KC-46 Landing Gear PBL: RFP Q&A

2/9/2026

Q1: When you request our past performance information from our customer base, in addition to the B767 can we use our other customers using similar landing gear (i.e. B737)?

A1: *As stated in Section L, paragraph 5.4, it is the offeror's responsibility to submit contracts that their team deems relevant. The solicitation grants offerors the flexibility to select examples they feel best demonstrate their ability to meet the requirements.*

Per the instructions, your proposal must include a narrative for each submitted contract that explains what aspects of the contracts are deemed relevant to the proposed effort and to what Technical subfactors they relate.

The Government will use this narrative, along with other information, to evaluate the relevance of the past performance in accordance with Section M. Therefore, when you choose to submit a contract, you must use the narrative to clearly justify its relevance to this acquisition.

Q2: Confirmation of whether 202513111-100, 202513111-200, and 202513111-300 are USAF top-level assembly numbers.

A2: *202513111 (-100, -200, and -300) are USAF top level assembly part numbers grouping all OEM part numbers that the USAF would like included in a full shipset, as identified in TRD Main, section 3.8.*

Q3: The corresponding OEM/manufacturer part numbers (if different) for these full assemblies.

A3: *There is not a singular OEM part number defining what the USAF considers a shipset. USAF drawing 202513111 groups various system specific assembly part numbers into a single definition for a shipset.*

Q4: Any available cross-reference, bill of materials, or breakdown that identifies the component-level part numbers comprising these assemblies.

A4: *Per section L, paragraph 2.3 and 2.4, USAF is requesting that proposals be based on a -300F series landing gear to demonstrate technical proficiency. Final USAF shipset configuration management will be agreed upon post-award, and any necessary cross-references will be provided at that time.*

2/25/2026

Q5: Would it be acceptable to include a compliance matrix for the FAR/DFAR requirements and note which ones the offeror complies with and which ones are not applicable or self-deleting?

A5: *Please see Section L 6.7 which addresses "Exceptions to Solicitation Requirements" including the format for how this information should be provided*.

Q6: On page 23 of the solicitation SPRHA1-26-R-4646, are the FAR/DFARS reference missing from "Inspection and Acceptance" and from "F.O.B. Origin"?

A6: These are not FAR/DFARS clauses. These sections are fill-ins for the contractor to indicate the facility code and address where inspection, acceptance, and transportation actions will occur for the requirements which specify these activities occur at Origin.

3/4/2026

Q7: Could you please advise how offerors can obtain the applicable drawings and technical specifications for the KC-46 landing gear DLRs, shipsets, and subcomponents covered under this PBL? Do you have a copy of the DMWR or the TDP?

***A7*:** Due to data release restrictions, the government is unable to provide the KC-46 CMMs prior to award. Please see section L for proposal submission requirements, specifically:

> 2.3 Technical Data For Purposes of Proposing – Due to data release restrictions, the required overhaul/remanufacture Component Maintenance Manuals (CMMs) for the KC-46/2C landing gear will not be provided prior to contract award. The successful offeror will receive access to these CMMs upon contract award. For proposal purposes, offerors are required to leverage their understanding of the 767-300F series landing gear and demonstrate their experience and capability to remanufacture that version of landing gear. However, offerors are encouraged to identify and discuss any remanufacture gaps between the 767-300F and the 2C gear.
>
> 3.5.1 The offeror shall submit a detailed remanufacture plan that thoroughly demonstrates experience and capability to remanufacture the entire 767-300F shipset, covering all processes from start to finish IAW TRD Appendix C paragraph 2.0 Remanufacturing Process through 2.18 Rob-Back/Cannibalization. The plan must also provide evidence that the offeror possesses facilities and equipment with

the capacity to remanufacture Landing Gear shipsets IAW the Time Change Interval (TCI) schedule (section J attachment 5).

3/6/2026

Q8: Under the proposal guidelines section 2.23.1 of the subject RFP, the requirement for a single digital page size is noted (8.5 x 11). Can you please advise if flowcharts, or Gantt charts showing timelines and process steps can be larger to accommodate the format (Assist in being able to view)?

***A8*:** RFP Section L 2.23.2 addresses tables, charts, graphs, and figures but fails to specify a page size that can be used for these depictions. The RFP will be amended to read as follows:

> *2.23.2 Legible tables, charts, graphs, and figures shall be used wherever practical to depict organizations, systems and layout, implementation schedules, plans, etc. These displays shall be uncomplicated, legible and shall not exceed 11 x 17 inches in size. These pages may only be used for large tables, charts, graphs, diagrams, and schematics, not for pages of text. Oversized images or figures should be designed to be easily navigable and viewable within the digital document. For tables, charts, graphs and figures, the text shall be no smaller than 10-point.*

Q9: The RFP Section M 2.3.5 defines 'Team Member'. For clarity, could you provide guidance on how this definition and the requirement for a teaming agreement applies in the following two common subcontracting scenarios?

- Scenario A: A supplier is used for a single, specialized, or proprietary process on a component part, as one step in a larger overhaul or manufacturing effort managed by the prime contractor.
- Scenario B: A supplier is used to perform a standard, commercially available process (e.g., a specific type of coating) for which numerous qualified sources exist.

Is a teaming agreement required in either of these scenarios?

***A9*:** The RFP defines a 'Team Member' as a subcontractor that meets both of the following conditions: (1) they have program level responsibility and oversight, AND (2) their capability, certifications, or qualifications are utilized to satisfy the Technical Factor.

A subcontractor who performs a discrete task, service, or process under the program management and oversight of the prime contractor would not typically meet the definition of a 'Team Member,' as they do not have 'program level responsibility.' This appears to be true in both Scenario A and Scenario B as described.

Therefore, from a compliance standpoint, the RFP would not require a teaming agreement for subcontractors in these scenarios.

Separately, offerors are reminded that the decision to enter into a teaming agreement is ultimately a matter of each offeror's individual business judgment and risk management strategy. While it may not be required, an offeror may determine that a teaming agreement is beneficial to secure capacity, pricing, or commitment from a critical or sole-source supplier. The responsibility rests with the offeror to determine the appropriate business arrangements necessary to successfully perform the contract.

3/23/2026

Q10: In section 6.3 of subject RFP, the requirement is to input 365 days into block 12 (which is labeled discount terms) and block 16. I believe this should be fill out block 17a and sign form.

A10: The requirement references the incorrect blocks. The RFP will be amended to read as follows: "Section A – Solicitation/Contract Form: Complete blocks 17a, 17b, 30a, 30b, and 30c of the SF 1449. Signature by the offeror on the SF 1449 constitutes a binding proposal."

Q11: Regarding the electrical harness, we would like clarification as to what the requirements are related to the wiring whether test/repair of wire bundle assemblies are acceptable or replace all wires with new regardless of condition. CMM only provides repair instruction, when necessary, as this is standard practice.

A11: No, replacement of all wires with new regardless of condition would not be required. As stated in TRD Appendix C 2.0 for remanufacturing, overhauls should be completed IAW the applicable CMMs. If a serviceable asset can be provided through repair, then a new electrical harness would not be required.

Q12: Regarding the metering valve assembly, does the remanufacture requirement apply as defined in TRD Appendix 2.0 or does the USAF want this assembly to be test and repair?

A12: The USAF requires remanufacture as defined in TRD Appendix C 2.0 for a component to be returned in a serviceable condition. All unserviceable landing gear parts will be subject to disassembly, inspection and a complete remanufacture, modification/update,

and test of each end-item and all associated components, when applicable, will be performed per 14 CFR part 43 and approved for return to service in accordance with the latest versions of applicable Component Maintenance Manuals (CMMs). USAF considers the metering valve assembly to be an associated component as defined in Appendix C section 2.0 requiring remanufacture.

3/30/2026

Q13: In Appendix B, the RTAT is noted in para 4.1 as 75 days plus 7 days for shipping for a total of 82 days. In the TRD Main attachment, it states in para 3.8.2 that the RTAT is 90 days. While this may appear somewhat insignificant, given the disincentive penalties, I think it should be clarified.

A13: The 82-day metric (ELT metric) in Paragraph 4.1 of TRD Appendix B refers to the full shipsets that will be sent in to support the 10-year TCI. This is a metric set by the government for return of the overhauled shipsets.

TRD Main paragraph 3.8.2 refers to the subcomponent overhauls that will be sent in on individual orders on an as needed basis. Please note that this is a different requirement than the shipset requirement in paragraph 4.1 above. The example in 3.8.2 lists an agreed upon RTAT of 90 days and gives an example of contractor delivery requirements. In the TEP (Attachment 6) the government has listed a NTE RTAT of 90 days and are requesting offerors to propose an RTAT for each subcomponent.

Both metrics are clearly defined in TRD main 3.7 paragraph 3.7.1 (ELT) and 3.7.2 (RTAT) and further outlined in Appendix B.

Q14: Also, in Appendix B, the timeframe to notify DCMA after completion is 24 hours. I think perhaps it is more plausible that the time frame be amended to notification NLT than COB of the following normally scheduled workday as I can see some potential conflicts with the ability to that with weekends and holidays.

A14: The 24-hour notification requirement in Appendix B should be considered a component of the production schedule in meeting the RTAT. This includes planning for compliance in all scenarios. In situations where the 24-hour period concludes on a weekend or holiday, the offeror would be expected to plan accordingly to ensure notification is made, meeting RTAT requirements.

4/7/2026

Q15: In TRD Appendix C, para 2.4.2, SSLLP Verification, has a reference to TRD Main, paragraph 3.16.3 for reporting SSLLP discrepancies from Attachment 3 received from the Government. I do not see paragraph 3.16.3 in the TRD Main document. Can you please advise. How should we notify the Government?

A15: This is a typo in TRD Appendix C. The correct reference is 3.15.3 in the TRD Main. The TRD doesn't specify "how" the notification should be made but states "the contractor must notify the Government before starting any remanufacturing work on any LLPs in the assembly." An amendment will be issued to correct the attachment.

Q16: In TRD Appendix A, para 6.2.1.1, if a sub-component has multiple SSLLP and one or some of the SSLLP do not meet the usable cycles to rework for use, and the contractor is required to replace the part(s) with new, does the Government cover the replacement cost of these parts?

A16: The replacement costs for these parts should be built into the FFP associated with sub-component remanufacture. Per TRD 3.8.2: "For the sub-component DLRs the contractor will be required to provide a single FFP for remanufacture of each sub-component DLR NIIN. The Government will provide an unserviceable asset, and the contractor will be required to deliver a remanufactured, serviceable asset within the negotiated RTAT."

4/17/2026

Q17: If an offeror is currently in the process of obtaining AS9110 certification but will not have it finalized prior to the proposal submission deadline, will the proposal still be considered compliant?

A17: AS9110 certification is a mandatory prerequisite for award. For offerors that do not hold a current AS9110 certification, our intent is to allow offerors to submit a comprehensive plan that shows how they will obtain certification prior to contract award. Sections L & M of the RFP have been updated to clarify this requirement in RFP amendment 0004.

4/30/2026

Q18: Specific to sub-component pricing, - if a sub-component is scrap (i.e. axle, torque arm, etc.) how is the contractor compensated for the level of work performed?

A18: If a sub-component item is deemed scrap, the government will assess whether to utilize O&A funding to either fund the additional costs required to repair the existing asset and bring it back to a serviceable condition or to fund the additional cost for the contractor to provide a new replacement asset, if available.

In the event the government chooses not to exercise the above options, they will take the condemnation on the scrapped asset. In this situation, the government agrees that the contractor should be compensated for work performed during the tear down and evaluation up to the point of scrap and will utilize the O&A to provide reimbursement for actuals only, exclusive of any profit or fee. An update to TRD Appendix A will be made to include this allowance in a future RFP amendment.

Q19: Specific to sub-component pricing, is the contractor responsible for replacing a scrap sub-component end item with new?

A19: No, the contractor is not responsible for replacing scrap/BER sub-component end items with new ones (If there is an option for the Government to procure a new replacement sub-component from the contractor, the government would evaluate this option utilizing the procedures outlined in TRD Appendix A, Section 8.0, Subsection (c). In accordance with TRD Main 3.8.2, the contractor must provide a single FFP for the remanufacture of each sub-component DLR NIIN. In the event a sub-component is deemed BER, the contractor shall adhere to the process outlined in TRD Appendix A, Section 8.0, Subsection (c).

Q20: Several of the sub-component items contain identified O&A parts (Attachment 6) within the assemblies. Would these O&A parts be considered for GFM for the sub-components if they scrap as they are for the shipsets?

A20: No, the government does not intend to provide GFM for O&A parts that scrap during the overhaul of subcomponents. The GFM is only provided as a last resort option on the shipsets given the criticality of returning the shipsets to the USAF in the specified timeframe.

However, the government does recognize the potential challenge these high price, low failure items can create when developing a FFP for the subcomponents. The government intends to amend the TRD to allow for the additional repair (outside of CMM requirements) or replacement of the O&A parts to be paid for outside of the FFP proposed in the TEP. Additionally, there are methods for addressing other unique instances spelled out in the subcomponent BER (scrap) portion of the TRD utilizing O&A funding. An update to the TRD outlining this change will be made in a future RFP amendment.

6/8/2026

Q21: Technical Requirements Document (TRD) Paragraph 3.5(d) requires contractors to have a System Security Plan (SSP) in accordance with NIST SP 800-171 in effect at the time the solicitation is issued, or as authorized by the Contracting Officer. How does this requirement impact prospective bidders who have not completed the Basic Assessment prior to the release of the solicitation?

A21: TRD Paragraph 3.5(d) does not require offerors to have completed the assessment prior to the release of the solicitation. The phrase "in effect at the time the solicitation is issued" refers to the specific version of the NIST SP 800-171 publication that serves as the standard, not the timeline for when the Contractor's System Security Plan (SSP) must be created. While bidders are not required to have completed the assessment prior to receiving the solicitation, the offeror must have a completed SSP and a summary assessment score posted in the Supplier Performance Risk System (SPRS) prior to contract award.