Section M, we recommend the instructions be altered to allow bidders to follow the Section L instructions on page 81 when structuring Volume II (and recommend not using the WBS for structuring the response to Volume II).</p>	<p>See response to item 7.</p>
<p>24. Section L; Page 82; Para L.25 (b) (1) REFERENCE: Proposal Content & Page Limitations, Cost Volume, (a) Cost Exhibits. QUESTION: The DRFP references a narrative on pages 93 and 94 that we are presuming is the Cost Narrative part of the Cost Volume, where we would describe the non-technical basis of estimate such as application of indirect factors, escalation methodology, and fee. Recommend modifying “(a) Cost Exhibits” in the table on page 82 to read “(a) Cost Narrative and Cost Exhibits”. Would this be acceptable to the Government? Note: DRFP references a narrative on pages 93 (3rd paragraph from the bottom) and 94 (2nd paragraph from the top of the page)</p>	<p>The “narrative” required in the third paragraph from the bottom on DRFP page 93 is in the context of information to be included in the written narrative of the Offer Volume, for which there is no page limitation.</p> <p>The “narrative” required in the second paragraph from the top on DRFP page 94 is in the context of, “As such, provide a detailed narrative explaining the basis of the indirect rate derivation, describing the types of costs accumulated for the specific rate pool and their estimation rationale, and the methodology for the projected base of application.”</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Solicitation provision L.25, GSFC 52.215-201, Proposal Preparation—General Instructions, table in (b)(1), Cost Volume, revised accordingly.</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>25. Section L; Page 82; L.25 Item (b) (1) and Section L; Page 96; L.29 Item 2 (d) REFERENCE: On page 82, the DRFP states: “Cost Volume, (b) Basis of Estimates, 2 Pages per WBS Level 3” *Footnote: *Prime Offeror and each individual significant subcontractor. On page 96, the DRFP states: “For any significant subcontract that has a potential estimated value in excess of the threshold stated in Section 1 instructions above, BOEs must be provided for that subcontract following the above specified format. BOEs shall be submitted by both the Prime Offeror and all Significant Subcontractors and shall comply with the BOE page limitations set forth in the PROPOSAL PREPARATIONS—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS provision of this RFP.” QUESTION: Is it acceptable for the prime to submit a single, integrated BOE that clearly identifies which labor and materials are provided by the prime and which by subcontractors?</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>26. Section L, Page 85, L.26 (9) and Section L, Page 89, Para L.28, second paragraph REFERENCE: On page 85, the DRFP states: “Offerors shall possess a Secret level facility security clearance for performance of this contract and this clearance shall be maintained throughout the life of the contract. Offerors shall provide their CAGE code for verification of current security clearance status.” On page 89, the DRFP states: “The Offeror’s proposed Phase-In Plan shall describe how the security challenges associated with International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) 22 C.F.R. Chapter I, Subchapter M Parts 120-130 requirements and the requirements for HSPD-12 facility personnel access and personnel security clearance processes will be prepared for during phase-in so as to prevent work interruptions on the contract effective date.” QUESTION: What are the specific requirements for the SECRET level facility?</p>	<p>Offerors shall possess a Secret level facility clearance for performance of this contract, in accordance with Attachment O, Contract Security Classification Specification (DD 254). This requirement is not for a specific facility. See the Defense Security Service (DSS) homepage at www.dss.mil for information required for the facility clearance.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>27. Section L; Page 98; Para L.30 (a) REFERENCE: INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR: This section states “Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for all of your most recent contracts (completed and ongoing) for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$10M that your company has had within the last five (5) years of the RFP release date.” QUESTION: Offerors may have many contracts that meet the requirements stated above. Given the 25-page limit, would the Government consider limiting the past performance information from Offerors to up to three relevant contracts from the prime and up to five when including those from significant subcontractors?</p>	<p>No. It will be up to each Offeror to determine the number of recent contracts (completed and ongoing) for similar efforts for which they shall furnish the requested past performance information that will meet the page limitation.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>28. Atch. A SOW Table 6, pages 44 – 53 and Section L, page 100, Para L.31 REFERENCE: SOW Table 6 (list of recurring and non-recurring DRPA projects). QUESTION: Section L.31 (page 100) requires Offerors to generate cost estimates (Cost Exhibits 2I and 2K) for all recurring and non-recurring DRPAs in SOW Table 6 (pages 44 – 53). However, for many of the DRPAs (for example R10 and R11) there is insufficient information in SOW Table 6 for Offerors to generate reasonable labor and cost estimates. If Offerors are left to define their own assumptions for each DRPA, NASA is going to receive widely varying labor and cost estimates, depending on those assumptions. We respectfully suggest NASA either: a) remove the requirement to cost the DRPAs in SOW Table 6; or b) provide detailed pricing assumptions for each DRPA so that all Offerors can bid to the same assumptions.</p>	<p>See response to item 14.</p>
<p>29. Section J.1, Page 66; Section B, page 4, Line 26; and Section L, page 82, L.25(b)(1) REFERENCE: In the table on page 66, the DRFP indicates that Attachment L New Technology Reporting Plan and Attachment Q Training Plan are due with the proposal as they are listed as TBP. On page 4, the table indicates the Training Plan is due “90 Calendar Days after Contract Effective Date”. QUESTION: Since neither of these plans are mentioned in Section L.25 as being part of the delivered proposal, would the Government please clarify if these plans are to be submitted after contract effective date?</p>	<p>Training Plan is due 90 calendar days after contract effective date. New Technology Reporting Plan is due 30 calendar days after contract effective date.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Solicitation clauses J.1, List of Attachments, and B.4, GSFC 52.211-90, Supplies and/or Services to be Provided, revised accordingly.</p>
<p>30. REFERENCE: NSRP Personnel Change QUESTION: We understand Norm Shultz is no longer with the program. Has a new COR been identified?</p>	<p>A NASA Form 1634 COR delegation form will be prepared and the delegation made and distributed prior to award of the NSROC III contract. At this time a COR delegation has not been made for NSROC III.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>31. Enclosure 1, Page 1, Challenge 1 REFERENCE: "Provide reliable and flight qualified, commercially available sustainer and upper-stage (exo-atmospheric) rocket motors, per the relevant parts of Section 2.1.1.6 of the SOW." QUESTION: Is the Government interested only in new or different types of commercially available rocket motors to fulfill this requirement, or are different types of military surplus motors also of interest?</p>	<p>The Government is interested in launch vehicle configurations that satisfy the requirements of the Program including Attachment A Statement of Work Section 2.1.1.6 (Government Property) and the mission model in Attachment A Statement of Work Section 2.2 Table 3. If there are flight qualified (reference Attachment A SOW 2.1.1.6 for definition of flight qualified) surplus motors available to NASA that could be substituted for commercial rocket motors then this could be considered a viable approach. If Offerors propose a surplus motor asset in place of a commercial asset the Government requires Offerors provide details regarding the quantity of surplus assets available and ability for NASA/SRPO to acquire the surplus assets in their approach.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Solicitation provision L.28, GSFC 52.215-210 Mission Suitability Proposal Instructions, Section 3, Mission Suitability Instructions by Subfactor, Subfactor B – Technical Approach, paragraph 1, revised accordingly.</p>
<p>32. Industry Day Briefing REFERENCE: Safety plan development. The briefing noted that some motor storage buildings were "explosive class restricted" but did not include the specific restrictions. QUESTION: What are the specific explosive class restrictions of each motor storage facility at WFF?</p>	<p>Detailed explosive class restrictions for each motor storage facility at Wallops Flight Facility (WFF) will not be made available because that level of detail is not needed to generate the health and safety plan. Motor storage facilities at Wallops Flight Facility (WFF) are adequate to meet the current needs of the Program, however very limited additional storage capability exists to bring large quantities of surplus or commercial assets on site.</p> <p>In general, rocket motors with a 1.3 hazard classification are stored on Wallops main base in the magazine area, and rocket motors with a 1.1 hazard classification are stored on Wallops Island. Only one building on Wallops main base is able to store 1.1 hazard classification motors and is intended for smaller net explosive weight of Class 1.1 propellant (i.e. spin motors, igniters, etc.). Wallops Class 1.1 storage is near capacity with motors currently in inventory.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>33. Industry Day Briefing REFERENCE: Proposal development cycle. The briefing noted that the response time for the proposal would be 30 days. QUESTION: Given the complex nature of the proposal, both technically and administratively, we request the proposal development cycle be increased to between 45 and 60 days to allow contractors to develop more comprehensive solutions.</p>	<p>See response to item 1.</p>
<p>34. Question: Will the Government provide, with the release of the final RFP, a list of changes between the RFP and draft RFP?</p>	<p>Yes. A list of changes between the NSROC III draft RFP and the final RFP is included in this document.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>35. Bidders Library REFERENCE: The Mission Historical data is dated Jun 2014 on the cover page, the data covers up to FY13. " QUESTION: Request the Government provide mission historical files that include FY14 data up through the most recent mission data.</p>	<p>The Government has provided an updated document titled "Historical Data – Mission and Vehicle Data 09-18-14" in the NSROC III eLibrary that provides the additional data as requested.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>36. L. 28, 3, Subfactor A, Paragraph 2, Page 87 Can you provide system level performance/integration specifications for the parachute recovery system design requirement?</p>	<p>The Government will provide an additional document entitled "Parachute Documentation" to prospective Offerors. Because the information contained in the document is ITAR controlled, the document will be made available to self-certified, wholly American firms requesting the information.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>37. L.29, 2, (h), Page 96 Can you provide an estimated annual required number/type of Commercial Rocket Motors for procurement planning?</p>	<p>See response to item 13.</p> <p>It is expected Offerors will develop their own approach towards meeting contractual requirements for the provision of launch vehicles (including the purchase of commercial rocket motors as necessary) to satisfy the requirements for the mission model as described in Attachment A, SOW, Table 3 - Contract Baseline Mission Model.</p> <p>Offerors may also refer to the following eLibrary documents for additional information on vehicles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated Vehicle Performance – provides performance curves for current sounding rocket vehicle configurations • Historical Data – Mission and Vehicle Data 09-18-14 – provides historical data on vehicle configurations launched, vehicle definitions, and annual rocket motor usage rates • Sounding Rocket Working Group Presentations – provides historical data on commercial rocket motor sub-contracts <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Updated the mission model in Attachment A, SOW, Table 3 – Baseline Mission Model.</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>38. L.29, 2, (h), Page 96 Can you provide an estimated annual required number of Flight Termination Systems/Ordnance for procurement planning?</p>	<p>See response to items 13 and 37. The Government has considered this request and the SOW has been modified to include an updated mission model that defines the launch date fiscal year quarter, mission complexity level (MCL), launch location, and vehicle configuration for each mission. Vehicle configurations requiring a Flight Termination System (FTS) are designed by “36F” under the vehicle configuration column in Attachment A, SOW, Table 3 Baseline Mission Model. On the current NSRP (NASA Sounding Rockets Program) flight termination systems/ordnance are only flown on Black Brant IX vehicles (36.xxx) launching from White Sands Missile Range due to the narrow land range and the use of the boost guidance system. On rare occasion flight termination systems are also flown on vehicles with exo-atmospheric motors (i.e. Black Brant X [35.xxx] or Black Brant XII [40.xxx]) that fly a tailored trajectory (i.e. use the attitude control system to reorient the payload and exo-atmospheric motor prior to the ignition of the exo-atmospheric motor). The flight termination system requirement for tailored trajectory vehicles has only occurred on approximately 1-2 flights in the past 10 years on the NSRP. <u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Updated the mission model in Attachment A, SOW, Table 3 – Baseline Mission Model.</p>
<p>39. SOW, Table 3, Page 29 The number of planned launches at each location does not include a corresponding MCL. Can you provide the corresponding MCL for the launches planned at each location?</p>	<p>See response to item 13.</p>
<p>40. SOW, Table 3, Page 29 Will you allow the submission of Microsoft Project files for the purposes of the MCL 1-4 and the coordinated mission schedules?</p>	<p>No. In response to solicitation provision instructions in provision L.28, Mission Suitability Proposal Instructions, section 3, Mission Suitability Instructions by Subfactor, schedules may be submitted in PDF format. <u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>41. SOW, Table 6, Page 44 The DRPA task list in the SOW is not numbered. Will you update the DRPA task list to clarify the content of the referenced DRFP tasks (R13 and N12)?</p>	<p>Yes. <u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Statement of Work Section 2.3, Table 6, for both Recurring DRPA Work Orders and Non-Recurring DRPA Work Orders, revised accordingly.</p>
<p>42. <u>DRFP Reference:</u> I.107 Mentor Requirements and Evaluation and I.142 <u>Comment:</u> Millennium supports the inclusion of the NASA mentor protégé program. <u>Question:</u> 1852.219-79 specifies inclusion of mentor protégé factors in the award fee process. NSROC III does not have an award fee. How will incentives and rewards for mentor protégé activity be applied?</p>	<p>NASA’s evaluation of an Offeror’s proposal will include consideration of the Offeror’s participation and/or proposed participation in the Mentor Protege program in accordance with solicitation provision GSFC 52.215-310, Mission Suitability Factor, Subfactor C, Small Business Utilization, paragraph (b)(4). <u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>43. <u>DRFP Reference:</u> L.29.2.h Commercial Rocket Motors and Flight Termination System Costs <u>Comment:</u> Given the merger (underway) between ATK and OSC, and given that ATK is a motor supplier, requesting commercial motor pricing 1) may create an OCI for unbiased commercial motor supply; 2) may create an unfair advantage for the incumbent in obtaining special pricing not available to other bidders; and 3) there is no assurance that ATK will even cooperate and provide prices. <u>Question:</u> Given the ongoing merger between OSC and ATK, will the government consider removing the requirement for commercial motor pricing from the cost evaluation or take other measures to assure all competitors receive fair pricing?</p>	<p>See response to item 10.</p>
<p>44. <u>DRFP Reference:</u> L.29.2 Mission Suitability Proposal Format <u>Comment:</u> The proposal instructions are confusing with regards to Subfactor A Management Approach and may not allow bidders to reflect the overall management approach for the program to address all WBS elements, therefore not providing the government with the ability to evaluate a bidder’s total capability to execute the program. <u>Question:</u> Proposal instructions state “the WBS contained in Section K of this solicitation shall be used to structure the Mission Suitability Volume” yet Section L and M provide a very different structure. The proposal instructions require a submission that follows Section L and M to the greatest extent possible. Will the government consider reorganizing Section L Subfactor A instructions according to the WBS?</p>	<p>Response to the comment: Subfactor A, Management Approach, is not intended to request that an Offeror address all WBS elements. Rather, it is intended to request an Offeror address specific items that the Government believes will provide meaningful discriminators during proposal evaluation.</p> <p>Response to the question: See response to item 7.</p>
<p>45. <u>DRFP Reference:</u> Enclosure 4, Areas for Innovation, 4.1 Smaller and lighter-weight support electronics, sensors, and associated structural and mechanical elements. <u>Comment:</u> The DRFP requested technology innovations in payload/sub-payload avionics and related to meet growing demand by the science community for such capability. Within weeks of the DRFP response a government technology demonstration flight for such innovations was performed with the incumbent. This creates the perception of an unfair advantage for the incumbent (DRFP aligned to known ongoing innovations by the incumbent). <u>Question:</u> We understand that this innovation area encompasses ongoing program efforts, including the recent sounding rocket flights that tested new hardware/technologies. Please consider another need for innovation that allows all bidders an equal starting point, or please provide offerors with sufficient information about the ongoing efforts to enable us to propose innovations that do not duplicate current activities.</p>	<p>See response to item 12.</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>46. <u>DRFP Reference</u>: Statement of Work Table 3 and Table 4 <u>Comment</u>: None. <u>Question</u>: For the reference mission model of 18 flights per year, Table 4 provides payload characteristics for complexity levels but does not provide vehicle definitions or sufficient information to derive vehicle configurations or science/flight profiles. Please provide offerors with sufficient information to define the vehicle configurations and fundamental science or flight profiles for the baseline mission model.</p>	<p>See response to item 13.</p>
<p>47. Section L.28 “2. Mission Suitability Proposal Format” includes the following statement "The Mission Suitability Volume and the Cost Volume must follow the provided WBS". Section L.25 (a) (5) includes a direction that each proposal volume shall parallel, to the greatest extent possible, the format of the evaluation factors and subfactors contained in section L. <u>Question</u>: What does “follow the WBS” mean for the Mission Suitability Volume?</p>	<p>See response to item 7.</p>
<p>48. Section L.26 (c) (10) requires that the Offeror provide a preliminary analysis of possible organizational conflicts of interest that might flow from the award of this contract. <u>Comment</u>: The offeror intends to provide the contractors format unless the format is specified.</p>	<p>The preliminary analysis of possible organizational conflict of interest will be provided in the Offeror’s format. <u>Revision to DRFP documents</u>: None.</p>
<p>49. Section L.28 “3. Mission Suitability Instructions by Subfactor”, there are references to SOW Section 2.3 Table 6. This table does not include the identifiers R13 and N12. The Historical Data posting (#50) did include two tables that appear to have similar reference numbers (Tables 6 and 7). <u>Question</u>: Can the Section 2.3 Table 6 be modified to include the reference designators?</p>	<p>See response to item 41 above.</p>
<p>50. Attachment A “Statement of Work”, Section 2.1.1.3, Work Order Tracking, includes the directions to workload data and costs for individual work orders issued under the contract down to CWBS level 4. Attachment K, NSROC III WBS and WBS Dictionary, has one item label WBS Level 4 and that is Mission Complexity Level 4. <u>Question/Comment</u>: Please clarify the definition of CWBS Level 4.</p>	<p>The reference to CWBS Level 4 in solicitation Attachment A, SOW Section 2.1.1.3 (Work Order Tracking) was an error and has been removed from the SOW. The Government has revised solicitation Attachment A, SOW Section 2.1.1.3 (Work Order Tracking) to include additional information about the requirements for the work order tracking system for NSROC III. Also, the Government has revised solicitation Attachment K – NSROC III WBS and WBS Dictionary to depict how mission work orders will be issued under Level 3 MCL1, MCL2, MCL3, and MCL4 missions as well as DRPA work orders will be issued under Level 3 Recurring DRPA Projects and Non-Recurring DRPA Projects. <u>Revision to DRFP documents</u>: Attachment A, SOW Section 2.1.1.3, and Attachment K, NSROC III WBS and WBS Dictionary, revised accordingly.</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>51. Attachment A “Statement of Work”, Section 2.1.2.10 states that “Training of personnel shall be performed and provided by the contractor at its own expense.”</p> <p>Question/Comment: Please provide guidance if this requirement will cause a Cost Accounting Standard non-compliance by violating consistency requirements.</p>	<p>Training for implementation of the Sounding Rockets Program is an allowable direct cost under the contract. Training for compliance with Corporate requirements is not an allowable direct cost under the contract and the expense of such training shall be accounted for in accordance with the Contractor’s standard accounting practices. Attachment A SOW Section 2.1.2.10 has been modified accordingly.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Attachment A, SOW Section 2.1.2.10 updated to clarify training requirements and what types of training are allowable direct costs under the contract.</p>
<p>52. Attachment E “Financial Management Reporting Requirements”, page 4, Note 1 identifies that Management and Administrative Allocation is performed per the requirements listed below. However, In Attachment S “Technical Performance Incentive Fee Plan” page 1, identifies that “CPFF services work orders will be issued for management and administrative functions as well as for DRPA projects”.</p> <p>Question/Comment: Please provide guidance on whether or not there will be work orders issued for SOW 2.1 M&A support.</p>	<p>Work orders will not be issued for SOW 2.1 Management and Administrative support.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Attachment S, Technical Performance Incentive Fee Plan, Section II, Background, revised accordingly.</p>
<p>53. Section L. 30 contains the Past Performance Volume requirements and includes the subsection (a) Information from the Offeror. Section L.30 does not contain any subsections labeled Prior Customer Evaluations (Past Performance Questionnaires) or Deviations and Exceptions. However, in the page limitations table, L.25 (b) (1), the Deviations and Exceptions and Customer Evaluations are included in the Excluded Pages.</p> <p>Question: Is the table in L.25 (b) (1) correct?</p>	<p>No.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Solicitation provision L.25, GSFC 52.215-201, Proposal Preparation—General Instructions, table in (b)(1) revised to delete references to “Deviations and Exceptions” and “Customer Evaluations.”</p>
<p>54. Cost Exhibits 2 A, 2 D, and 2 I include the government provided numbers for materials, other subcontracts, freight, service/maintenance contracts, safety, gas rental, WOCR software license and special training. The Level 3 costs exhibits also contain these lines but with no values in these lines nor are they 'greyed' out.</p> <p>Question: Does the Government want the Offeror to further subdivide the Government provided numbers into the level 3 cost exhibit inputs or just bid them at level 2?</p>	<p>The Government has revised the NSROC III Cost Exhibits by adding in the WBS Level 3 Nonproposed Costs for materials, other subcontracts, freight, service/maintenance contracts, safety, gas rental, WOCR software license, and special training.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> NSROC III RFP Cost Exhibits 2B, 2C, 2E, 2F, 2G, 2H, 2J, and 2K revised accordingly.</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>55. DRPA N12 states, “NSROC shall propose, procure, and flight qualify a replacement <u>inertial measurement unit</u> (IMU, or gyro) to replace the <u>legacy gyro</u> used on the Sounding Rocket Program.”</p> <p>Question: Please clarify if the DRPA is to replace the inertial measurement unit or the gyro within the inertial measurement unit.</p>	<p>Offerors are reminded for the proposal response to provide an implementation approach detailing the <u>process</u> the Offeror would take to perform phase 1 and phase 2 of the DRPA work order, not to propose a replacement IMU solution.</p> <p>The Attachment A Statement of Work Section 2.3 Table 6 DRPA work order N12 is intended for the Offeror to evaluate the legacy inertial measurement unit (IMU) assembly, (reference NSROC III eLibrary document “Sounding Rocket Program Handbook” page 44 for the characteristics and capabilities of the legacy IMU), as part of the phase 1 study of requirements definition and market research to determine what components (if any) the Offeror wishes to retain within the IMU assembly and what components (if any) the Offeror intends to purchase from external vendors or manufacture in house at NSROC.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Attachment A Statement of Work Section 2.3 Table 6 DRPA work order N12, revised accordingly.</p>
<p>56. Section L.29 GSFC 52.215-221 Cost Volume Instructions (MAY 2014) includes Subsection 2. Cost Proposal Format, (h) COMMERCIAL ROCKET MOTORS AND FLIGHT TERMINATION SYSTEM. The instruction is: “Offerors shall complete Exhibit 6B detailing the proposed flight termination system costs by GFY to be bid under WBS Level 3 – recurring DRPA.” Exhibit 6B is titled “Flight Termination System – Commercial Ordnance Package.” Exhibits 1 and 2 (all) use the terminology “Flight Termination System Ordnance.” Question: What items is the Offeror including in the exhibit – the Ordnance package, or the proposed flight termination system?</p>	<p>Enclosure 1, Top Program Technical Challenges, item 2 updated to clarify the intent for the Offerors to provide solutions for a flight termination ordnance system only, not a comprehensive flight termination system.</p> <p>Offerors should include only the flight termination system (FTS) ordnance package costs (i.e. safe/arm device(s), transfer line(s), destruct charge(s), etc.) in Cost Exhibit 6B. If there are any additional costs associated with qualification or implementation of the flight termination system ordnance package into the Program, the material costs should be included in Cost Exhibit 6B and the labor hours/costs should be included in Cost Exhibit 6C. The hours/costs in Cost Exhibit 6C should be rolled into Cost Exhibit 2J (WBS Level 3 – Recurring DRPA), R1 for rocket motors and R4 for FTS ordnance.</p> <p>Costs for the Program’s qualified legacy flight termination system electronic components (i.e. receivers, logic units, batteries, antennas, etc.) have been included in Cost Exhibit 2J (WBS Level 3 Recurring DRPA) under “Materials” and “Other Subcontracts”.</p> <p>Solicitation provision L.29, section 2(h), second paragraph has been revised to reflect the change in wording from “proposed flight termination system costs” to “proposed flight termination commercial ordnance package costs”.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Solicitation provision L.29, section 2(h), and Enclosure 1, Top Program Technical Challenges, item 2, revised accordingly.</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>57. SOW 2.1.1.6, page 10, paragraph 1 states “The Contractor shall implement a comprehensive proactive maintenance program for all government property. All required maintenance shall be performed in accordance with the original manufacturer’s specifications as necessary to keep the government property functioning in accordance with government safety and property management requirements and standards.”</p> <p>Question: In order to effect a smooth transition of data and responsibilities, please provide a description of the government property maintenance process currently being used on NSROC II, including the names of any databases and tools. Are the current databases and tools available to NSROC III as GFP?</p>	<p>Current databases and tools will not be made available to NSROC III as GFP. The Government expects that the successful incoming NSROC III contractor to provide their own databases and tools in accordance with their approach.</p> <p>The incoming NSROC III contractor will receive spreadsheets in Excel format containing all available information on the government property that will need to be loaded into the incoming NSROC III contractor’s property management system.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>58. SOW 2.1.1.6, page 11, paragraph 3 states “The Contractor shall provide property management system support that meets the requirements of FAR 45-Government Property and NFS 1845-Government Property. The NSROC III Contractor shall track all Institutional Accountable Government Property drawn from Program Stock.”</p> <p>Question: In order to effect a smooth transition of data and responsibilities, please provide a description of the government property management system currently being used on NSROC II, including the names of any databases and tools. Are the current system, databases, and tools available to NSROC III as GFP?</p>	<p>See response to item 57.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>59. SOW 2.1.1.6, page 12, paragraph 7 states “The Contractor shall develop a stock and inventory management system to track and control all program supplies to ensure that all are available to support contract requirements when needed. ... The Contractor shall maintain assigned property including documentation indicating type and date of maintenance and calibrations performed.”</p> <p>Question: In order to effect a smooth transition of data and responsibilities, please provide a brief description of the stock and inventory management system currently being used on NSROC II, including the maintenance and calibrations database and procedures. Are the current system, databases, documentation, and tools available to NSROC III as GFP?</p>	<p>See response to item 57.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>60. SOW 2.1.1.6 page 13, paragraph 2 states “For rocket motors and pyrotechnic devices, the Contractor shall keep and make available to NASA records which document continuous compliance with manufacturer’s storage, transport, and operational recommendations.”</p> <p>Question: In order to avoid duplication of effort, will the government provide the current manufacturer’s storage, transport, and operational recommendations to NSROC III as GFP?</p>	<p>Yes, the manufacturer’s recommendations for storage, transport, and operations for the rocket motors and pyrotechnic devices will be provided to the successful NSROC III contractor as GFP.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>61. Cost Exhibits 1 and 6; SOW 2.1.1.6. “The Contractor shall be responsible for procuring commercially available rocket motors for the NSRP.... The legacy commercial rocket motors purchased in support of the NSRP are the Black Brant sustainer and the Nihka exo-atmospheric rocket motors, both of which are manufactured by Magellan Aerospace. NASA has also provided several Oriole sustainer rocket motors to NSROC that were flown in support of the NSRP. The Oriole sustainer rocket motor is manufactured by ATK. The Contractor shall procure either the legacy rocket motors or comparable, flight-qualified motors including associated flight-qualified hardware...”</p> <p>QUESTION A: Will the government provide additional mission specifications, including total payload mass, desired apogee altitude, any "time above altitude" requirements, and any "time on target" requirements sufficient for motor and FTS ordnance pricing? Rationale for question: To provide a priced list of appropriately-configured commercial rocket motors (whether legacy or comparable) and FTS ordnance packages in Cost Exhibit 6 and summarized on lines 37 and 38 in Exhibit 1, offerors must have mission specifications (or make assumptions) beyond the mission complexity levels and launch locations given in the SOW mission model. While a general program-level approach to the challenge of providing new commercial motors (enclosure 1) can be developed without individual mission specifications, that approach will not be a sufficient basis on which to select and price particular motor configurations to satisfy the mission model.</p> <p>QUESTION B: Alternatively, will the government accept offeror assumptions for these specifications; or as a third alternative, provide a “plug in” value for these costs?</p> <p>QUESTION C: If offeror assumptions are to be used, will the government describe how those assumptions will be evaluated?</p>	<p>Question A: See response to items 13 and 37. The Government will not provide additional mission specifications above the MCL level, launch location, and vehicle configuration for each mission.</p> <p>Question B and C: The performance capabilities of the current sounding rocket vehicle configurations identified in Attachment A, Statement of Work, Section 2.2, Table 3, Baseline Mission Model are provided in the eLibrary document titled “Updated Vehicle Performance.” If an Offeror chooses to propose a non-legacy rocket motor or vehicle configuration they should provide similar vehicle performance capability curves as those in the eLibrary document titled “Updated Vehicle Performance” and demonstrate that the motor and vehicle configuration is comparable as defined in Attachment A, Statement of Work, Section 2.1.1.6 (Government Property).</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None</p>

Industry Question	Government Response
<p>62. L.28, 3. Subfactor C, Page 90; and L.30, page 98. Small Business Plan & Past Performance Volume, a) Information from Offeror</p> <p>Question: Will NASA consider changing the small business goal to 25% of total proposed contract <i>labor</i> value?</p> <p>Rationale for question: Since a considerable portion of the NSROC III contract value is non-labor, the 25% small business goal is impractical to reach through subcontract labor alone. To reach this goal without subcontracting a majority of the workforce to small businesses, non-labor value will also have to be subcontracted, in some cases to various small businesses within the socioeconomic categories. This scenario could result in unnecessary inefficiencies through redundancy of procurement systems.</p>	<p>The small business goals set forth in the solicitation will remain as shown. NASA GSFC's Industry Assistance Office performed an assessment of the small business subcontracting opportunities for this NSROC III follow-on procurement based on historical data and an in-depth review of the functional requirement of each element of work to establish the subcontracting goals included in the solicitation.</p> <p>As stated at solicitation provision L.28, GSFC 52.215-210, Mission Suitability Proposal Instructions, section 3, Mission Suitability Instructions by Subfactor, Subfactor C, Small Business Utilization, paragraph (a)(4), "Offerors are encouraged to propose goals that are equivalent to or greater than those recommended by the Contracting Officer. However, offerors must perform an independent assessment of the small business subcontracting opportunities and are encouraged to propose goals exceeding the recommended goals where practical."</p> <p>Also, note that paragraph (a)(6) states, in part, "Offerors shall discuss the rationale for any goal proposed that is less than the Contracting Officer's recommended goal in any category. In addition, the Offeror shall describe the efforts made to establish a goal for that category and what ongoing efforts, if any, the Offeror plans during performance to increase participation in that category."</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>
<p>63. L.28 3. Subfactor C, page 90; and L.30, page 98 Small Business Plan & Past Performance Volume, a) Information from Offeror.</p> <p>Question: Will NASA consider adjusting the significant subcontractor threshold for purposes of Past Performance to 10% of total proposed contract labor value, or alternatively, \$2 million annual subcontract labor value?</p> <p>Rationale for question: The \$5 million threshold for significant subcontractors is impractical to meet with labor only, particularly when taking into account a 25% goal for small business. This poses a similar difficulty of spreading motor and material acquisition across subcontractors to meet the threshold.</p>	<p>Based on review of the Statement of Work requirements for this procurement, the Government will revise the threshold definition for Significant Subcontractor to \$2M.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> Solicitation provisions L.30 and M.6 revised accordingly.</p>
<p>64. SOW, Section 2.1.2.12 United States of America Export Regulations</p> <p>Question: Will NASA be responsible for the import of all equipment, systems, materials and supplies that could potentially return to the United States?</p>	<p>Yes, the import of equipment, systems, materials, and supplies that could return to the United States would be covered by the NASA obtained export license.</p> <p><u>Revision to DRFP documents:</u> None.</p>