Index	Comment / Question	Response
1	Does NASA anticipate any minimum corporate revenue or contract value thresholds for prime offerors beyond what is stated in the solicitation?	The contractual minimum value for the Engineering Services and Science Capability Augmentation (ESSCA) II contract is identified in Section B, MSFC 52.216-90. The ESSCA II contract will require the successful Offeror to be capable of meeting requirements up to the order limitations identified in 52.216-19 Order Limitations.
2	Can the Government confirm which ATTN to Sadie Moulton is correct? PPQ says PS20, attachment L-7 says PS50, and Attachment L-3 says PS20.	The contracting officer organization has been corrected to PS50.
3	If controlled proposal attachments are inaccessible until late and materially affect proposal development, what approach does NASA prefer for assumptions, relief, or schedule adjustment?	Controlled proposal attachments are accessible via the request process detailed on sam.gov here: https://www.fsd.gov/gsafsd_sp/en/how-do-i-request-access-to-a-restricted-attachment-on-a-contract?sys_kb_id=ab18146f87513610591d0e56cebb359b&id=kb_article_view&sysparm_rank=2&sysparm_tsqueryId=4ed4eb411b07fed0bc23a8a7624bcbdc. All submitted requests have been granted. The Government does not anticipate providing relief or schedule adjustment related to controlled attachment access.
4	For Sections A-I, there are issues completing fill-ins. Two Comments are provided. COMMENT 1: In Section B, the Unit Price and Amount columns for CLINS 0002 through 0006, 0008 through 0012, 0014-0015 will only accommodate 1 digit. The Amount column for CLIN 0013, 0016 and 0017 will not accept any digit.	Offerors are only required to fill in CLIN 0001 of the Section B Supplies and Services Table. The remainder of this table will be completed by the Government prior to contract award. This table has been revised to reflect TBD in the Unit Price and Amount Columns for all CLINs except CLIN 0001.

	COMMENT 2: For the MSFC 52.216-92 Matrix of Contract Line Items table: For all of the CLINs, the $TBD on the first line of the Value column can only be removed with a red line through the $TBD. The font size in the second line dollar field in the Value column for CLINS 0006, 0007, 0012, 0013, 0014, and 0015 is extremely large compared to the other CLINs. Finally, the table will not accommodate any entry at all into the Total Value of the Base and All Exercised Options $TBD field. Will the Government please provide a format that is fully accessible?	Offerors are only required to fill in the Value column for CLIN 00001 of the MSFC 52.216-92 Matrix of Contract Line Items table. The Government has highlighted applicable fill-in cells yellow, revised the cells to allow for easier fill-in, and added these to the list of required fill-ins in Section L, Volume IV – Contract Instructions (c)(3).
5	For RFP Cover Letter, 2nd Paragraph, it appears that 541715 Exception 3 is for other Aircraft Parts and Auxiliary Equipment. Please confirm the correct Exception is Exception 4 Guided Missiles and Space Vehicles, Their Propulsion Units and Propulsion Parts.	The Government has confirmed the correct NAICS is 541715 Research and Development in the Physical, Engineering, and Life Sciences (except Nanotechnology and Biotechnology) and Exception 3 Guided Missiles and Space Vehicles, Their Propulsion Units and Propulsion Parts with a small business size standard of 1,300 employees in the U.S. Small Business Administration Table of Small Business Size Standards. See: https://www.sba.gov/sites/default/files/2023-06/Table%20of%20Size%20Standards_Effective%20March%2017%2C%202023%20%282%29.pdf
6	If classified performance is required, may the Top Secret facility clearance requirement be satisfied by the team member proposed to perform the classified work, with the classified scope clearly allocated in the proposal?	Per the 80MSFC26R0002 cover letter, Offerors must have required clearance credentials at the time of proposal submittal. For proposals submitted as joint ventures, the joint venture itself or the individual partner(s) to the joint venture that will perform the necessary security work must have a facility clearance and must provide their CAGE code for verification of current clearance status.

		No Task Order (TO) or Delivery Order (DO) work is currently defined for the full IDIQ ESSCA II RFP. A DD254 with specific information regarding any TO/DO work requiring access to classified information will be issued at award. See Attachment L-5, Background and Historical, for information concerning classified work on the ESSCA contract.
7	If the facility clearance for the proposed classified performer is in process at proposal submission, will NASA consider that acceptable, or must the clearance be active at submission?	No. Per the 80MSFC26R0002 cover letter, Offerors must have required clearance credentials at the time of proposal submittal.
8	For a joint venture, must the joint venture entity hold the facility clearance at proposal submission, or may the clearance be held by the venturer performing the security work?	Per the 80MSFC26R0002 cover letter, for proposals submitted as joint ventures, the joint venture itself or the individual partner(s) to the joint venture that will perform the necessary security work must have a facility clearance and must provide their CAGE code for verification of current clearance status.
9	Does NASA require cleared personnel for all proposed labor categories, or only for personnel proposed to perform classified work?	NASA anticipates requiring cleared ESSCA II personnel only for work that involves access to classified information. For Offeror awareness, the Government anticipates <1% of ESSCA II personnel will be required to hold security clearances. See Attachment L-5, Background and Historical, for information concerning classified work on the ESSCA contract.

10	Will NASA identify which portions of ESSCA II performance are expected to require classified work so that offerors can scope cleared facilities and cleared personnel appropriately?	No TO or DO work is currently defined for the full IDIQ ESSCA II contract. A DD254 with specific work will be issued at award. See Attachment L-5, Background and Historical, for information concerning classified work on the ESSCA contract.
11	Will NASA consider revising the facility clearance timing from proposal submission to a later point in the acquisition, such as prior to contract award or prior to the first order requiring classified performance?	No.
12	If NASA allows the facility clearance to be obtained after proposal submission, will NASA sponsor the facility clearance for the proposed performing facility of the offeror, venturer, or subcontractor assigned to the security work?	See response to Question 11.
13	Can NASA confirm whether work requiring a facility clearance will be specified at the order level and tied to discrete requirements, including end item deliverables when applicable?	Work requiring a facility clearance is anticipated to be specified at the subtask order level or delivery order level and will be tied to discrete requirements.
14	Does NASA expect co-located performance at NASA sites, or is distributed performance acceptable when security, collaboration, and schedule requirements are met?	Refer to Attachment J-1 Performance Work Statement (PWS), Section 2.3 Facilities, for general expectations related to work location.

15	Will place of performance and the on-site versus contractor-facility mix be defined per task or delivery order, or does NASA expect offerors to assume a baseline onsite staffing footprint by center?	Refer to Attachment J-1 PWS, Section 2.3 Facilities, for general expectations related to work location. Refer to Attachment J-12 Installation-Provided Property and Services, Section 1.0 Potential Limits on Office Space and Work Area Space for anticipated office space/work area for on-site performance at Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC). The current expectation for known Stennis Space Center (SSC) requirements is that the work will be surge support provided by Work Year Equivalents (WYE) engaged at MSFC. There are currently no Other Center requirements identified for the ESSCA II contract beyond MSFC (inclusive of MAF) and SSC. Place of performance expectations will be defined in individual TO/DOs.
16	For MSFC, MAF, SSC, and other centers, does NASA have a typical on-site and remote performance mix that offerors should plan for, or is the place of performance determined by each order?	Refer to Attachment J-1 PWS, Section 2.3 Facilities, for general expectations related to work location.
17	Is ATOMS provided by NASA for contractor use and configuration, or is the contractor expected to provide and operate the ATOMS solution?	Refer to Attachment J-1, PWS, Section 2.4.1.

18	If the contractor is responsible for ATOMS, will NASA accept an implementation based on configured commercial platforms and integrations, provided all ATOMS requirements are met?	Yes.
19	Is ATOMS expected to operate as a standalone solution, or is it expected to integrate with NASA enterprise systems?	Per Attachment J-8, Automated Tools for Order Management Simplification (ATOMS) Suite of Tools Requirements, the ATOMS Suite will not be required to interface with any Government systems.
20	Is SAP interoperability required for ATOMS, or is ERP integration required only when directed by an individual task order or delivery order?	Per Attachment J-8, ATOMS Suite of Tools Requirements, the ATOMS Suite will not be required to interface with any Government systems.
21	Will NASA specify hosting requirements for ATOMS, including whether ATOMS must be hosted in a NASA-controlled environment or may be hosted in a contractor-managed environment under NASA-defined constraints?	Refer to Attachment J-1, PWS, Section 2.4.10.
22	Who is responsible for obtaining and maintaining the Authority to Operate for ATOMS?	The ESSCA II ATOMS will be a contractor-operated system. There is currently no expectation that Authority to Operate will be required for this system.

23	Does NASA require ATOMS to integrate with NASA identity management and single sign-on, and will NASA specify the required integration approach?	No. Refer to Attachment J-1, PWS, Section 2.4 and Attachment J-8 ATOMS Suite of Tools Requirements for ATOMS Suite requirements.
24	What is the expected data classification for ATOMS content, and what restrictions apply to storage, export, and retention?	The Government anticipates information up to level of Controlled Unclassified Information could be housed in the ATOMS system, including but not limited to information controlled under International Traffic in Arms Regulations and Export Administration Regulations, as well as proprietary business information. Per Attachment J-1 PWS, section 2.1.4, the ESSCA II contractor will be required comply with NASA, MSFC, or other Center, as applicable, regulations, policies, clauses, directives, procedures, and standards when performing all work under the ESSCA II PWS. Refer to J-1, Performance Work Statement, Section 2.4.27 for ATOMS records management requirements.
25	Will NASA require the use of a NASA-managed document repository for ATOMS records and artifacts, or may the contractor propose a repository approach consistent with NASA requirements?	Full ATOMS Suite requirements are identified in Attachment J-1 PWS, Section 2.4 and Attachment J-8, ATOMS Suite of Tools Requirements.
26	Will NASA provide required interfaces to NASA financial, procurement, document management, and reporting systems, and when will interface requirements be released?	Per Attachment J-8, ATOMS Suite of Tools Requirements, the ATOMS Suite will not be required to interface with any Government systems.

27	Are there NASA-standard reporting outputs or data exchange formats that ATOMS must support for dashboards, metrics, audit records, and order reporting?	Refer to Attachment J-1 PWS, Section 2.4 and Attachment J-8, Automated Tools for Order Management Simplification (ATOMS) Suite of Tools Requirements for ATOMS requirements. See Attachment L-8 Complexity of ESSCA for embedded example files and references to requirement language demonstrating the size and scope of the current contract financial tracking and reporting.
28	Does NASA expect ATOMS to include request intake tracking and service-level performance tracking, or is basic workflow tracking sufficient?	Full ATOMS Suite requirements are identified in Attachment J-1 PWS, Section 2.4 and Attachment J-8, ATOMS Suite of Tools Requirements.
29	Will NASA define standard response time expectations for task order and delivery order requests, and will response time be evaluated at proposal time?	TO and DO response time requirements are defined in Section I, Clause 1852.216-80 Task Ordering Procedure.
30	Does NASA anticipate routine performance at multiple NASA locations under a single order, or is multi-site performance determined by each order?	The Government anticipates the majority of TOs will have single NASA location performance. Place of performance expectations will be defined in individual TO/DOs.

31	Will NASA identify baseline assumptions regarding Government-furnished property and Government-furnished equipment versus contractor-provided tooling and equipment, or is this determined by each order?	Refer to Attachment J-12 Installation-Provided Property and Services, Attachment J-12-A Installation-Accountable Property List, and Attachment J-13 List of Government Furnished Property. Additional property information may be identified in specific TO/DOs.
32	Does the solicitation define any end items with physical or performance requirements, or are those requirements defined at the order level?	The Request for Proposal (RFP) does not provide any specific end-item deliverable requirements for ESSCA II. Refer to Attachment J-1 PWS, Section 4.0 for contract-level End-Item Deliverable requirements.
33	For work involving fabrication, assembly, inspection, or test, will NASA accept that AS9100 or ISO 9001 certifications are held by the performing entities, with requirements flowed down and governed under the prime's quality management approach?	Quality management standards will be specified in each TO or DO as applicable.
34	For services-only subcontractors without AS9100, will NASA accept documented quality procedures and prime oversight as sufficient for that scope?	Section E Clause 52.246-11 provides higher-level contract quality standards required for contractor compliance under ESSCA II. Quality management standards will be specified in each TO or DO as applicable.
35	For work involving Controlled Unclassified Information, will NASA accept a segmented approach where only entities with the required controls access or store Controlled Unclassified Information, and other subcontractors perform using controlled interfaces and non-sensitive deliverables?	NASA Procedural Requirement (NPR) 2810.7 establishes Agency-wide requirements for the protection of Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI). See: https://nodis3.gsfc.nasa.gov/displayDir.cfm?Internal_ID=N_PR_2810_0007_&page_name=Preface

36	What cybersecurity requirements govern contractor systems that handle Controlled Unclassified Information under ESSCA II, and does NASA require each subcontractor to meet those requirements independently or allow compliance through scope segmentation and prime-managed flow-down controls?	Refer to Attachment J-1, PWS, Section 2.2.15. Refer to Attachment J-2 Data Procurement Document, DRD 1839CD-001 Security requirements for Unclassified IT Resources for information on IT security requirements, reporting, and applicable documents.
37	For Attachment J-4 – Award Fee Evaluation Plan, in assessing underrun/overrun thresholds, does NASA normalize for Government-directed scope changes or funding delays, or are thresholds applied strictly to negotiated values absent formal mods?	The Government anticipates processing revisions (i.e. Contracting Officer approved ESSCA-provided Task Order Plans in the ATOMS tool) to most Task Orders (TOs) multiple times throughout the year to capture any scope or requirements changes, and thereby set the basis for cost performance. The revision and corresponding cost will be captured in Attachment J-17 Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity Task Orders. Historically the Cost Control Factor evaluation of variance has focused primarily upon year-ending overall cost variance against the final approved revisions to the TOs, with a secondary focus upon monthly variances against the then-current TO revision cost. Note that the Government reserves the right to unilaterally update the Award Fee Evaluation Plan prior to any period of performance, in accordance with Marshall Work Instruction (MWI) 5116.1, and to add areas of emphasis at any time throughout the period of performance.
38	Section K, The checkboxes in Section K are highlighted in yellow; however, those checkboxes are unable to be checked. The best that an Offeror can do is to put an X to the right of the checkbox -- and that comes out as a tracked change. Any data that we add, such as the Disclosure Statement data on page K-16, comes out as a tracked change which changes the pagination of the document.	The Government has revised Section K so checkboxes are enabled for marking and added additional space in fill-in areas to assist with potential pagination changes. The Government has turned off the track changes function for Sections J-M and does not expect the Offeror to return any sections with track changes.

	Is it the Government's intent for Offerors to: (1) put an X to the right of each checkbox and fill in other data required, and (2) keep Track Changes enabled?	
39	For Section L, page limitations (7)(F), Can the Government define “non-substantive” text for purposes of the 10-point font exception? For example, does the content in the “Requirement” column of the MTA-4, ATOMS L-7 Requirements Matrix, the corresponding responses in the “Offeror Comments” column, and other proposal graphics or tables containing similarly complex text qualify for use of the 10-point font?	See revised Section L, NFS 1852.215-81 PROPOSAL PAGE LIMITATIONS, paragraphs (b)(1)(b) and (b)(7)(F).
40	For Section L, Mission Suitability, MTA-8, pages L-15 and L-16, Please clarify the types of innovations to be included in MTA8. Are the innovations listed in MTA8 meant to be areas where an offeror is investing their own funds (e.g., reinvesting profit or incurring unallowable expenses) to provide capabilities beneficial to ESSCA? Or are these innovations offered at no direct cost to the contract (i.e., the costs might be included in indirect rates)? Or are these innovations items offered for Government consideration that are not accounted for in the offeror's Volume II / Attachment L-1, but could be authorized by NASA under a TO or DO post award (for example an innovative technical solution that could be implemented as a TO)? Or, is MTA8 simply meant to be a consolidated list of innovative approaches inherent in an offeror's approach and discussed throughout the proposal?	Innovations an Offeror may provide in response to MTA8 are intended to be provided at no direct or indirect cost to the Government. The Government does not anticipate awarding TOs or DOs to support accepted innovations. There is no requirement for an Offeror to provide a response to MTA8.

41	For Section L, Mission Suitability, MTA-8, pages L-15 and L-16, if an offeror proposes an innovation that is inherent in their approach to meet RFP requirements, should it be listed in MTA8? For example, if an offeror proposes an innovative approach to meet ATOMS requirements, we believe that should be described in MTA-4 and does not need to be repeated in MTA-8. As another example, an innovative approach to Pursuits Culture and Partnering should be described in MTA-7, and not repeated in MTA-8. Please confirm.	Only “no cost innovations" are encouraged within MTA-8. An innovative approach or solution that is inherent to an Offeror's response should be addressed in the section of the proposal to which that innovation applies. Repeating the innovation in MTA-8 is not necessary.
42	For Section L, Mission Suitability, WCSF3, page L-17, Did you mean WCSF3 instead of WSCF3?	Yes. This reference has been corrected to WCSF3 in Section L.
43	What evidence does NASA prefer to substantiate rapid ramp and surge staffing for an integrator-led team?	The RFP does not require substantiation of rapid ramp and surge staffing. Refer to Section L, Subfactor B – Workforce Compensation, Sustainment and Flexibility, WCSF 2: Workforce Flexibility for RFP requirements most closely associated with this question.
44	What is NASA’s definition of a major subcontractor for cost, volume, detail, and L-1 completion requirements?	Refer to Section L, Volume II – Cost Volume Instructions, a.4. for the ESSCA II RFP definition of major subcontractor.

45	In Section L, Volume II.a.4, FAR 15.404-8 does not appear to be a real reference. Can the Government please confirm the correct FAR reference?	FAR 15.404-8 is an existing portion of the FAR via the Revolutionary FAR Overhaul. See: https://www.acquisition.gov/far-overhaul/far-part-deviation-guide/far-overhaul-part-15#FAR_15_404_8.
46	Does NASA require a specific escalation approach for labor and other direct costs in evaluated pricing, or may offerors propose assumptions with rationale?	Refer to Section L, Volume II – Cost Volume Instructions, b.2.i.F.
47	Does NASA require a specific indirect rate structure, or may offerors propose a defensible structure consistent with their established accounting practices?	Refer to Section L, Volume II – Cost Volume Instructions, specifically b.2.ii.B., b.2.i.H, and b.3.ii.E, for instructions related to this question.
48	In Section L, Volume II.b.2.ii.A.2, please confirm the reference to "applicable subcontractors" should be updated to reflect "major subcontractors", as applicable subcontractor is no longer a term in the RFP.	Section L, Volume II.b.2.ii.A.2 has been revised to change applicable subcontractors to major subcontractors.
49	In Section L, Volume II.b.2.ii.C, FAR 15.404-8 does not appear to be a real reference. Can the Government please confirm the correct FAR reference?	FAR 15.404-8 is an existing portion of the FAR via the Revolutionary FAR Overhaul. See: https://www.acquisition.gov/far-overhaul/far-part-deviation-guide/far-overhaul-part-15#FAR_15_404_8.

50	For Section L Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions - Benchmark Labor Rates, page L-27, there appear to be some inconsistencies in the benchmark rates for the following locations/labor categories: 1. At GRC, the Eng/Sci 6 rate is $64.46 while the Eng/Sci 7 rate is $64.25. 2. At JSC, the Eng/Sci 8 rate is $89.38 while the Eng/Sci 9 rate is $89.28. Please confirm or correct the benchmark rates. If the rates are correct, please provide a rationale for the apparent reduction in rates despite an increase in years of experience.	See revised Benchmark Direct Labor Rate table in Section L.
51	For Section L, Past Performance, paragraph (e), Section II, page L-42, Past Performance Record Safety Table, if offerors calculate and report the required safety rates using the equations provided, may offerors omit the instructional calculation rows shown below the "Number of hours worked by the Contractor on this contract" row?	Yes. Flexibility to submit Past Performance Record Safety Tables without instructional cells has been added to Section L, Past Performance Volume Instructions.
52	Does NASA expect each offeror to demonstrate capability across all skill areas, or is strength in a subset acceptable when the offeror provides credible teaming coverage for the remaining areas?	Refer to Section M, Factor III – Past Performance Volume Evaluation for information on how past performance will be evaluated. Breadth of relevant coverage across the applicable PWS elements will be determined by the past performance referenced contracts submitted, limited to the parameters and relevancy thresholds in Section L, Volume III - Past Performance Volume Instructions.

53	For Attachment L-1 Excel Pricing Model, Tab A - Summary, Tab D - CMO and Tab B-X IDIQ Rate Development, please clarify how the government will evaluate the CMO costs for Offerors with differing prime allocations. Based on the current structure of Attachment L-1, the CMO costs are estimated in Tab D then applied to the prime labor only in Tab B-XX IDIQ Rate Development. This approach results in only partial CMO cost allocation based on the percentage of labor allocated to the prime offeror. For example, if one prime allocates 60% of the total labor to themselves, only 60% of the CMO costs will be captured in the total proposed cost shown in Tab A. Similarly, a prime that is allocated 30% of the total labor will only capture 30% of the CMO costs in the total proposed cost shown in Tab A. This approach could result in a cost advantage to a prime that allocates more labor costs to their subcontractors.	CMO is considered a burden that can be applied to subcontracts according to the approach of the Offeror. The Attachment L-1, Tab A spreadsheet includes a row for burden on subcontracts. If the Offeror chooses to identify CMO separately, the Offeror may add an additional row. If rows are added, the Offeror needs to check the accuracy of the final totals.
54	For subcontractor pricing in the L-1 model, does NASA require detailed burdening disclosure at the subcontractor level, or is rolled-up pricing acceptable when supported by subcontractor quotes and prime analysis?	Per Section L, Volume II – Cost Volume Instructions, b.2.ii., Section 2 – Basis of Estimate (BOE) Summary, the Offeror and all major subcontractors must provide a pricing narrative BOE that explains in detail all pricing and estimating techniques for all cost elements.
55	Must the L-1 pricing workbook be submitted without structural changes beyond designated input fields, or are limited modifications permitted if documented?	Per Section L, Volume II – Cost Volume Instructions, (a)(8), the Offeror must not alter the Attachment L-1, Excel Pricing Model formats except for lengthening forms as appropriate or adjusting column widths, adding additional columns or rows, or correcting errors that would preclude the submission of an accurate proposal. The Offeror is permitted to alter formulas, if necessary, on Attachment L-1, Excel Pricing Model. If an Offeror enters data or modifies a formula in a non-highlighted cell, Offeror must highlight the cell in red and provide explanation of the changes.

56	For Attachment L-9, page L-19, RFP Section L states: "As part of this plan, the Offeror must complete and submit Attachment L-9, Small Business (SB) Proposed Goals…." For compliance with FAR 52.219-9(d)(1) under SB-1 Small Business Subcontracting Plan, does the Government intend for Offerors to submit: Attachment L-9 L-19 (a) a single table summarizing SB subcontracting goals for the entire period of performance (base and option years), similar to Attachment L-9; or (b) separate tables for each year of the period of performance? If separate annual tables are required, may all tables (including the summary and base/option year breakout) be submitted as part of Attachment L-9 and excluded from the page count?	See revised Section L, Volume I – Mission Suitability Volume Instructions, Subfactor C – Small Business (SB), (b), SB1: Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Tables submitted as part of the Small Business Subcontracting Plan will not be excluded from the Mission Suitability page limitation.
57	Will NASA give evaluation credit for a management approach that uses a single integration and governance framework across the team, including common reporting, interfaces, standards, and security controls?	The Government will not evaluate potential Offeror solutions prior to proposal submission. Refer to Section M for information on how the Government will evaluate proposals.
58	Will NASA evaluate an offeror's approach to achieving subcontracting goals as part of the Management Approach or another evaluation factor, and if so, where is it assessed in Section M?	Refer to Section M, Factor I – Mission Suitability Volume Evaluation, (a), Subfactor C: Small Business.

59	For delivery orders involving fabrication and inspection, what proposal-level evidence does NASA consider most persuasive for quality execution readiness, without requiring proprietary artifacts?	Offerors are encouraged to provide information in their proposals that best describes and supports their approach to fulfilling the ESSCA II PWS requirements, as guided by the instructions provided in Section L.
60	Will NASA evaluate skill coverage at the offeror team level, including specialized subcontractors, when the prime serves as the integrator and performs overall program management and execution governance?	Refer to Section M, Factor III – Past Performance Volume Evaluation for information on how past performance will be evaluated. Breadth of relevant coverage across the applicable PWS elements will be determined by the past performance referenced contracts submitted, limited to the parameters and relevancy thresholds in Section L, Volume III - Past Performance Volume Instructions.
61	How will NASA consider subcontractor past performance when subcontractors are proposed as primary performers for specific skill areas?	The Government will evaluate past performance in accordance with Section M, Factor III Past Performance Volume Evaluation.
62	For Section M, Factor III Past Performance, paragraph (b), pages M-6 and M-7, Would the Government consider the following clarification to Section M Factor III (b)? “In determining the overall relevancy of individual referenced contracts, each referenced contract will be evaluated in the order of size, content, and complexity. If a referenced contract is determined to be not relevant in either size, content, or complexity, it will be determined not relevant overall and will not be further evaluated. NASA reserves the right to evaluate past performance referenced contracts for subcontractors other than major subcontractors	The Government has revised Volume III – Past Performance Instructions, paragraph (c) and Factor III Past Performance Volume Evaluation, paragraph (b).

	that have the potential to impact performance of the proposed contract. As part of its confidence level assessment, the Government will consider the past performance of other entities (e.g., parent, affiliate) where meaningful involvement is clearly described; however, the Government is not obligated to assess similar impact on the offeror's ability to successfully perform the required effort as those references performed by the prime offeror. The Government may also consider other factors that contribute to overall confidence such as the breadth of relevant coverage across the applicable PWS elements and demonstrated relevant performance as a prime contractor. If an Offeror is a new joint venture (JV) without a past performance record, past performance will be evaluated for each individual JV partner for which a referenced contract is submitted, in accordance with the relevancy thresholds established for the Offeror (see also 13 C.F.R. § 124.513(f)). Participation of an individual JV partner in another JV will be evaluated provided that the partner's sole effort is clearly described and meets established relevancy criteria. When an Offeror submits a past performance reference for work performed as part of an unpopulated JV, the Offeror must clearly delineate the specific portion of the effort performed by that entity, independent of the overall JV performance. "Sole effort" in this context refers to the individual partner's contribution, not the JV's collective performance. The past performance submission should identify as applicable: the partner's specific scope of work and functional responsibilities; the percentage or relative share of work performed by that partner; key deliverables, outcomes, or performance results directly attributable to that partner; and, the partner's management, technical, or operational control over its portion of the work. The Government will evaluate	

	such past performance based on the relevance and quality of the proposing partner's demonstrated effort, not the performance of the JV as a whole. When an Offeror submits a past performance reference for work performed by a populated JV, the Government may evaluate the past performance references of the populated joint venture where the Offeror had a "sufficient role" in the JV to make the performance of the JV relevant. "Sufficient role" in this context refers to an Offeror's contribution to the performance of the JV, which may include, but is not limited to an Offeror's contribution to the performance of the JV as a manager, member, or venturer of the populated JV. The past performance submission should identify as applicable the Offeror's specific contribution to the populated JV. References for protégé members of any proposed mentor-protégé joint venture, HUBZone members of any HUBZone joint venture, and 8(a) participants of any 8(a) joint venture will be evaluated in accordance with the relevancy thresholds established for proposed subcontractors (see 13 C.F.R. § 125.8(e), 13 C.F.R. § 126.616(f), and 13 C.F.R. § 124.513(f), respectively). Parent or affiliate references for the Offeror will be held to the relevancy thresholds established for the Offeror.	
63	For Prospective Contractor Responsibility and Eligibility Standards (Oct 2021), para. (b), page M-1, Can the Government clarify what types of inconsistencies between the Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Plan and other proposal volumes would be considered "material" and could render a proposal invalid and ineligible for award?	In accordance with the requirements of paragraph 11 of DRD 1389MA-003 Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Plan, an Offeror is required to submit an OCI Plan that complies with the content requirements listed in paragraph 15.3 (a-q). The Agency may communicate with an Offeror outside of negotiations in an iterative process per Section L provision Prospective Contractor Responsibility and Eligibility Standards, paragraph (b), in relation to the OCI Plan, and the Plan must be acceptable to the Agency.

		A "material" inconsistency between the OCI Plan and other proposal volumes could render a proposal invalid or ineligible for award. For example, an Offeror is required to assert "that to the best of its knowledge no OCIs exist currently, if applicable" per paragraph 15.3(j). Furthermore, the Offeror must provide "a list of all the prime's and proposed subcontractor(s)'s NASA contracts and subcontracts currently being performed and contracts performed within the last five years of the release of this solicitation, in order to provide the CO a better understanding of other NASA work performed by the Offeror that may give rise to an actual or potential conflict. For each prime contract and subcontract listed, the Offeror must: (1) identify the contract number; (2) describe the scope of work in sufficient detail to ascertain the likelihood of a conflict with performance of this contract; and (3) discuss any conflicts that may arise from performance of the listed contracts and award of this contract." If a potential or actual OCI is identified by the Agency when reviewing these details for the prime or its subcontractors *and* the Offeror cannot provide an acceptable method to avoid, neutralize, or mitigate the OCI, a "material" inconsistency exists between the contents of the proposal and the acceptability of the OCI Plan which may render a proposal ineligible for award. Note: DRD 1389MA-003 Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Plan has been updated to require initial submission of the draft OCI Plan with proposal, and to require submission of the final OCI Plan no later than 20 days after the start of the phase-in period.

64	For Prospective Contractor Responsibility and Eligibility Standards (Oct 2021), para. (b); FAR 15.204-2, page M-1, the solicitation states the Government may communicate with offerors regarding eligibility requirements outside the evaluation process and that such communication does not constitute negotiations. If OCI concerns are identified, will offerors be provided an opportunity to clarify or address those concerns prior to a final determination of eligibility or will OCI determinations be made on a pass/fail basis without opportunity for revision?	Yes. Offerors will be provided an opportunity to clarify or address concerns identified by the Government related to Organizational Conflicts of Interest prior to final determination of eligibility.
65	Will NASA treat accounting, timekeeping, and cost controls as an acceptability requirement or as an evaluated performance risk?	Accounting system adequacy (which includes consideration of timekeeping and cost controls) is considered as support for the cost volume evaluation as well as the responsibility determination required by FAR 9.103. The RFP has been revised to address submission of accounting system documentation. See revised Cost Volume instructions and new Attachment L-11 SF1408 Preaward Survey of Prospective Contractor Accounting System.
66	What evidence does NASA want to demonstrate cost-type readiness without submission of sensitive internal artifacts?	The ESSCA II RFP does not require demonstration of “cost-type readiness”. The Government will evaluate proposals as detailed in Section M.