(a) The purpose(s) of this amendment is to publish answers to questions received during the question window of June 4-9, 2026.

(b) **Attachment A**, **RESPONSES TO INDUSTRY QUESTIONS**, provides responses to questions and comments provided by industry. **Attachment B, CHANGE LOG**, provides a From-To Matrix of changes made to the solicitation.

(c) In relation to NextSTEP-3 Appendix E: NEXUS Backward-Compatible Ka-Band Relay Section 1.2, General Information for Participants, third bullet *Point of Contact*, and seventh bullet, *Inquiries*, the five (5) calendar day period for questions or comments relative to this acquisition has closed (i.e., questions and comments relative to this acquisition were previously due no later than June 9, 2026). At this time, the Government is no longer accepting additional questions or comments in relation to the solicitation, as released on June 4, 2026. However, questions or comments are conditionally permitted, provided they are limited to the Amendment 01 information contained herein. Submission of questions or comments in relation to Amendment 01 shall be submitted via email to the designated point(s) of contact no later than 5:00 P.M. Central Time, June 25, 2026.

(d) All other terms and conditions of solicitation 80MSFC26R0006 remain unchanged.

ATTACHMENT A – RESPONSES TO INDUSTRY RFP QUESTIONS

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
1	SCAN-MSFC-0001, Attachment F	What are the FFP contract values expect to be for CLIN 1, 2 and 3?	The Government is not authorized to disclose the total funding available for this competitive procurement. Offerors must provide separate proposed pricing for each CLIN, including distinct pricing for CLIN 2 and the optional CLIN 3 demonstration extension and service-validation phase. See Section 4.6, Volume III, Price Volume.
2	SCAN-MSFC-0001	How much does project NEXUS expect to contribute toward obtaining 8 Sci Ka comms links?	The Government is not authorized to disclose the total funding available for this competitive procurement. The Government's contributions are dependent upon the number of contracts awarded, if any, and the individual solution(s) offered Furthermore, in accordance with Section 4.1, the Government will not respond to an offeror regarding evaluations, opinions, or recommendations related to any proposed approaches or concepts.
3	_NextSTEP-3+APPENDIX+E_NEXUS+BC+Ka-Band+Relay+BAA_80MSFC26R0006, 4.3 Proposal Format and Contents	Please clarify it the font size for graphics and charts is 12-points.	The Times New Roman font style and 12-point font size will apply to all information provided in the offeror's page limited Volumes in accordance with Section 4.3 Instructions for the page limited volumes. For example, graphics and charts shall be in 12-point, Times New Roman font.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
4	_NextSTEP-3+APPENDIX+E_NEXUS+BC+Ka-Band+Relay+BAA_80MSFC26R0006, 5.1 Evaluation, C. Corporate Contribution	BAA Section 5.1, Part C states, "To receive a Pass, the Offeror must demonstrate that it is making a meaningful corporate contribution that is directly relevant to the proposed NEXUS effort." Meaningful and directly relevant are subjective terms and there is no indication of how Offerors corporate contributions will be rated meaningful ore directly relevant. Will NASA provide clear evaluation criteria regarding corporate contribution to include what makes proposed corporate contributions meaningful, directly relevant, and what exact information is required to provide sufficient information for NASA to evaluate?	Revised Sections 4.4.3(g) and 5.1 C for clarity.

5	_NextSTEP-3+APPENDIX+E_NEXUS+BC+Ka-Band+Relay+BAA_80MSFC26R0006, 5.1 Evaluation, Volume III – PRICE VOLUME	BAA Section 5.1, Volume III – PRICE VOLUME states, "In connection with the price reasonableness evaluation, NASA will assess the impact of the Offeror's proposed corporate contributions on price reasonableness." It is unclear how corporate contributions will affect proposed evaluated price or how corporate contributions will be used to assess price reasonableness. It is our understanding that corporate contributions are commercial investments that the Offeror makes that may benefit the solution for this BAA, without charging NASA for the entirety of the commercial investment. If this assumption is correct, any costs directly associated with the requirements of this program would be directly charged in the price proposal for this BAA. As such, corporate contributions should not be added to the total evaluated price, or be used in the assessment of price reasonableness. Will NASA confirm that corporate contributions proposed will not be added to the total evaluated price in Attachment J?	NASA confirms that proposed corporate contributions will not be added to the Net Proposed Price in Attachment J. Please note that this solicitation does not utilize the term "Total Evaluated Price." As outlined in Section 5.1 (Evaluation, Volume III – Price Volume), NASA will evaluate overall price reasonableness in an integrated manner. This evaluation considers available funds, CLIN pricing, corporate contributions, milestone payment structures, and consistency with the technical approach. Corporate contributions explain the difference between the total resources required to perform the technical scope and the direct price proposed to the Government. Per Solicitation Section 4.6 (Volume III – Price Volume, General Instructions), any corporate contribution that affects a CLIN's cost must be fully reflected in the proposed CLIN price. The narrative must clearly explain how contributions were applied, and the pricing model must show those impacts mathematically and consistently across all CLINs. To achieve this, Attachment J, Tab 6 "Corporate Contributions" Worksheet is provided to fully delineate these contributions. As indicated in the Attachment J instructions, the Offeror must document if they have included any corporate contributions in the proposed price.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
			Attachment J (Pricing Model) has been modified via this amendment to reflect this mathematically. Offerors must enter the total price of the CLIN (including the cost of corporate contributions) and use the designated reduction line to subtract the corporate contribution. This ensures the contribution acts as a cost reduction, leaving only the net direct price in the Net Proposed Price.

6	NextSTEP-3+APPENDIX+E_NEXUS+BC+Ka-Band+Relay+BAA_80MSFC26R0006, 4.4.3 (g) Corporate Contribution	Section (g), Corporate Contributions, states that NASA expects proposals to include a mix of in-kind contributions to the proposed effort "as opposed to claiming all corporate contributions based on prior investments." Could NASA clarify how offerors should account for and receive evaluation credit for substantial pre-existing corporate investments that directly enable performance of the NEXUS service, such as operational ground infrastructure, network operations centers, mission operations systems, terrestrial connectivity, cybersecurity capabilities, and other facilities or equipment already developed and funded at private expense? Specifically, may offerors identify and quantify the value of such existing infrastructure and capabilities as corporate contributions when those assets will be used to support NEXUS performance, and if so, what methodology or level of supporting detail does NASA expect for evaluation purposes?	See Section 4.4.3(g), Corporate Contributions. Pre-existing corporate investments may be proposed as corporate contributions only to the extent they are directly relevant to, and will be used in support of, the proposed NEXUS effort. Offerors should not claim the full historical development cost of broader commercial infrastructure, systems, facilities, or capabilities as a NEXUS corporate contribution. Instead, Offerors should identify and value only the estimated specific portion, use, service, or incremental cost being contributed to support NEXUS performance. For example, an Offeror should not claim the full development cost of a launch vehicle, ground network, or operations center solely because that capability may support the proposed approach. However, the Offeror may identify and value the specific launch service, dedicated ground support, operational capacity, or other directly relevant contribution being provided to NEXUS. Offerors should clearly identify the proposed contribution, describe how it supports NEXUS performance, provide the estimated value being contributed, and explain the basis for that value. Corporate contributions must be documented in Attachment I, Corporate Contribution Worksheet, and reflected in the pricing model, as applicable. NASA's expectation for a mix of in-kind contributions remains unchanged. NASA will evaluate corporate contributions in accordance with the solicitation.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
7	NextSTEP-3+APPENDIX+E_NEXUS+BC+Ka-Band+Relay+BAA_80MSFC26R0006, 2.2 Emphasis of Appendix E	Given that Offerors must submit firm-fixed-price CLIN 2 and CLIN 3 pricing prior to completion of CLIN 1 concept maturation and risk reduction activities, how does NASA intend to address the pricing uncertainty associated with long-lead procurements, launch commitments, and supplier selection decisions that may occur before CLIN 1 is completed?	NASA will evaluate overall price reasonableness using the price analysis techniques described in FAR 15.404-1(b). NASA may consider the reasonableness of the price in relation to available funds, proposed CLIN pricing, proposed corporate contributions, milestone payment structure, and consistency between the proposed price, schedule, and technical approach. in accordance with the solicitation's requirements seen in Volume III. A FFP acquisition is appropriate when performance uncertainties can be identified and estimated. Therefore, an Offeror should identify its uncertainties and estimate accordingly.
8	NextSTEP-3+APPENDIX+E_NEXUS+BC+Ka-Band+Relay+BAA_80MSFC26R0006, 2.2 Emphasis of Appendix E	If NASA awards multiple CLIN 1 contracts, what criteria will be used to determine which contractors, if any, receive CLIN 2 and CLIN 3 option exercises? Does NASA anticipate a competitive down-select process, independent assessments of each performer, or another approach?	Please refer to Section 6.2, Post Award, 6.2.1, Use of Options. Any contract(s) awarded as a result of this solicitation will include pricing for CLINs 1, 2, and 3. In accordance with this section, the Government is not obligated to award CLINs 2 and 3 under any resulting contract. Therefore, down-select procedures do not apply.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
9	NextSTEP-3+APPENDIX+E_NEXUS+BC+Ka-Band+Relay+BAA_80MSFC26R0006, 4.5, (2) (iii) Transition to Service and Business Approach	1. NASA states that NEXUS will inform future decisions regarding sustained relay services but does not establish a follow-on acquisition. 2. When does NASA currently envision a future procurement for operational relay services? 3. What level of interoperability among multiple providers is NASA seeking to preserve?	1. See Section 2.2, Emphasis of Appendix E. This solicitation does not establish or guarantee a follow-on acquisition for sustained operational relay services. 2, Future decisions regarding sustained operational relay services will be impacted by the results of this effort, NASA mission needs at the time, demonstrated performance, commercial viability of proposed solutions, and standard acquisition planning processes. 3. The Offeror must describe how backward compatibility and interoperability will be achieved and tested with legacy TDRS-compatible Ka-band users without requiring modification to customer vehicle onboard systems, including interfaces, acquisition and tracking considerations, and how compatibility will be demonstrated during testing and on-orbit validation. See Section 4.5, Subfactor 1 – Technical Approach, (1)(iv).

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
10	NextSTEP-3+APPENDIX+E_NEXUS+BC+Ka-Band+Relay+BAA_80MSFC26R0006, 5.1, Volume II, Subfactor 1 – Technical Approach, (2) (iii) - Transition to Service and Business Approach	What factors will NASA consider when evaluating whether a proposed relay architecture represents a commercially sustainable solution? For example, will NASA consider non-NASA revenue opportunities, commercial customer diversification, production scalability, or reliance on future Government demand?	See Section 4.5, Subfactor 1 – Technical Approach, (2) (iii), Transition to Service and Business Approach. The Offeror must describe the approach for transitioning from demonstration to sustained service, including the technical, operational, interoperability, continuity, and commercial business elements needed to support scalability, sustainment, mission assurance, and long-term service delivery. The response must address how the proposed approach supports a successful and economical relay capability with commercially sustainable spacecraft design, production, deployment, and operations. The Offeror must describe an approach that enables service scalability beyond NASA for other Government or authorized mission users, as applicable, without providing or implying commercial access to NEXUS Ka-band frequencies reserved for Government mission use.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
11	NextSTEP-3+APPENDIX+E_NEXUS+BC+Ka-Band+Relay+BAA_80MSFC26R0006, 4.4.3 Eligibility Information (f) Launch Vehicle and Deployment	For hosted-payload approaches, how will NASA evaluate the risks associated with dependence on a host spacecraft operator relative to architectures in which the offeror owns and controls the relay spacecraft platform?	See SOO Section 4.4. Other hosted payloads are permitted and encouraged; however, such payloads must not degrade, interfere with, constrain, delay, or otherwise adversely affect the NEXUS relay service or the Offeror's ability to meet NEXUS performance, availability, cybersecurity, schedule, operational, or service continuity requirements. Spacecraft commodities can be shared with hosted payloads, but hosted payload anomalies, failures, operating modes, resource demands, mission requirements, or associated ground/user interfaces must not propagate to or impact the NEXUS relay service, operations, or availability. NASA will evaluate proposals consistent with Section 5 of the solicitation.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
12	NextSTEP-3+APPENDIX+E_NEXUS+BC+Ka-Band+Relay+BAA_80MSFC26R0006, 2.6.1 Data Rights	Could NASA clarify the scope of the Government purpose and reprocurement rights it anticipates requiring for capabilities developed under the NEXUS effort, particularly for systems that build upon pre-existing commercial infrastructure and intellectual property?	For any item, component, or process, the Government will have all data rights necessary to maintain, repair, or overhaul the item, component, or process. If mixed funding (i.e., funding from both the Government and the contractor) is involved with the development of an item, component, or process, the Government will also have the rights to conduct a competitive procurement for replacement of the item, component, or process using the related data. For "systems that build upon pre-existing commercial infrastructure and intellectual property," the system will have to be evaluated at the item, component, or process level to determine whether mixed funding was involved in the development. Reference FAR 52.227-14, Alternate II.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
13	SOO 1. Purpose	The SOO encourages hosted payloads and additional service lines on the relay platform and rewards commercially sustainable, scalable solutions. How will NASA evaluate the relative benefit of delivering NEXUS as an incremental service on mature, multi-customer commercial infrastructure already in operation and/or with operator experience already providing this type of service?	The SOO establishes what must be achieved through demonstration to validate service readiness and inform transition to sustained commercially provided relay services. Regarding how the Government will evaluate, see Section 4.5, Subfactor 1 – Technical Approach, (2) (iii), Transition to Service and Business Approach. The Offeror must describe the approach for transitioning from demonstration to sustained service, including the technical, operational, interoperability, continuity, and commercial business elements needed to support scalability, sustainment, mission assurance, and long-term service delivery. The response must address how the proposed approach supports a successful and economical relay capability with commercially sustainable spacecraft design, production, deployment, and operations. NASA is not assigning inherent preference to any specific ownership model, deployment status, or business structure. Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the stated evaluation criteria in Section 5, based on the overall credibility and suitability of the proposed approach to meet NASA mission needs.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
14	Appendix E Section 2.2	1. CLIN 3 / Phase 3: Additional Demonstration, Anomaly Resolution, and Service Validation mentions that Attachment F contains "milestones, associated deliverables, payment structure, and acceptance criteria". Attachment F makes no mention of CLIN 3. 2. What are the expected milestones, associated deliverables, payment structure, and acceptance criteria for CLIN 3?	1. There are no payment milestones associated with CLIN 3. Therefore, this language has been removed from Appendix E Section 2.2, CLIN 3. CLIN 3 Deliverables are consistent with Attachment H, Model Contract, NFS 1852.235-73, Final Scientific and Technical Reports, Alternate II (Deviation). Payment Structure is consistent with Attachment H, Model Contract, NFS 1852.232-80, Submission of Vouchers/Invoices for Payment. (APR 2018) 2. The above documents can be referenced to find the expected milestones, associated deliverables, payment structure, and acceptance criteria for CLIN 3.
15	SRD	Is the DIFI standard an acceptable implementation of the preferred VITA-49.2?	The SRD does not preclude the DIFI standard or implementation. Further, in accordance with Section 4.1, the Government will not respond to an offeror to provide an individual response that will not be provided to other potential offerors. Additionally, the Government will not provide evaluations, opinions, or recommendations regarding any suggested approaches or concepts.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
16	N/A	Will NASA support contractors obtaining orbital slots and licensing at non-TDRS locations?	NASA is not prescribing a specific orbital architecture, deployment approach, ownership model, or technical solution. Offerors must propose the architecture and implementation approach they determine best satisfies the NEXUS requirements, provided the proposed solution supports the service needs of legacy TDRS-compatible users without requiring modifications to current, legacy Government user spacecraft. NASA will evaluate proposals based on feasibility, risk, scalability, operational suitability, interoperability, long-term service flexibility, and the ability to meet the stated requirements and demonstration objectives (See Section 2.1, Acquisition Approach and Scope) In regard to licensing, please refer to the Government's response to Question #17.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
17	N/A	Is it feasible for NASA to influence the licensing of non-standard orbital altitudes for a contractor to provide an optimal NEXUS solution?	As seen in Attachment A1, SOO, Section 4.1, the Offeror must be responsible for securing the appropriate spectrum authorizations from the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), or other applicable regulatory entities, as well as associated ITU filings, for all other aspects of the overall system. Consistent with the above-referenced section, Offerors are responsible for obtaining all required licenses, authorizations, and regulatory approvals for their proposed orbital approach at their own cost and risk. Non-standard orbital altitudes or regimes are permissible if the Offeror demonstrates a credible licensing and operational strategy. NASA does not license commercial satellite systems and cannot guarantee approval of any specific orbital approach. NASA may participate, as appropriate, in Government coordination processes related to spectrum usage and protection of NASA missions and assets. Consistent with Section 5, proposals will be evaluated on the overall credibility and feasibility of the proposed approach, including the regulatory strategy and operational viability of the orbital concept.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
18	J_Pricing Model and Appendix E Solicitation, Section 2.2	Previous drafts of Appendix E included "Please note that no additional proposals will be requested for Phase 2 and Phase 3." That language is not present in the official RFP release; does this indicate that offerors are able to submit updated proposals for CLIN2 and CLIN3 during CLIN 1 or after the completion of CLIN 1?	Offerors will not be allowed to submit revised proposals for CLIN2 and/or CLIN3. After completing its market research, the Government redrafted the solicitation to remove the phased downselect approach that was previously included in the draft solicitation. See 6.2, Post-Award, Subsection 6.2.1 Use of Options, "…this solicitation includes two option CLINs which will not be exercised at the time of contract award <u>but will be evaluated as part of this initial competition as authorized by FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options."</u>
19	Appendix E Solicitation	Would NASA consider giving a 2-week extension due to the level of effort of this opportunity, the changes that have occurred between the draft and final versions, and the July 4th Holiday?	The Government is currently reviewing the proposal submission deadline. Offerors will be notified promptly if any changes are made. At this time, Offerors should continue to plan for and work toward the current published deadline.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
20	Attachment H, Model Contract	Attachment H, Model Contract still has "Draft" markings. Are offerors supposed to do fill-ins into this Draft version or is a final Model Contract going to be released soon? Understanding that filling-in "TBD" is reserved for NASA, could NASA advise where in the Model Contract offerors are expected to provide fillin information? Note: there are no "To be proposed" "TBP" or similar indicators in Attachment H	The NASA Contract Writing System (NCMS) will have a “Draft” marking on all SF-26 contracts that have not been awarded; therefore, the Government cannot alter these documents. As this is the Final Solicitation model contract attachment, any resulting award will require update for tailoring specific to selected offeror(s). Offerors are required to propose CLIN values and complete applicable clauses that require insertion of other contractor specific information (e.g., data assertions). See Section 4.7, Section II.
21	Attachment F, Payment Milestones and Acceptance Criteria	Is the CLIN 3 information missing from the document? NextSTEP-3 Appendix E, page 10 mentioned CLIN 3 milestones would be in attachment F, but they appear to be missing.	There are no payment milestones for CLIN 3 in this solicitation as reflected in Attachment F as well as Attachment H, Model Contract, clause NFS 1852.232-77. A revised Attachment F has been included to reflect a CLIN 3 section clearly identifying there are no payment milestones. Section 2.2, CLIN 3 has also been revised to identify that there are no payment milestones in CLIN 3.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
22	Attachment B, Data Procurement Document, page B-13 (DRL)	The DRL incorrectly lists NEXUS-DRD-07 as the Security Architecture Definitions (SAD). It is actually the Intellectual Property & Data Rights Management Plan (IPDRMP) (per the DRD). Please clarify and/or correct.	This is a typographical error. NEXUS-DRD-005 is the SAD, and NEXUS-DRD-007 is the IPDRMP. The Data Procurement Document (DPD) has been revised to correct the typo in the Table of Contents.
23	Attachment J, Pricing Model	Does the direct labor element cover all labor, or only labor remaining that may not fall under the other cost elements?	The direct labor (row 4) on Tab 3_Cost_Info_by_CLIN of Attachment J Pricing Model covers only the remaining labor that does not fall under the cost elements below it.
24	Attachment J, Pricing Model	Can additional rows be added to the table to increase the labor category amount?	Yes. Offerors are permitted to add additional rows to Tab 3_Cost_Info_by_CLIN of Attachment J Pricing Model to reflect proposed labor necessary to fulfill NEXUS requirements. When inserting rows, the Offeror is responsible for ensuring the accuracy of formulas and figures, which includes update of any underlying Excel formulas, cell references, or summary totals.
25	Attachment J, Pricing Model	What impacts should be captured in Tab 5 of the pricing sheet? Is it just cost related or all impacts?	In accordance with the Tab 5 of the Pricing Model, price related impacts need to be addressed in relation to the price drivers in Column A.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
26	Appendix E, Section 4.3 Proposal Format & Contents (Table 4.1, page 18); Section 4.4.1 Transmittal Letter (vi) (viii (D) page 21; Section 4.7 Volume IV Section II "Small Business Utilization" p.35)	Given that a portion of the scope may be funded by corporate contribution which reduces the potential small business subcontracting opportunities, would it be acceptable for offerors to propose a Commercial Plan (as per FAR 52.219-9) in place of an Individual Subcontracting Plan which is contract specific?	NEXUS is FAR Part 35 solicitation, not a FAR Part 12 solicitation. The NEXUS user capability does not exist in the commercial marketplace. FAR 52.219-9, Alternate II requires that the Offeror submit a Business Subcontracting Plan with the proposal.
27	SRD	Need clarification on proper data handling for program information since the SRD is not portion-marked. Please provide a Security Classification Guide or other guidance as to what specific facts are CUI within the SRD.	The entire document is ITAR and CUI as reflected on the cover page. Security Classification Guides (SCGs) are specifically for classified information, not for CUI or Export Controlled information. CUI is governed by Executive Order 13556 and 32 CFR 2002, and is not classified, but still requires special safeguarding. Offerors are responsible for storing, handling, and understanding the data properly as reflected on the cover page of the document and in accordance with their ITAR registration agreements. This includes, but is not limited to, electronic communications to the Government. Offerors must not handle this data in open electronic communications. Attachment A.2, NEXUS SRD has added the CUI marking to its headers and footers as well.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
28	SRD 2.2.13	The text states that A_o "accounts for items such as loss of system redundancy during failover" but we believe it should state "loss of system availability during failover". It is expected that there is a loss of redundancy during failover since redundancy is a strategy to maintain availability if one piece of the redundant system is unavailable.	Operational Availability is intended to account for the operational impacts associated with failover events. Loss of redundancy alone does not necessarily reduce availability.
29	SRD KaRS-13, KaFS-14, Allowable Degradation	Can NASA clarify if the requirements KaRS-13 and KaFS-14 are intended to size the Space to Ground Link capacity? Or, is this requirement mean to bound only the effects of distortion and interference degradation caused by the relay satellite and ground side processes? The context specifies "excluding free space path loss", yet also specifies "all the hardware and processes in between the ground demarcation and the space demarcation" If KaRS-13 and KaFS-14 are not intended to size the SGL capacity, is there a target maximum C/N0 or C/N that the link shall support?	KaRS-13 and KaFS-14 are not intended to size the SGL but rather bound the total effects due to distortion and other degradations caused by the NEXUS relay satellite and ground systems, exclusive of free space and atmospheric losses. See Attachment A.2 NEXUS SRD, 3.3 Ka-Band Return Service, KaRS-13 and KaRS-14. The SRD does not address a target C/No or C/N.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
30	SRD KaRS-8, KaFS-10, Axial Ratio	Is the intent of KaRS-8, KaFS-10 requirement (Axial Ratio over 3-dB Beamwidth) to specify an axial ratio over the *tracking* beamwidth? What is the significance to the customer of the 3-dB beamwidth vs the expected system tracking beamwidth?	The intent of the axial ratio requirements is to bound the worst-case, expected axial ratio for the NEXUS SSL antenna during tracking (i.e., bound the worst-case polarization mismatch loss expected by the NEXUS customers to meet RF link performance).
31	Attachment B, Data Requirements List (DRL), pg B-13	NEXUS-DRD-007 is listed as Security Architecture Definition (SAD) in the DRD list, but DRD-007 is Intellectual Property & Data Rights Management Plan (IPDRMP). SAD is DRD-005.	Refer to the response to Question 22 above.
32	Appendix E, 3.1	May offerors designate ground entry points in data centers located in each region, at sites of their choosing? Minimizing the length of the data connection from the remote ground stations to the ground entry point is important for maintaining an acceptable Frame Loss rate. If ground entry points are limited to existing NASA PoPs, there may be significantly more complexity required to maintain an acceptable Frame Loss rate from the remote site to the ground entry point.	An Offeror must propose its solution subject to the constraints in Country Group D of SOO Section 4.2 and SRD CS-11.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
33	Appendix E, 4.3	For Volume 1, the transmittal letter is often a separate file or attachment to the proposal rather than directly included in Volume 1. Can the transmittal letter be submitted separately given the letterhead requirements which may differ from the proposal header/footers?	As the transmittal letter is specifically excluded from the page limitation established for Volume I, the transmittal letter may be included in Volume I. However, the transmittal letter must not be submitted as a separate file or attachment from Volume I. See the first paragraph of Section 4.3, Proposal Format and Contents.
34	Appendix E, 4.3	For Volume 1, Table 4.1 states the Transmittal Letter and Executive Summary are both Excluded Items from the page count, while the page numbering instructions state the page number shall start at "1" and increase sequentially. For excluded items, should the page number stay within the sequential numbering, or can the page number be set to a different format such as "i, ii, etc." with sequential numbering starting at the pages included in the page limit?	The following change has been made to the solicitation: All pages must be consecutively numbered, starting with “1” (one) on the first page of each volume with the exception of the Cover Page, Table of Contents, Executive Summary, and the Transmittal Letter. Offerors must number these pages using Roman numerals (i.e., [i, ii, iii]) in order to differentiate these pages from the page limited pages which starts with “1.” Regarding the Launch Vehicle and Deployment evidence, provide these documents after the last Volume I numbered page. Offerors may utilize their own differing numbering nomenclature given these documents are excluded from the Volume I page limitation. See Section 4.3, Proposal Format and Contents.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
35	Appendix E, 4.3	Typically, individual volumes will have a cover page including data rights assertions on the volume as part of the document. Table 4.1 does not explicitly exclude the cover page, nor table of contents from the page limit. Will cover pages and table of (contents / figures / tables) be counted against page limits?	See Government's response to Question #34.
36	Appendix E, 4.3	Are all Graphics required to have text in 12 font? Most current art work is legible as is but changing to TNR-12 will require significant rework and render most unuseable. Is this a correct interpretation of the instructions?	The Times New Roman, 12-point font will apply to all information, including graphics, provided in the offeror's page limited Volumes in accordance with Section 4.3, Instructions for page limited volumes (i.e., Volumes I and II).

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
37	Appendix E, 4.3 and 4.5d	Section 4.3 states that Volumes II and III must be structured by CLIN; however, Section 4.5.d states that Volume II must be structured by Subfactor. These appear to contradict in the case of Volume II. Is Volume II intended to be organized by CLIN or by Technical and Management Subfactors? There may be additional confusion created by the final sentence of 4.5.c, which states "In addition, the Offeror must clearly identify how its proposed approach aligns each below subfactor with the Government identified CLIN structure and the stated goals for each CLIN, demonstrating how their unique approach supports, without deviating from, the CLIN specific objectives and performance." Does this along with 4.3 and 4.5.d imply that the Section 4.5.d ordering must be fully repeated for each CLIN?	Section 4.3 is revised to indicate that only Volume III must be structured by CLIN. Sections 4.3 and 4.5(c) are also revised for clarity.
38	Appendix E, 4.3, Table 4.1	This item "Infrastructure Validation," is vague and unclear. Can NASA provide more direction or guidance in what they expect for this item?	The Government removed the Infrastructure Validation bullet from the Table 4.1, Volume IV - Contract Volume in Section 4.3, Proposal Format and Contents.

39	Appendix E, 4.6	The total number of vendors and suppliers with proposed prices below $20M (categorized as "non-significant subcontractors" in Section 4.6) used for supplies, materials, and equipment in a spacecraft program is in the hundreds, if not thousands. As defined in Section 4.6, the nearly limitless level of detail into the Offeror's supply chain is excessive for a commercial services offering. Recommend limiting separate proposal pricing details to only significant subcontractors and not include sub-tier vendors and suppliers.	The proposal instructions in Section 4.6 remain unchanged. Section 4.6 requires complete price breakdowns and detailed cost narratives for significant subcontractors, which is consistent with FAR 15.404-8(b)(1)(i). For non-significant subcontractors, Offerors must separately identify each subcontractor in the pricing forms and describe the scope and level of support in the narrative Basis of Estimate. Full separate price breakdowns and detailed BOEs are not required for non-significant subcontractors. The solicitation does not require a list of every general vendor or material supplier that provides commodities (e.g., nuts and bolts). Traditional subcontractors (i.e., those performing a specific, substantive portion of the project scope) are typically limited in number; an Offeror will likely have a small number of nonsignificant subcontractors to identify rather than a large number. Since the request is limited to identifying the nonsignificant subcontractors along with their defined scope of work, without requiring a complex pricing breakdown or a detailed Basis of Estimate (BOE), the Government considers its request to be reasonable. Offerors are responsible for providing sufficient information to support the Government's assessment of the reasonableness, completeness,

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
			and credibility of the proposed price in accordance with Section 4.6 Volume III – Price Volume, Non-Significant Subcontractor Information.
40	Appendix E, 4.6	Attachment I is required to be submitted in Vol II as well as Vol IV, Section II. Please clarify if Attachment I must be submitted in both volumes.	Attachment I is required to be submitted in **two separate volumes**: • **Volume III – Price Volume**: The completed Attachment I must be provided as part of the Price Volume submission (along with Attachment J). This supports the price narrative and demonstrates how corporate contributions are reflected in the proposed CLIN prices. • **Volume IV – Contract Volume**: Attachment I must also be provided as part of the Contract Volume submission. This documents the Offeror's proposed corporate contribution commitments that would be incorporated into the contract if selected. Attachment I is **not** required in Volume II (Technical and Management Approach Volume). Offerors must ensure that Attachment I is included in both the Price Volume and Contract Volume as specified above.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
41	Appendix E, 4.7	Section I and Section II both list Attachment H Model Contract as a required submission. Please clarify if Vol IV must include the Model Contract in both Section I and Section II of the submission.	Volume IV is one (1) volume, but it includes three sections (i.e., Sections I, II, and III) within that one (1) volume. Appendix E, Table 4.1 has been revised to reflect that Attachment H Model Contract is an attachment to Volume IV.
42	Appendix E, 4.7	IMS is listed in both Sections II and III. Please clarify if the IMS must be submitted in both sections.	The Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) should be submitted in the Volume IV – Contract Volume. In 4.7, Sections II and III both mention the IMS; however, the IMS will only need to be submitted once in accordance with NEXUS-DRD-019. Table 4.1 has been revised to remove the IMS from Volume II and add the IMS to Volume IV. Note: If selected for award, the proposed IMS will be incorporated into the contract as a Section J attachment for the baseline. Therefore, Attachment H, Model Contract, has also been revised to reflect Section J, Attachment J, Integrated Master Schedule (Baseline).
43	Appendix E, 5.1	May offerors self-identify strengths and weaknesses for NASA to consider, along with any additional that NASA may identify in its review?	Offerors should not assume that self-identified strengths and weaknesses will be adopted as evaluation findings. Offerors are advised to submit proposals that reflect their most favorable terms per the evaluation criteria in Section 5.1.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
44		Is it permissible for an Offeror to share NASA provided Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI), including CUI//SPEXPT, with foreign-owned parent or subsidiary entities, provided the Offeror complies with all applicable export control laws, distribution restrictions, and security requirements?	Offerors and proposed subcontractors (i.e., who require access to export controlled information) must be a U.S. entity to be eligible to participate in this requirement. See Section 3.1, paragraphs (a) and (b).
45	Appendix E Solicitation, section 3.1 (a) Eligibility of Offerors	Can U.S. entities subcontract with non-U.S. entities provided data export control regulations are followed?	Please refer to the Government's response to Question 44.
46		Could you please clarify your expectations for Phase 2 and Phase 3 in the initial proposal, particularly regarding both pricing and technical content? As the RFP is currently written, a full cost breakdown of Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3 are required in this initial submission; however, scope of Phase 2 and Phase 3 will significantly be impacted during Phase 1 execution. Is this the government's intent, or would a detailed cost breakdown limited to Phase 1 be acceptable with Phase 2 and Phase 3 to be re-bid or refined later?	See 2.2, Emphasis of Appendix E, "…structured with a base CLIN and two separately priced option CLINs." See 4.3, Proposal Format and Contents. See 6.2, Post-Award, Subsection 6.2.1 Use of Options, "…this solicitation includes two option CLINs which will not be exercised at the time of contract award <u>but will be evaluated as part of this initial competition as authorized by FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options."</u> Therefore, revised pricing for CLINs 2 and 3 subsequent to any award will not be allowed.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
47		Given that the Phase 2 and Phase 3 scope, design, and demonstration configuration may evolve based on the results and trades performed during Phase 1, what level of technical and management detail do you expect in Volume II for Phase 2 and Phase 3? Do you anticipate the same depth as for Phase 1, or is a higher-level description with notional pricing acceptable, to be revisited after completion of Phase 1?	Please refer to the Government's response to Question 46.
48		Can you please provide more information on the corporate contributions: are these only within Phase 1, if this is a long term contribution beyond Project NEXUS, or during Phase 1, Phase 2, and/or Phase 3 of Project NEXUS?	In accordance with Section 4.4.3 (g) Corporate Contributions, corporate contributions apply to the **overall** NEXUS effort proposed under this solicitation (i.e., Phases 1, 2, and 3 / CLINs 1, 2, and 3).

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
49	H_NEXUS TDRS-BC Model Contract_ 80MSFC26R000X	For contractors that do not have Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) compliant systems, and plan to propose only a commercial Firm-Fixed Pricing solution, we request all clauses associated with a non-commercial solution be removed, or at minimum notated to not apply to providers awarded under FAR Part 12 (SF 1449), or that are providing a commercial solution, to include FAR Part 30 and 31 derived clauses (e.g. 52.230-2, 52.230-6, 52.244-2, 52.215-21) and any NFS equivalents or supplements. We also request confirmation that offerors of commercial solutions shall only be required to submit Data Other Than Certified Cost or Pricing Data.	NEXUS is a FAR Part 35 "Research and Development Contracting" solicitation and not a FAR Part 12 "Acquisition of Commercial Products and Commercial Services" effort. Therefore, the award(s), if any, will be made consistent with the solicitation for this requirement, the relevant clauses that align with the Omnibus, and the current Revolutionary FAR Overhaul. In accordance with Section 5.1 Evaluation, Volume III – Price Volume, certified cost or pricing data is not required due to anticipated competition. However, the Government reserves the right to request "data other than certified cost or pricing data."
50	H_NEXUS TDRS-BC Model Contract_ 80MSFC26R000X	In support of the commercial solution this RFP solicits, we request the Government add relevant FAR Part 12 commercial acquisition clauses, including but not limited to: 52.212-4, 52.212-5, 52.232-29, and 52.232-31.	Please refer to the Government's response to Question 49.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
51	B_Data Procurement Document (DPD)	The DRD-008 Service Financial & Pricing Structure Definition (SFPSD) requirement contains many cost-type contract reporting requirements that are dependent on CAS and certified cost and pricing data systems, meaning, the SFPSD was drafted assuming cost-plus service pricing. Request to remove DRD-008, or, at a minimum, rework to allow for FFP services pricing models.	Please note that Attachment B, DPD, is revised. The revised NEXUS-DRD-008, paragraph 7, states the following: "The SFPSD provides the Government with sufficient insight to assess commercial viability, affordability, long-term service sustainability, and potential pricing-related risks to future service availability. The SFPSD is intended for use in evaluating whether the proposed service pricing approach is practical, scalable, and supportable over time within a commercial fixed-price service acquisition framework. This DRD does not require certified cost or pricing data, cost-accounting system information, Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) compliance information, indirect rate data, detailed cost build-ups, corporate financial statements, profit calculations, return-on-investment analysis, break-even analysis, EBITDA projections, or open-book accounting information."

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
52	_NextSTEP-3 APPENDIX E_NEXUS BC Ka-Band Relay BAA_80MSFC26R0006, Section 4.4.3(g)	Corporate contributions are more commonly seen with Grants, CRADAs, or Space Act Agreements. Requesting to remove this requirement from the BAA. This change would also be reflected in the Contract (CLINs) and Pricing Model (sheet 6) docs.	The corporate contributions requirement will remain unchanged. Corporate contributions are a deliberate element of this BAA and the NextSTEP partnership model. The requirement is intended to demonstrate industry commitment, support commercial viability, and provide a credible basis for long-term service sustainability. Offerors must propose corporate contributions in accordance with the solicitation. NASA will evaluate the requirement as stated in the solicitation. See Section 5.1, Volume I, paragraph C. Corporate Contribution, and Section 5.1, Volume III – Price Volume, and Attachment J – Pricing Model.
53	J_Pricing Model, Tab 3	Firm Fixed Pricing proposals do not have pricing breakouts by Cost Elements, or include Fee information. Request to remove Tab 3.	Tab 3 will not be removed. As stated in Section 5 of the solicitation, while certified cost or pricing data is not required due to anticipated competition, NASA reserves the right to request "data other than certified cost or pricing data.".

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
54	J_Pricing Model, Tab 2	Request to increase the number of milestones per CLIN to align milestone events with key deliverables.	The current payment milestones, as established in Solicitation, Attachment F, have been established by the Government, to include non-payment milestones. However, Offerors may propose additional milestones consistent with their proposed approach. Section 2.2 indicates that an Offeror's proposed SOWs shall include the Offeror's proposed milestones for each CLIN.
55	_NextSTEP-3 APPENDIX E_NEXUS BC Ka-Band Relay BAA_80MSFC26R0006, Section 5	NASA is requiring FFP pricing, a detailed schedule, and offeror SOW for each CLIN, however, the scope of CLIN 3 is determined by NASA if additional demonstration, anomaly resolution, retest, extended performance measurement, expanded user interaction, or closeout evidence is needed. Offerors will not be able to provide accurate schedule, SOW, or pricing for CLIN 3 until NASA determines the scope of CLIN 3 on an offeror-by-offeror basis. Recommend schedule, pricing, and SOW not be required for CLIN 3 at this time.	Rescheduling, repricing, and/or rescoping will not be allowed. See Section 2.2, which describes CLIN 3 as an optional demonstration extension and service-validation phase if NASA determines that additional demonstration, anomaly resolution, retest, extended performance measurement, expanded user interaction, or closeout evidence is needed.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
56	_NextSTEP-3 APPENDIX E_NEXUS BC Ka-Band Relay BAA_80MSFC26R0006, Table 4.1	Table 4.1 Proposal Submission Context includes a far right-hand side column titled "Excluded Items, Attachments, & Pages" however, it does not indicate which items listed in that column are excluded, attachments, or pages of content. This will lead to confusion. Recommend additional clarity on what is excluded vs an attachment or content page	Every item listed in the Excluded Items, Attachments, & Pages column is specifically excluded from the page limitation for the relevant page limited volumes (i.e., Volumes I and II) or non-page limited volumes (i.e., Volumes III and IV). Offerors should note, however, that all Excluded Items, Attachments, & Pages relevant to the two, page limited volumes (i.e., Volumes I and II) must comply with the Times New Roman, 12-point font requirements in accordance with Section 4.3.
57	SRD	AP-4 Onboard Proximity Sensors: Are there any requirements for this sensor? i.e. resolve an object of at least X cm at a distance of at most Y km?	Per SRD Section 3.7 AP-4, the NEXUS System shall possess onboard proximity sensors capable of continuously monitoring the orbital environment and providing real-time detection and alerting of close-approach (conjunction) events (e.g., meteoroid approaches not reported by existing external warning systems) to support the safety of relay satellite operations.
58	SRD	AP-7 Additional Customer Vehicle-Imposed Operational Constraints: For the Demonstration, should this requirement be considered at face value? Or should architectures assume the >20% coverage at any time value in the SOO for sizing purposes?	“The demonstration must deploy enough assets to service at least 20 percent of the full-service volume at any given time, assuming the user could be at 0km or up to 900km altitude,” (SOO Section 3.1, Representative service volume validation) while simultaneously meeting the contact duration thresholds defined in SRD AP-7.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
59	SRD	For AP-7, Additional Customer Vehicle-Imposed Operational Constraints: may an Offeror rely on other potential providers, architectures, or future awards to satisfy the requirement, or must each Offeror demonstrate that its own proposed end-to-end solution satisfies AP-7?	Consistent with Section 2.1 of the solicitation, NASA is not prescribing a specific orbital architecture. Offerors may propose any architecture that provides an end-to-end solution meeting the solicitation requirements and demonstration objectives. Each Offeror is responsible for demonstrating how its proposed end-to-end solution satisfies the applicable requirements, including AP-7. Offerors may not rely on other Offerors' proposed architectures, potential providers, or future awards to satisfy requirements within their own proposal.
60	SOO 3.1	Simultaneous User Support, including CONUS: for the legacy customer within region A, is persistent coverage required for this user for the demo? Or does the >20% coverage at any given time found in a subsequent bullet ("Representative service volume validation") imply that this region must be covered some of the time (>20%) but not persistently?	With regard to simultaneous user support, persistent (100% continuous) coverage for a user in Region-A is not required; however, minimum contact durations still apply (Ref SRD AP-7). With regard to >20% coverage, "the demonstration must deploy enough assets to service at least 20 percent of the full service volume at any given time, assuming the user could be at 0km or up to 900km altitude," (SOO Section 3.1, Representative service volume validation) while simultaneously meeting the contact duration thresholds defined in SRD AP-7.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
61		Does project Nexus approve of teaming agreement with other Government agencies?	NASA does not pre-approve specific teaming, partnering, hosting, or business arrangements prior to proposal evaluation.
62		At the appropriate level, please identify what departments are eligible and ineligible for teaming agreements. Just as documented in the ineligible company clause.	Section 3.1 lists excluded companies, and it is not specific to departments within those companies.
63		Will Project NEXUS accept a government owned, company operated adjunct payload on a separate government agency platform? So long as the payload meets mission requirements of Project Nexus?	Offerors are responsible for demonstrating that their proposed approach is feasible and executable, including any required agreements, authorities, approvals, access, and operational commitments. NASA will evaluate the proposed approach in accordance with the solicitation's evaluation criteria in Section 5.1.
64	Appendix E, Section 2.2	The BAA calls for an FFP for all three phases. Would the government consider FFP for phase 1 and ROM price for Phase 2 and 3.	Please refer to the Government's response to Question 46.
65	Appendix E, Section 6.2	Does the government intend to solicit updated pricing if option 2 and option 3 are exercised?	Please refer to the Government's response to Question 46.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
66	Reference SOO Section 4.1, Spectrum and Regulatory Compliance, for the NEXUS spectrum authorization model, regulatory compliance, and expectations.	Please clarify the spectrum-authorization model for NEXUS. For a contractor-owned, contractor-operated LEO, MEO, or GEO, spacecraft providing backward-compatible Ka-band relay service, will NASA provide/sponsor the required NTIA authority and related coordination for use of NASA/TDRSS Ka-band frequencies at the proposed orbital locations, or must the Offeror independently obtain all FCC/ITU/orbital-location rights for those frequencies? Please identify any required approvals, agreements, limitations, and timing gates for award, launch, on-orbit testing, and operational service.	Reference SOO Section 4.1, Spectrum and Regulatory Compliance, for the NEXUS spectrum authorization model, regulatory compliance, and expectations. Offerors are responsible for proposing an approach that complies with all applicable U.S. and international spectrum, licensing, regulatory, orbital, launch, and operational requirements. Offerors are responsible for obtaining any commercial, non-Government spectrum authorizations, including FCC, ITU, orbital-location, inter-satellite, space-to-ground, launch, or other approvals required for their proposed system, unless expressly identified in the solicitation as Government-furnished. NASA will evaluate the credibility, feasibility, regulatory risk, and schedule realism of each Offeror's proposed spectrum and licensing approach in accordance with the solicitation.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
67	NASA has not identified any Government Furnished Property, to include Government Furnished Information, available for Offeror use in relation to the NEXUS effort.	Will NASA provide a Government Furnished Information package identifying the exact Ka-band frequency assignments, emission limits, coordination con-straints, and protected service areas/geometry?	NASA has not identified GFP, to include GFI as available for Offeror use, for this requirement, and the solicitation does not so indicate. Offerors should develop their proposals based on the solicitation, including the Service Requirements Document and all applicable spectrum, compatibility, coordination, and mission protection requirements. Offerors are responsible for proposing an approach that is compatible with NASA's heritage Ka-band relay service needs and protects Government mission operations.

68	SOO Section 3.1	It seems that describing space to space links and 0-900km service volume creates the possibility of links that support various sorts of platforms (land, sea, air, and space). The regulatory authorization from NTIA is explicitly for space to space connections. We would like to clarify the regulatory authority under which links and orbital slots will be enabled for this capability…clarifying the domains of operation. Further details: • Attachment A.1, Section 3.1 defines the full service volume as all longitudes, latitudes between +/-75 degrees, and altitudes from 0 km to 900 km. Section 4.1 states that NASA will secure the Ka-band forward and return space-to-space link authorizations through NTIA and file those links with the ITU. Section 4.2 separately restricts NEXUS ground assets, network/system operations centers, network lines, and supporting infrastructure from being located within or traversing Country Group D countries. • Please confirm whether NASA's NTIA/ITU authorization for the NEXUS Ka-band space-to-space links is intended to permit service to authorized Government user vehicle throughout the full-service volume, including when the user platform is geographically over (or	NASA's NTIA/ITU authorization for the NEXUS Ka-band space-to-space links is intended to permit service to authorized Government user vehicles throughout the full-service volume. Offerors must propose solutions consistent with the Country Group D constraints in SOO Section 4.2 and SRD CS-11. As defined in SOO Section 4.2, the Country Group D infrastructure and routing prohibition applies to terrestrial ground assets, network operations, communications routing, and supporting infrastructure. NASA will obtain the required space-to-space link authorizations necessary to provide the NEXUS service over the defined service volume. Mission/customer vehicle-specific regulatory, diplomatic, spectrum, or operational constraints, if any, are outside the scope of this procurement.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
		in) a foreign sovereign territory, including China and Russia. • If any bilateral, multilateral, ITU, national-administration, overflight, geographic, policy, or operational coordination agreements enable, limit, condition, or preclude NEXUS Ka-band relay service when an authorized Government user vehicle is over (or in) China or Russia, please identify those agreements or constraints and clarify whether the Government or Offeror is responsible for satisfying them. • Please also confirm that the Country Group D infrastructure/routing prohibition in Section 4.2 applies to terrestrial ground, network, operations, and supporting infrastructure, and does not by itself prohibit space-to-vehicle relay service to authorized Government user platforms located within the defined service volume.	

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
69		What tools does NASA anticipate using to support the evaluation of Project NEXUS proposals, including any use of artificial intelligence tools?	NASA may use standard Government-approved technical, engineering, business, and administrative tools to support proposal analysis and evaluation. Examples include MATLAB, STK, Excel, cost and schedule tools, mission analysis tools, link budget tools, modeling and simulation tools, and similar software. NASA may also use approved artificial intelligence tools to assist with aggregating, summarizing, and organizing evaluator comments and analyses. AI tools will not independently evaluate, score, or make judgments regarding any proposal, and will not be used to make source selection decisions. All AI-assisted outputs will be reviewed and validated by qualified Government personnel to ensure compliance with the solicitation, FAR, NFS, and applicable security, proprietary, CUI, and export control requirements. AI use is limited to administrative support functions and will not replace evaluator judgment.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
70	Offerors may propose novel technical approaches, lower-TRL elements, aggressive schedules, or accelerated CLIN 2 demonstration paths, provided the proposed approach is consistent with the solicitation requirements.	If an Offeror proposes a novel technical approach, lower-TRL element, aggressive schedule, or accelerated CLIN 2 path, what information should be provided to support NASA's evaluation?	Offerors may propose accelerated schedules for completing CLIN objectives, milestones, deliverables, reviews, and demonstration activities. The stated CLIN periods of performance represent maximum planned durations and do not preclude earlier completion when technically and programmatically appropriate (Section 2.2, Emphasis of Appendix E) The schedule must explain how the proposed approach achieves ATC and preserves the minimum 30-calendar-day on-orbit performance measurement period within CLIN 2. Offerors may propose accelerated schedules where credible and supported by technical maturity, launch/deployment readiness, ground readiness, user-integration planning, and schedule risk mitigation. (Section 4.5, Subfactor 2 – Management Approach (1)(v))

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
71		Given that the specific scope of CLIN 3 may depend on the results of the CLIN 2 demonstration, how should Offerors develop CLIN 3 pricing, schedule, and Statement of Work content in their initial proposal?	Offerors are required to propose CLIN 3 pricing, schedule, and Statement of Work content at the time of initial proposal submission, consistent with Section 2.2 and Section 4.3 of the solicitation. Offerors should base their CLIN 3 price on the types of activities described in the solicitation, including potential additional demonstration, anomaly resolution, retest, extended performance measurement, expanded user interaction, or closeout activities. Attachment J must represent a fully integrated pricing strategy for each CLIN. NASA will evaluate the proposed CLIN 3 pricing, schedule, and approach for reasonableness, feasibility, and consistency with the Offeror's overall demonstration strategy. See Section 4.6, Volume III – Price Volume.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
72	Offerors are responsible for identifying and obtaining all required licenses, authorizations, approvals, orbital-location rights, and regulatory approvals for their proposed approach at their own cost and risk. NASA has not identified GFP, to include GFI as available for Offeror use, for this requirement, and the solicitation does not so indicate.	How should Offerors address orbital, spectrum, licensing, or regulatory approvals that are not yet in place at the time of proposal submission?	Per Subfactor 2 (2) Regulatory, Security, and Sustainability, the Offeror must describe the regulatory compliance approach for the proposed on-orbit demonstration and any subsequent transition to sustained operational relay service. The proposal must identify all applicable regulatory, licensing, spectrum, cybersecurity, export control, mission authorization, operational approval, and other compliance requirements associated with the proposed NEXUS architecture and demonstration approach.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
73		If an Offeror's solution relies on third-party spacecraft, ground systems, hosted payload arrangements, or commercial network infrastructure, how should responsibility for integration and service performance be addressed?	Offerors may propose approaches that rely on third-party infrastructure, provided the proposed approach meets the solicitation requirements. The Offeror remains fully responsible for the proposed end-to-end solution, including integration, interfaces, operations, mission assurance, service delivery, performance, and management of third-party dependencies. Offerors should describe how third-party roles, commitments, interfaces, and risks will be managed. NASA will evaluate the credibility, feasibility, and risk of the proposed approach in accordance with the solicitation.

Index	Industry-Provided RFP Reference	Question	Response
74	Offerors should clearly identify material assumptions, dependencies, required approvals, external commitments, and associated risks that affect the proposed technical approach, schedule, price, or performance. Offerors should explain the basis for each material assumption and describe related mitigation or management approaches.	How should Offerors handle major assumptions or external dependencies that could affect proposed price, schedule, or performance?	Offerors should clearly identify material assumptions, dependencies, required approvals, external commitments, and associated risks that affect the proposed technical approach, schedule, price, or performance. Offerors should explain the basis for each material assumption and describe related mitigation or management approaches. NASA will evaluate the reasonableness of those assumptions, the associated risks, and the adequacy of the proposed mitigation in accordance with the solicitation. See Attachment J, Pricing Model, Tab 5 for Assumption Drivers.
75		Please clarify whether charts, tables, figures illustrations, pictures, graphs, or other embedded objects can be in 10-point type or whether all text must be in 12-point type.	The requirement for Times New Roman, 12-point font will apply to all information provided in an offeror's page limited volumes (i.e., Volumes I and II) in accordance with Section 4.3, Instructions for page limited volumes. Furthermore, please note that the Times New Roman, 12-point font is applicable to the documents listed in the column of Table 4.1, entitled "Excluded Items, Attachments, & Pages," for Volumes I and II.

ATTACHMENT B – CHANGE LOG

Index	RFP Reference	From	To
1	Appendix E	Primary Point of Contact (POC): Jennifer George	Primary Point of Contact (POC): Jacquelyn Pletcher
2	Appendix E, Acronyms	GFE – Government Furnished Equipment GFD – Government Furnished Data GFP – Govenrment Furnished Property	Removed from Acronym Table.
3	Appendix E, Section 2.2, CLIN 3	First sentence of the first CLIN 3 paragraph: *The purpose of CLIN 3 is to provide an optional demonstration extension and service-validation phase if NASA determines that additional demonstration, anomaly resolution, retest, extended performance measurement, expanded user interaction, or closeout evidence is needed.*	First sentence of first CLIN 3 paragraph revised: *The purpose of CLIN 3 is to provide an optional demonstration extension and service-validation if NASA determines that additional demonstration, anomaly resolution, retest, extended performance measurement, expanded user interaction, or closeout evidence is needed.*

Index	RFP Reference	From	To
4	Appendix E, Section 2.2, CLIN 3	Last sentence of the first CLIN 3 paragraph: *CLIN 3 milestones, associated deliverables, payment structure, and acceptance criteria are provided in Attachment F, Payment Milestones and Acceptance Criteria.*	Last sentence of the first CLIN 3 paragraph has been deleted.
5	Appendix E, Section 3.1(a)	First sentence of the first paragraph: *Offerors must be a United States entity to be eligible to participate in this requirement.*	First sentence of the first paragraph revised: *Offerors and proposed subcontractors (i.e., who require access to export controlled information) must be a United States entity to be eligible to participate in this requirement.*
6	Appendix E, Table 4.1, Volume I	Page Limit: *20*	Page Limit revised: *20 pages*
7	Appendix E, Table 4.1 Volume I	Excluded Items, Attachments, & Pages: • *Transmittal Letter* • *Executive Summary* • *Launch Vehicle and Deployment acceptable evidence as defined in 4.4.3.*	Excluded Items, Attachments, & Pages revised: • *Cover Page* • *Table of Contents* • *Transmittal Letter* • *Executive Summary* • *Launch Vehicle and Deployment acceptable evidence as defined in 4.4.3 (f).*

Index	RFP Reference	From	To
8	Appendix E, Table 4.1 Volume II - Technical and Management Approach	Excluded Items, Attachments, & Pages: • *CASQ Attachment G* • *Integrated Master Schedule* • *Statement of Work* *(provide all after the last numbered pages)*	Excluded Items, Attachments, & Pages revised: • *Table of Contents* • *CASQ Attachment G* • *Statement of Work* *(provide all after the last numbered pages)*
9	Appendix E, Table 4.1 Volume III - Price		Excluded Items, Attachments, & Pages revised: • *Pricing Model Attachment J* • *Corporate Contribution Attachment I*

Index	RFP Reference	From	To
10	Appendix E, Table 4.1, Volumes IV – Contract Volume	Excluded Items, Attachments, & Pages: • *Infrastructure Validation: Partnership agreements, facility access documentation, equipment specifications, technology capability documentation* • *Organizational Conflicts of Interest Plan* • *Installation-Accountable Governemnt Property (IAGP) / Government Furnished Property (GFP) List* • *Data Rights (Assertion Notice, corresponding narratives, and evidence)* • *Small Business Plan*	Excluded Items, Attachments, & Pages revised: : • *Joint Venture Agreement, Mentor-Protégé Agreement, & Contractor Teaming Agreements* • *Model Contract Attachment H* • *Integrated Master Schedule* • *Organizational Conflicts of Interest Plan* • *Small Business Plan* • *Intellectual Property and Data Rights Management Plan* • *Corporate Contribution Worksheet Attachment I*

Index	RFP Reference	From	To
11	Appendix E, Section 4.3, Proposal Format and Contents	Second paragraph of Section 4.3: *Volumes II and III of the proposal must be structured as follows:*	Second paragraph of Section 4.3 revised: *Volume III of the proposal must be structured as follows:*
12	Appendix E, Section 4.3 Proposal Format and Contents	First bullet under "Instructions for page limited volumes": *All pages must be consecutively numbered, starting with "1" (one) on the first page of each volume.*	First bullet under "Instructions for page limited volumes" revised: *All pages must be consecutively numbered, starting with "1" (one) on the first page of each volume with the exception of the cover page, table of contents, executive summary, and the transmittal letter. Offerors must number these pages using Roman numerals (i.e., [i, ii, iii]) in order to differentiate these pages from the page limited pages which starts with "1."*
13	Appendix E, Section 4.3, Proposal Format and Contents	Sixth bullet under "Instructions for page limited volumes": *Font style shall be Times New Roman, and the font size shall be not smaller than 12-point for all text including, but not limited to the documents listed within the "Excluded Items, Attachments, & Pages" column of Table 4-1 above, charts, tables, figures, illustrations, pictures, graphs, or other embedded objects.*	Sixth bullet under "Instructions for page limited volumes" revised: *Font style shall be Times New Roman, and the font size shall be not smaller than 12-point for all text including, but not limited to the documents listed within the "Excluded Items, Attachments, & Pages" column of Table 4.1 above, charts, tables, figures, illustrations, pictures, graphs, or other embedded objects.*

Index	RFP Reference	From	To
14	Appendix E, Section 4.4.3 (g) Corporate Contributions	*The overall proposed effort is defined as the combination of corporate contribution and Government resources required for the proposed effort.*	*The overall proposed effort is defined as the corporate contribution required for the proposed effort.*
15	Appendix E, Section 4.4.3 (g) Corporate Contributions		Added a new paragraph at the end Section 4.4.3(g): *Offerors must demonstrate that proposed corporate contributions are directly relevant to the NEXUS effort and will be used to support execution of the proposed approach. Corporate contributions consisting solely of prior investments, without a clear commitment of resources to the proposed NEXUS effort, may not be sufficient to satisfy this requirement. Offerors should identify the specific contribution, describe how it supports NEXUS performance, provide the estimated value being contributed, and explain the basis for that value. All corporate contributions must be documented in Attachment I, Corporate Contribution Worksheet.*
16	Appendix E, Section 4.5 (a)	*Revised proposals may be requested only from those Offerors included in the competitive range. Any clarifications will be conducted in accordance with FAR Subpart 15.202(a)(2).*	*Revised proposals may be requested only from those Offerors included in the competitive range.*

Index	RFP Reference	From	To
17	Appendix E, Section 4.5(c), Removing CLIN Structure from Volume II	Removed last sentence of Section 4.5(c): *In addition, the Offeror must clearly identify how its proposed approach aligns each below subfactor with the Government identified CLIN structure and the stated goals for each CLIN, demonstrating how their unique approach supports, without deviating from, the CLIN specific objectives and performance.*	Added to the end of Section 4.5(c): *As this acquisition is structured with a base CLIN and two option CLINs, Offerors should still ensure that their proposed technical and management approach clearly addresses the distinct objectives, scope, and performance requirements of CLIN 1, CLIN 2, and CLIN 3, as applicable.*

Index	RFP Reference	From	To
18	Appendix E, Section 4.6, Overall Pricing and BOE Requirements	Second paragraph: *Offerors must provide separate proposed pricing for each CLIN, including distinct pricing for CLIN 2 and the optional CLIN 3 demonstration extension and service-validation phase. Any proposal assumption dependent on Government-provided resources must clearly identify the resource, the basis for the assumption, and the resulting impact on price, schedule, or performance should the resource not be provided. NASA may evaluate the feasibility and associated risk of any such dependency when assessing price, schedule, and execution credibility.*	Second paragraph revised: *Offerors must provide separate proposed pricing for each CLIN, including distinct pricing for CLIN 2 and the optional CLIN 3 demonstration extension and service-validation.*

19	Appendix E, Section 4.6, General Instructions	First paragraph: *The Price section must include both a price narrative and the completed Attachment I: Corporate Contribution Worksheet and Attachment J, Pricing Model. Any corporate contribution that affects a CLIN's cost must be fully reflected in the proposed CLIN price. The narrative mustclearly explain how contributions were applied, and the pricing model must show those impacts mathematically and consistently across all CLINs. The Offeror must prepare the Price Volume consistent with the Offeror's current accounting system. An Offeror's failure to comply with all Price Volume instructions (including those for electronic submissions) may result in rejection of the proposal. The price narrative must explain, in detail, all pricing and estimating techniques for the effort and corporate contributions.*	First paragraph revised: *The Price section must include both a price narrative and the completed Attachment I: Corporate Contribution Worksheet and Tab 6 of Attachment J, Pricing Model. Any corporate contribution that affects a CLIN's cost must be fully reflected in the proposed CLIN price in Tab 1 and Tab 3 of Attachment J, Pricing Model. The narrative must clearly explain how contributions were applied, and the pricing model must show those impacts mathematically and consistently across all CLINs. The Offeror must address the price impacts stemming from the listed price drivers and assumptions in Column A of Tab 5 of Attachment J, Pricing Model. The Offeror must prepare the Price Volume consistent with the Offeror's current accounting system. An Offeror's failure to comply with all Price Volume instructions and the Instructions Tab of the Attachment J, Pricing Model (including those for electronic submissions) may result in rejection of the proposal. The price narrative must explain, in detail, all pricing and estimating techniques for the effort and corporate contributions.*

Index	RFP Reference	From	To
20	Appendix E. 5, Proposal Review Information	Second paragraph: *Any clarifications will be conducted in accordance with FAR Subpart 15.202(a)(2).*	Second paragraph was deleted.
21	Appendix E, Section 5.1 Evaluation, Volume I – Part II Eligibility Review	End of second paragraph: *NASA reserves the right to conduct clarifications with Offerors regarding compliance with the eligibility criteria, including how an Offeror satisfies any required corporate contribution requirement.*	End of second paragraph was deleted.

Index	RFP Reference	From	To
22	Appendix E, 5.1 C, Corporate Contributions	First and second paragraphs: *The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Corporate Contribution on a Pass/Fail basis. This factor will not be numerically scored and will not receive strengths, weaknesses, or adjectival ratings.* *Pass: To receive a Pass, the Offeror must demonstrate that it is making a meaningful corporate contribution that is directly relevant to the proposed NEXUS effort. For purposes of this section, the proposed overall effort is defined as the combination of the Offeror's corporate contribution and any Government resources required to perform the work.*	First and second paragraphs revised: *The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Corporate Contribution on a Pass/Fail basis. This factor will not be numerically scored and will not receive strengths, weaknesses, or adjectival ratings.NASA will not establish a fixed dollar threshold, percentage, or formula for determining whether a corporate contribution is meaningful.* *Pass: To receive a Pass rating, the Offeror shall demonstrate that its proposed corporate contribution is directly relevant to the NEXUS effort and mitigates risk in the execution of the proposed approach.*

Index	RFP Reference	From	To
23	Appendix E, 5.1 C, Corporate Contributions	End of the fourth paragraph: *The Offeror must clearly distinguish proposed corporate contributions from NASA-funded work and must identify any proposed Government resources, federally funded participation, or use of federal facilities associated with the proposed effort.*	End of the fourth paragraph revised: *The Offeror must clearly distinguish proposed corporate contributions from NASA-funded work.*
24	Attachment A.2, NEXUS SRD		Added CUI heading to header and footer of the attachment.
25	Attachment B, DPD		Added the Solicitation Number on the cover page and updated the Document Change Log.
26	Attachment B, DPD	Data Requirements List reading DRD-005 is the SAD and DRD-007 is the SAD.	Data Requirements List reading DRD-005 is the SAD and DRD-007 is the IPDRMP.
27	Attachment B, DPD	DRD-008 as posted for the Final Solicitation release.	Revised DRD-008 as reflected in item #52 of Amendment 01 Question and Answer log.
28	Attachment F, Payment Milestones and Acceptance Criteria		Added a CLIN 3 section.
29	Attachment H, Model Contract	Contracting Officer listed as Jennifer George.	Conytracting Officer listed as Jacquelyn Pletcher.

Index	RFP Reference	From	To
30	Attachment H, Model Contract, Section J	Section J lists Attachments A through I.	Section J lists Attachments A through J. Added: J – Integrated Master Schedule (Baseline)
31	Attachment J, Pricing Model. Instructions Tab	Coproate contributions: Corporate contributions should not be deducted from Total Proposed Price unless already reflected in the proposed Firm-Fixed-Price. Government resources: Requested Government resources, GFE, GFI, facilities, or support should be identified with impact if unavailable.	Coproate contributions: When a corporate contribution directly affects a CLIN price, the Offeror shall clearly identify and quantify that impact to ensure full transparency and traceability within the pricing model. The Net Proposed Price column on 1_CLIN_Summary Tab must not include Corporate Contribution values. Assumptions & Drivers: Offerors must address the price impacts stemming from the outlined price drivers and assumptions in Column A of Tab 5. For each item, the offeror must identify the applicable CLIN, state whether it is included in the Gross Proposed Price, detail the basis / explanation, and specify the potential impact if the assumption changes.
32	Attachment J, Pricing Model. Tab 1 CLIN Summary and Tab 3 Cost Info by CLIN		Tab 1 and Tab 3 provide rows to account for Corporate Contributions and its effect on the Net Proposed Price.
33	Attachment J, Pricing Model, Tab 5 Assumptions & Drivers and Tab 6 Corporate Contributions		Removed GTA and Government Resources row from Tab 5. Removed Government Resources and Type Column from Tab 6.

Index	RFP Reference	From	To
34	Appendix E, Section 4.2.1, Electronic Submission of Proposals	Second Paragraph: *Proposals must be received no later than 10:00 a.m. Central Time on July 7, 2026.*	Second Paragraph Revised: *Proposals must be received no later than 10:00 a.m. Central Time on July 7, 2026. The link for proposal submissions can be accessed here: https://nasagov.box.com/s/sp39ho1qu99guzpy5m55zkqj5lrd18xc*