Index	Comment / Question	Response
1	The DRFP states font style shall be Times New Roman and the font size shall be not smaller than 12-point for all text, including text used in charts, tables, figures, illustrations, or other embedded objects (e.g., pictures or screenshots). Suggest using small font size (10 pt) for tables and graphics. Some graphics will have trouble fitting on a page, i.e. organization chart.	Request was considered and resulted in a revision to NFS 1852.215-81 Proposal Page Limitations, paragraph (b) (1) and (b)(7)(F).
2	MTA4 asks for the submittal of ATOMS Suite Requirements Matrix Attachment L-7 be submitted under Volumes 1 within the 175 page requirement. Suggest making this matrix exempt from the Volume 1 page count because the attachment without populated content is 26 pages. Once content is added the matrix could take up a large percentage of page count leaving other sections lacking space to fully answer section L requirements.	The Government maintains the requirement in Volume I - Mission Suitability Instructions, (d), Subfactor A: Management and Technical Approach, MTA4: ATOMS Suite of Tools to complete the ATOMS Suite Requirements Matrix at Attachment L-7 as part of its page-counted response. However, the Government has increased the page count for Volume I - Mission Suitability to 215. See NFS 1852.215-81 Proposal Page Limitations.
3	WST3 requires naming key personnel and providing resumes. Could the Government consider modifying this requirement to instead have Offerors submit position qualifications and role descriptions only, rather than resumes and named individuals? This would ensure that proposals are evaluated based on the strength of the proposed management structure and role requirements, not the identity of specific individuals - many of whom are often replaced post-award.	No. WST3 Key Personnel has been modified to WCSF3 Essential Personnel in the final RFP. The Government has reviewed the WCSF3 Essential Personnel requirements and determined them to be appropriate for this acquisition.
4	Will the Government consider a minimum of 10 months of performance for presented past performance reference contracts? 10 months is still a duration that demonstrates performance and it allows all potential offerors to present their most recent and relevant citations from their portfolios.	No. The Government has reviewed the past performance referenced contract minimum performance requirements and determined them to be appropriate for this acquisition.

5	Would the Government consider removing the past performance contract value threshold for proposed subcontractors? Prime offerors are ultimately responsible for the execution of the ESSCA II contract and require size, scope, and relevancy thresholds. Creating an annual contract value threshold for subcontractors creates barriers of entry for qualified small business subcontracting teammates to demonstrate their relevance.	No. The Government has reviewed the subcontractor size relevancy threshold of $10M in Volume III - Past Performance Instructions, paragraph (d)(1) and determined it to be appropriate for this acquisition.
6	Would the Government consider removing the requirement for Offerors to demonstrate prior implementation experience for proposed innovations under MTA8 and MTA9? Instead, would the Government allow Offerors to propose innovations tailored specifically to ESSCA II without requiring direct implementation history with supporting implementation rationale?	The Government has changed RFP requirements related to innovations. See Volume I - Mission Suitability Volume Instructions (d), Subfactor A: Management and Technical Approach, MTA 8: No-Cost Innovations.
7	Will the Government confirm Small Business Contracting Goals are only achieved through prime labor or first-tier subcontracting teammates for labor workshare only?	Small business subcontracting goals will only be applicable if an Other than Small business is the successful ESSCA II Offeror. The Agency is aware that SBA has issued a final rule allowing Other than Small prime contractors to elect to receive small business subcontracting credit for small business concerns performing as first-tier subcontractors or subcontractors at any tier pursuant to their small business subcontracting plan. See 3 CFR 125.3. However, this final rule has not yet been incorporated into FAR Part 19 or FAR 52.219-9. For the purposes of this solicitation, the Government will adhere to the current version Revolutionary FAR Overhaul Part 19 and 52.219-9. If a small business is the successful ESSCA II Offeror, all dollars obligated to the contract will be counted as direct small business dollars, unless the successful Offeror's size designation changes.

8	In Section I, the DRFP states, “Offerors shall furnish the following information for each past performance referenced contract/subcontract,” and lists items numbered 1 through 10; however, item 9 appears to be omitted. Would the Government please confirm whether this omission was intentional or if an item was inadvertently left out?	Section L, Volume III - Past Performance Volume Instructions, paragraph (e) Section 1 has been revised to correct list numbering.
9	The contract will include an option to transition the skills augmentation portion to CPFF in the event of sustained, highly excellent performance as determined by the Government. The Government will consider potential transition to CPFF once the ESSCA II Contractor receives two consecutive Performance Evaluation Board scores greater than 98%. Can Offerors propose a separate fixed rate in the case that the contract transitions from CPAF to CPFF in Section 5 - Fee/Profit on our cost volume?	Attachment L-1 Excel Pricing Model has been revised to accommodate proposal of an award fee rate for contract years 1-4 and proposal of a fixed fee rate for contract years 5-8.
10	Phase-in price should be input in cell C4, not to exceed $600,000. Would the Government consider remove phase-in costs in total price evaluation of each Offeror?	No. The Government considers inclusion of phase-in cost in the Offeror's proposed and probable cost for the contract requirements appropriate for this acquisition.
11	Rates provided in Background and Historical Appendix for the Engineering Technicians 1-4 are less than those provided in the DRFP Section L – Volume II – Tab B Instructions. Can the Government confirm that the rates provided in the Historical attachment are correct given that they are less than the Government provided minimums in the DRFP?	The Government has confirmed Incumbent WYEs and Average Unburdened Direct Labor Rates in Attachment L-5-A align with data submitted by the incumbent under the current contract. Additional data from December 2025 has been added to the attachment.
12	This competitive acquisition will result in a hybrid indefinite-delivery, indefinite-quantity (IDIQ) contract with the ability to issue cost-plus-award-fee (CPAF), cost-plus-fixed-fee (CPFF), and firm-fixed-price (FFP) orders. Should the Offeror propose different fee/profit rates in Section 5 of our cost volume based on the different potential contract types? Only Award Fee is included in the EPM for calculation of Offeror's total evaluated price. Will Offeror's proposed fixed fee rates be included in the evaluation price?	Attachment L-1 Excel Pricing Model has been revised to accommodate proposal of an award fee rate for contract years 1-4 and proposal of a fixed fee rate for contract years 5-8. Attachment J-7 Schedule of Rates and Description of Labor Categories, Table J-7-2 Contract Negotiated Rates has been revised to remove Fixed Fee (End-Item Deliverables CLINS 0003 and 0009) and Profit (End-Item Deliverables CLINS 0004 and 0010). Per the revised attachment, fee or profit for end-item deliverables will be established in each DO.

		Complexity of the specific deliverable will be considered in establishing the fee or profit.
13	The Background and Historical Appendix document contains SME 1-3 LCATs, while the Attachment L-1 EPM does not contain any of these LCATs and instead shows Engineer/Scientist 6-11 that the Appendix document does not contain. To ensure Offeror's propose salaries meet or exceed the average unburdened hourly direct labor rates provided in the Appendix, can the Government provide a mapping of the SME LCATs to the Engineer/Scientists 6-11 LCATs in Attachment L-1?	No. The 80MSFC18C0011 ESSCA labor categories and 80MSFC26R0002 ESSCA II labor categories have different descriptions and typical education and experience levels. The Government has determined that meaningful mapping of these labor categories is not possible.
14	The WYEs provided in the EPM exceed the WYEs provided in the Incumbent WYEs. Do the WYEs contained in the EPM include the specialty subcontractors on this contract? Or are those costs captured in the ODC section of the EPM?	Staffing profiles presented in the Excel Pricing Model are provided for proposal pricing purposes. Historical staffing profiles and incumbent WYEs provided in Attachment L-5 and L-5-A are provided for reference only. The ESSCA II WYEs will be determined by ESSCA II contract orders, which will be placed based on requirements and available budget. Cost Volume noted that Labor costs will not be allowed through ODC. The Government has revised Section L, Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, (b)(3)(ii)(A) to include the following note: Government-provided ODC cost does not include any cost to pay for workforce.
16	Could the Government provide a sample Pursuits Culture and Partnering Plan?	No. Offerors are encouraged to review information provided in DRD 1839MA-009 to assist with development of the Pursuits Culture and Partnering Plan.

17	The clause calls for formal evaluations to determine the award fee at 6-month intervals, but the Att. J-4 Award Fee Plan clearly states the award fee periods are conducted at 12-month intervals. Will the Government consider changing the time period of evaluations within Clause 1852.216-76(b) to 12 months to be consistent with the Award fee plan?	Clause 1852.216-76 Award Fee for Service Contracts has been revised within fill-in constraints to be consistent with Attachment J-4 Draft Award Fee Evaluation Plan.
18	Will the Government please clarify and confirm the intent is to clearly state "*80%" vs. "80"* for consistency with the language in the original clause?	Clause 1852.216-76 Award Fee for Service Contracts, paragraph (f)(1) updated to state, "The total amount of award fee available in an evaluation period that will be provisionally paid is the lesser of 80% or the prior period's evaluation score."
19	Since Executive Order 14026 has been revoked, will the Government remove clause 52.222-55 as a requirement?	Clause 52.222-55 Minimum Wages for Contractor Worker Under Executive Order 13658 (due to Revocation of Executive Order 14026) has been incorporated in full text in Section I.
20	Can the Government please confirm that applicable subcontractors, as defined in cost volume instructions, are permitted to upload their detailed cost volume submission into NASA's EFSS Box?	The term applicable subcontractor is no longer included in this solicitation. Refer to Section L, Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, paragraph a. 4. for the definition of major subcontractor. Major subcontractors are permitted upload their cost volume to NASA's EFSS Box.
21	The request for the Government to enable extensibility of the ATOMS suite to concurrent or future utilizations by contractors could inadvertently expose Prime proprietary data, Government data, and data from other existing contractors as well as posing potential cybersecurity risks. Would the Government consider striking this part of the requirement, or revising the language to address these concerns?	Attachment J-1 Performance Work Statement requirement 2.4.25 which addressed ATOMS Suite extensibility has been significantly revised.

22	Will the Government please revise the language of this requirement to clarify that the source code required for delivery does not include specific interfaces dealing with data exchanges using the Prime's internal business processes and systems?	Attachment J-1 Performance Work Statement requirement 2.4.26 which addressed ATOMS Suite delivery has been removed and is now reserved.
23	The current WD revisions listed in Draft RFP are at least 2 revisions old. Example: WD 2015-4727 is now actually Rev 27 dated July 8, 2025, but DRFP states Rev 25 dated Dec 22, 2024. Will the Government incorporate the latest WD revisions in the Final RFP at the time of the Final RFP?	Attachment J-16 Wage Determinations has been revised to include the most recent wage determination revisions and associated published dates.
24	Will the Government please exclude cover pages, Table of Contents, Lists of Figures, Compliance Matrix, and Acronym lists from any and all page counts?	The Government has excluded title pages and table of contents from Mission Suitability and Past Performance volume page limitations. The Government has also increased the Volume I - Mission Suitability page count to 215. See NFS 1852.215-81 Proposal Page Limitations (a) and (b)(8).
25	It appears the Government is asking for the Total Compensation Plan in pricing but also includes a reference to it within mission suitability under WST2, which again instructs the offerors to include a TCP under the cost volume. The inclusion of WST2 insinuates the Government expects some TCP related content for this section within the proposal. Would the Government please confirm that it is the Government's intent that the Total Compensation Plan is only to be included in Volume II: Cost, but will be evaluated in Volume I: Mission Suitability?	The requirement to submit a Total Compensation Plan has been removed from the solicitation. Refer to Section L, Volume I - Mission Suitability Volume Instructions, Subfactor B, WCSF1: Workforce Compensation and Sustainment for instructions regarding submission of compensation-related information.
26	Can the Government please confirm that Tab B only needs to be completed by applicable subcontractors (as defined in the cost volume instructions)?	Tab B must be completed by prime Offerors and major subcontractors. Refer to Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, (a)(4) for the definition of major subcontractor. Refer to Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, b. 3. Excel Pricing Model for applicability of tabs to Offeror and subcontractors.

27	Can the Government please confirm that Tab E only needs to be completed by applicable subcontractors (as defined in the cost volume instructions)?	Tab E must be completed by prime Offerors and major subcontractors. Refer to Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, (a)(4) for the definition of major subcontractor. Refer to Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, b. 3. Excel Pricing Model for applicability of tabs to Offeror and subcontractors.
28	Can the Government please confirm that Tab F only needs to be completed by applicable subcontractors (as defined in the cost volume instructions)?	Tab F must be completed by prime Offerors and major subcontractors. Refer to Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, (a)(4) for the definition of major subcontractor. Refer to Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, b. 3. Excel Pricing Model for applicability of tabs to Offeror and subcontractors.
29	The Section L Past Performance Instructions (d)(1) on page L-37 lists the relevancy size standard as an average annual value of $45M or greater for prime/JV contracts, which is incredibly low in comparison to ESSCA's historical annual value of ~$240M (which is expected to grow for ESSCA II based on the $3.5B ceiling). Would the Government consider increasing the relevancy size standard from "an average annual value of $45M or greater for prime/JV contracts, and an average annual value of $10M or greater for proposed subcontractors" to "an average annual value of $150M or greater for prime/JV contracts, and an average annual value of $20M or greater for proposed subcontractors"? This would better align the prime/JV size standard with the complexity of managing and staffing a highly technical contract closer in size to ESSCA II, reducing risk to the Government. Additionally, the increase to the subcontractor size relevancy standard would better align to those capable of providing a substantial impact on ESSCA II performance.	The Government has considered the size relevancy thresholds in Volume III - Past Performance Volume Instructions, (d)(1) and determined them to be suitable for this acquisition.

30	Can the Government please confirm that subcontractors do not need to provide a transmittal letter with their submissions?	The requirement to provide a transmittal letter, as outlined in Section L, VOLUME IV- CONTRACT INSTRUCTIONS (APR 28 2025), paragraph (c), applies only to the offeror. Refer to the preceding paragraph (b), which states, “Offerors shall provide the contract volume in the sections described below [...].”
31	Will the Government consider updating the Section M evaluation criteria for MTA4 to state the following? "NASA will evaluate the proposed approach for implementation of an ATOMS Suite of Tools, including responses to the ATOMS suite of tools requirements matrix."	Section M, FACTOR I - Mission Suitability Volume Evaluation, (a), Subfactor A: Technical and Management, MTA4: ATOMS Suite of Tools has been revised as follows: "NASA will evaluate the proposed approach for implementation of an ATOMS Suite of Tools, including responses to the ATOMS Suite of Tools requirements matrix."
32	Will the Government consider changing the definition of applicable subcontractors from those with "more than 2.5% of WYE for Contract Year 1" to those with "WYE equaling 9% or more of the Total Contract Value." This change would reduce burdens on smaller subcontractors spent preparing cost volume submissions, prevent "gaming" of subcontractor application and engagement around Contract Year 1 only, and ensure the Government only reviews cost volume submissions from those with a more substantial impact on successful ESSCA II delivery.	The term applicable subcontractor is no longer included in this solicitation. Refer to Section L, Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, paragraph a. 4. for the definition of major subcontractor.
33	Would the Government consider lowering the font size to Times New Roman 8-point for text outside of the margins (e.g., footer, page numbers) and figures/illustrations?	The Government has revised NFS 1852.215-81 Proposal Page Limitations, paragraph (b)(1) to permit use of 10-point type for non-substantive text used in charts, tables, figures, illustrations, or other embedded objects (e.g., pictures or screenshots).

34	Will the Government please clarify whether fee is to be applied to End-Item-Delivery? There seems to be a disconnect between the instructions provided in Attachment J-7, Table J-7-2, Contract Negotiated Rates and Attachment L-1, EPM Descriptions and Instruction, Tab A, which indicate that fee/profit is to be included for End-Item-Delivery and Section L instructions which state “Fee will not be applied to ODC and End Item Delivery. Please clarify.	Fee will not be applied to ODC and End Item Delivery in the Excel Pricing Model. Attachment J-7 Schedule of Rates and Description of Labor Categories has been revised to remove End-Item deliverable Fixed Fee and Profit rows from Table J-7-2 and to add a clarifying note as follows: "Fee or profit for End-Item Deliverables will be established in each DO. Complexity of the specific deliverable will be considered in establishing the fee or profit."
35	There does not appear to be a method to apply the CMO rate to subcontractor labor and/or ODCs for proposal purposes. As the CMO will support the entire program, it should be applied to all program costs, not limited to prime contractor labor. We recommend removing the CMO calculation in the individual location worksheets and including it in the A-1 Summary worksheet as a separate row calculated using the correct base. This will ensure full absorption of the CMO costs and support a more accurate price. Examples: In the "D-CMO" worksheet, the CMO rate is applied to subcontractor labor and ODCs. Conversely, on the individual location worksheets, the CMO rate is only applied to the prime contractor labor. This differing methodology will result in an inaccurately proposed CMO costs.	CMO is considered a burden and can be applied to subcontracts and ODC according to the approach of the Offeror. The Tab A spreadsheet includes a row for burden on both subcontracts and ODC. 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.

36	Will teammates and subcontractors be required to hold a Top Secret facility clearance? Additionally, should LCAT pricing include personnel with a TS clearance?	The prime Offeror must provide their Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) code for verification of current clearance status. Offerors must have these 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. For Offeror awareness, the Government anticipates <1% of ESSCA II personnel will be required to hold security clearances.
37	Key Personnel Proposed Salary is required as part of Attachment L-6 in Volume I: Mission Suitability. Will the Government confirm that offerors should include previous/current salary amounts in Volume I as part of its Attachment L-6 submission?	The Government confirms Offerors are required to provide proposed position salary and previous salary for Essential Personnel in Attachment L-6.
38	Does the government intend for contractors to escalate the SCLS categories? Individual Location tabs (B-?) are set up to escalate all labor categories including SCLS. Note: FAR 52.222-43 does NOT appear to be incorporated into the solicitation.	FAR 52.222-43 Fair Labor Standards Act and Service Contract Labor Standards-Price Adjustment (Multiple Year and Option Contracts), which was incorporated by reference in the DRFP, has been removed from the contract. Refer to Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, b. 2. F. for the Government's instructions related to application of escalation.
39	Instructions indicate "On the supporting data templates, provide cost history for the prior two fiscal years and current fiscal year (actuals and budgeted) and projected for the term of the contract." However, on Page L-30 of 80MSFC26R0002 DRFP Cover Letter and Sections J-M it says "On the supporting data templates, provide cost history for the prior three fiscal years and current fiscal year (actuals and budgeted) and projected for the term of the contract." Please clarify if offerors are to provide two prior years or three prior years.	Section L, Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, b.3.ii. E and F require cost history for the prior three fiscal years and current fiscal year (actuals and budgeted) and projected for the term of the contract. Attachment L-1 Excel Pricing Model instructions have been revised to align with these instructions.

40	DRFP Attachment L-1 Excel Pricing Model Tab F does not include blending formulas to convert offeror fiscal year fringe rates into contract year rates. Does the government want offerors to include that blending calculation (similar to what is shown on Tab E) for fringe rates?	The Government has added cells for conversion of contractor fiscal year to contract year rate to Attachment L-1 Excel Pricing Model.
41	What differentiates Equipment from Materials, and from Miscellaneous ODCs?	Refer to Attachment L-5 Background and Historical Information, section Travel, Materials, and Training, Table 6 for working descriptions and examples of various cost categories.
42	Is there an explanation for the variance in the years of experience between ES LCATs, which are non-linear progressions (reference ES 7 to 8, as 5 years, vice ES 8 to 9, as only 2 years)	No. The Government has provided typical education and experience for each labor category for Offeror reference in Attachment J-7.
43	Would NASA consider using a singular NASA Asbestos and Lead plan, applicable to MSFC, MAF, and SSC, instead of a separate plan for each center? The fundamental requirements should be the same. This duplication of regulations adds cost that could be minimized with one standard.	No.
44	What is PLI and ALI (acronym definitions not found)?	Acronyms ALI and PLI are defined in Attachment J-18 Acronym List.
45	Phase Out is in parallel with TO, DO of final year of the Contract. Will this be a separately priced CLIN? Is it expected that this will be done by existing staff in parallel with normal work activities?	There will not be a separately priced CLIN for phase-out. The Government anticipates phase-out will be completed by existing staff in parallel with normal work activities.
46	In providing support to NASA's Artificial Intelligence and Digital Transformation initiatives, please identify required Standards or Guidance (MPR/MPG) documents to assure proposals are compliant with expectations?	Specific standards and guidance related to Artificial Intelligence and Digital Transformation initiatives will be provided in TOs and DOs as applicable.
47	There are only 9 items on the Government Furnished Property list. Does the government intend to share more items in a future list or is this considered a complete list?	The Attachment J-13 Government Furnished Property list is considered complete. As stated in the attachment, this list can change prior to contract award and during contract performance.

48	Requirement is "Perform any planned preventative maintenance and upgrades from of 5:00 p.m., to 7:00 a.m., Central Time." Is this inclusive of weekends also?	Yes. Attachment J-1 Performance Work Statement, paragraph 2.4.21 has been updated to state, "Perform any planned preventative maintenance and upgrades from 5:00 p.m., to 7:00 a.m., Central Time, daily."
49	Define the difference between the Small Business Engagement and Subcontracting Plan.	Refer to FAR 52.219-9 Small Business Subcontracting Plan for Small Business Subcontracting Plan requirements. Refer to Attachment J-2 Data Procurement Document, DRD 1839MA-005 for Small Business Engagement Plan requirements.
50	There are significant deliverables related to software development, however there are no labor categories which support this directly. Is it expected that the software development tasks would be within the FFP CLIN structure for End-Item Deliverables?	The Government considers the labor categories in Attachment J-7 sufficient to address the labor needs for anticipated ESSCA II TOs and DOs.
51	For the location of the LCATS rates: will they reflect the location where the employees perform the work or where the tasks originate?	Proposed rates should reflect the location where employees perform the work.
52	Clarify how Innovations will be evaluated. Should they include linkages to the PWS; and, should they include ROI content with valuations of cost to implement, timelines and efficiencies or savings (represented numerically)?	The Government has changed RFP instructions related to innovations. Refer to Section L, Volume I - Mission Suitability Volume Instructions (d), Subfactor A: Management and Technical Approach, MTA 8: No-Cost Innovations.
53	Will innovations be incorporated by reference in the awarded contract or are these proposed as elective that will be negotiated post-award for issuance on a separate task order?	The Government has changed RFP instructions related to innovations. Refer to Section L, Volume I - Mission Suitability Volume Instructions (d), Subfactor A: Management and Technical Approach, MTA 8: No-Cost Innovations.

54	Can the government please confirm that the file naming conventions on Page L-11 (e) are negated by the naming conventions on page L-28 (C) for the Cost/Price volume?	The requirements of ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS – PROPOSAL MARKING AND DELIVERY THROUGH NASA'S EFSS BOX provision section (e) are applicable to all proposal submissions. That provision provides examples of acceptable file names. Per the note in Section L, Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, b.3.i.C. the Cost/price volume instructions require a more specific naming convention for Cost/Price volume submissions in order to more easily identify Offeror and applicable subcontractor Cost/Price volume submissions, consistent with the structure identified for EFSS Box proposal submission.
55	The con-ops documentation in the e-Library seems to be missing	The ESSCA (Classic) Concept of Operations document remains available on the ESSCA II e-Library - https://www.nasa.gov/mnrco/.
56	Applicable subcontractors, per Attachment L-1, would be identified in the Cost Volume.	The term applicable subcontractor is no longer included in this solicitation. Refer to Section L, Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, paragraph a. 4. for the definition of major subcontractor.
57	May applicable subcontractors directly submit their TCP to the Government, as it will contain proprietary data? Similarly, confirm the page limitation for the Offeror's Mission Suitability Volume, if they include subcontractors' TCPs.	The term applicable subcontractor is no longer included in this solicitation. The requirement to submit total compensation plans has been removed from the solicitation.
58	Should the Mission Suitability explicitly exclude any numeric values associated with the TCP, otherwise included in Attachment L-1?	The requirement to submit a Total Compensation Plan has been removed from the solicitation. Refer to Section L, Volume I - Mission Suitability Volume Instructions, Subfactor B, WCSF1: Workforce Compensation and Sustainment for instructions regarding submission of compensated-related information.
59	The minimum escalation rates only go through 2033. However the POP goes through 2035. How should offerors apply escalation in calendar years 2034 and 2035?	Section L, Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, Table L-2 Escalation Rates has been revised to include rates for 2034 and 2035.

60	Attachment L-3 TOTAL COMPENSATION RATE BUILD-UP FORM. Please confirm that this is only to be completed for Professional Exempt labor categories, not the SCLS labor categories?	The requirement to submit a Total Compensation Plan has been removed from the solicitation. Attachment L-3 is now reserved.
61	Can Offerors propose the Benchmark rates without providing any additional documentation to support the direct labor rates?	No. The Offeror and all applicable major subcontractors shall provide a pricing narrative BOE that explains in detail all pricing and estimating techniques for all cost elements.
62	Why are benchmark labor rates significantly higher than the incumbent rates? Variances between the benchmark rate and incumbent rates are found for most of the Engineer/Scientist categories, providing the incumbent contractor with an apparent cost advantage over non-incumbent contractors. Can the government help industry understand the nature of the variance between the benchmark rates and the incumbent rates?	The Government has provided benchmark average unburdened hourly direct labor rates and incumbent average unburdened hourly direct labor rates for informational purposes. The labor categories used in the ESSCA contract are not the same as the labor categories used in ESSCA II. Incumbent average unburdened hourly direct labor rates may not directly map to the ESSCA II labor categories.
63	Will the WYE percentage calculation be based on the total number of employees on the referenced contracts? If so, how should WYEs that provide support unrelated to these PWS be identified on the table? Or, should the percentage be calculated on the Government's estimated WYEs for each PWS? If so, please provide. If 4 of the 14 PWS equates to 'relevant', how will other percentages of relevancy be evaluated?	The Government has revised the PWS Element WYE Percentage Assignment Table in Section L, Volume III - Past Performance Volume Instructions and included a note stating, "There is no expectation that the average number of personnel on the referenced contract will be fully accounted for in the Past Performance Content Element WYE Table or PWS Element WYE Percentage Assignment Table."
64	Will a past performance reference where the offeror was a subcontractor be evaluated the same as if performed as a prime?	The Government will evaluate past performance in accordance with Section M, Factor III Past Performance Volume Evaluation.
65	Will a past performance reference from a major subcontractor teammate be evaluated the same as a reference from the prime offeror?	The Government will evaluate past performance in accordance with Section M, Factor III Past Performance Volume Evaluation.

66	The instructions in (d)(2) refer to PWS 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, and 2.10, but the tables in Section II(1) and (2) only asks offerors for PWS 2.0. Is this intentional?	Refer to revised Section L, Volume III - Past Performance Volume Instructions.
67	Will the Government reduce the allowable font/type size in tables and graphics to 10 pt Arial Narrow or Tahoma to allow offerors more space while maintaining readability.	Font style shall be Times New Roman. The Government has revised NFS 1852.215-81 Proposal Page Limitations, paragraph (b)(1) to permit use of 10-point type text for non-substantive text used in charts, tables, figures, illustrations, or other embedded objects (e.g., pictures or screenshots).
68	The DRFP specifies that a Table of Contents must be provided for all volumes with the exception of the Contract volume. Will the Government confirm that Offerors should not include a List of Exhibits/Figures or Acronym list for the Contract volume as well?	Offerors are not prohibited from including a List of Exhibits/Figures or Acronym list for the Contract Volume.
69	Can the tables in L-5-22 through L-5-27 be provided in Excel format?	The Government will not provide the tables in Attachment L-5 in Excel format.
70	Does the government require a response to "1852.245-80 GOVERNMENT PROPERTY MANAGEMENT INFORMATION (JAN 2011)" in our proposal? If so, what Volume should this information be included? Or does DRD 1839LS-001 due 30 days after start of Phase-In fulfill this requirement?	Responses to 1852.245-80 Government Property Management Plan are to be included in Volume I - Mission Suitability. See Section L, Volume I - Mission Suitability Volume Instructions, (d) MTA1 Management approach, paragraph (g).
71	Cell K19 (Fringe Year 8) appears to be referencing the wrong cells. It is referencing Row 26 which is Year 1. The correct reference appears to be Row 208 (224 for MSFC) which is consistent with the other Year 8 formulas.	This formula has been corrected in the Attachment L-1, Excel Pricing Model Tab A.
72	Cell I9 is intended to reflect Year 6 for ARC, however the formula references GRC (B-**4 G**RC'!$O156). Please confirm that the correct formula should read =B-**3 A**RC'!$O156.	This formula has been corrected in the Attachment L-1, Excel Pricing Model Tab A.
73	There are no hours in Year 2 for the Engineer/Scientist 11 (ES-11) yet there are hours for all other years. Is that an oversight?	Yes. Cell L34 on Attachment L-1, Excel Pricing Model Tab B-5 GSFC and Tab B-7 JSC have been revised.

74	In the EPM workbook, there appear to be several formula errors in Tab F-Fringe, Row 84. Generally the formula should sum rows 82, 77, 72, 67, 61 and 57. The formula in Column B references B60 rather than B61. Columns C through I generally appear to reference one row below the intended cell (e.g. 68 rather than 67, 73 rather than 72, etc.).	These cells have been corrected in Attachment L-1, Excel Pricing Model Tab F.
75	Can Offerors revise the cells that contain "100" hours, to be a calculated product of each Offeror's productive hours, applied to the WYEs?	No. The Government requires each Offeror to price 100 hours for these labor categories.
76	To allow for competitive pricing for non-labor procurement, will the government provide historical purchasing data for the past 3 years to identify the types of items included?	No. However, refer to Attachment L-5 Background and Historical Information, section Travel, Materials, and Training, Table 6 for working descriptions and examples of various cost categories.
77	Does the Government expect all historical data in the current ATOMS Suite to be transferred over, maintained, and/or archived in the new ATOMS Suite?	No.
78	The table on L-30 refers to "DRD information." Can the Government be specific on where this DRD information resides?	The table in Section L, Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, b.3.ii.B. has been revised to remove the reference to DRD information.
79	Can the Government please clarify if this is requesting all contracts across the entire company for both Prime and Subcontractors to be listed, or simply all contracts from our list of cited past performances?	Volume III - Past Performance Volume Instructions, (e) Section II (4) requires Offerors and any proposed subcontractors to provide a list of all contracts terminated for default and a listing of all contracts whose scope was reduced because of performance or cost problems. This requirement is not limited to the list of referenced past performance contracts.
80	Will the Government please confirm that it is only the A-J document that will keep the solicitation's numbering convention because the Contract volume itself includes other information?	Confirmed.
81	Can offerors use their own page numbering convention for the rest of the Contracts volume (including the standard disclosure statement required by the FAR)?	Yes.

82	Will the Government please confirm that only the A-J document which should not have a Table of Contents?	Offerors are not prohibited from including a Table of Contents in the Contracts volume.
83	To help ease the evaluator in finding requirements, is it acceptable for offerors to provide a Table of Contents for other information in the Contracts volume?	Offerors are not prohibited from including a Table of Contents in the Contracts volume.
84	This contract has historically incorporated support from both on-site and off-site personnel. Offers may have a separate fringe rate based on work location (with the on-site personnel often at a lower rate), which could be presented on a separate worksheet for either on- or off-site. May offerors edit the workbook to submit these options or can the Government provide an additional tab for the MSFC location?	No. The Government anticipates the vast majority of ESSCA II support will be provided on-site. For proposal purposes, Offerors must propose fringe rates based on on-site performance.
85	MTA1(d) refers to PWS Section 2.2.17, which does not seem germane to this section. Please confirm that the PWS reference is correct and appropriate.	The PWS reference in Section L, Volume I - Mission Suitability Volume Instructions, (d) Subfactor A: Management and Technical Approach, MTA1 (d) has been corrected.
86	The requirement for the End Item DO appears to be internally inconsistent between the Scope (" the Offeror shall produce two International Standard Payload Half Racks, one for ground testing, and a second for transport as part of co-manifested payloads on various launch vehicles.") and the deliverable list ("The Offeror shall develop a design/analysis package and end-item delivery with the optimum combination of the following features"). Can the government clarify if the objective of the DO is to deliver hardware, to perform a study, or both? Please also clarify the meaning of "TBD" in the Scope section?	Attachment L-4 Example End-Item Deliverable has been revised to describe a scenario rather than provide a sample Delivery Order Request. TBD references have been removed from the attachment.
87	How many WYEs constitute "relevant" or "highly relevant" for each PWS element?	The Government will not provide this level of evaluation detail in the solicitation.

88	Can NASA clarify performance indicators for transition from CPAF to CPFF under Section H?	Special Contract Requirement H.1 states, "NASA's determination to transition to use of CPFF skills augmentation CLINS will be based on the contractor's ability to demonstrate a firm understanding of the unique technical requirements and to demonstrate sustained, highly excellent, performance."
89	Since non-incumbents will need to provide greater detail in the phase-in plan based on the complexity of the four-month transition, will the government allow for 30 pages separate from the overall page count.	No.
90	Will the Government exclude the resume information contained in Attachments L-6-1 and L-6-2 from overall page count?	No.
91	During the industry day, the CO described the process for moving from CPAF to CPFF CLINs and, if in the best interests of NASA, from CPFF back to CPAF CLINs. Are these options limited to be only at the contract level, or does the Government have the ability to apply CPAF and CPFF CLINs to different tasks concurrently?	Should the Government exercise the option to transition skills augmentation from CPAF to CPFF, all task order work will transition. At no time will the Contractor be eligible for both the award fee and fixed fee for skills augmentation services.
92	If ESSCA II is not utilized by other centers, how will the 5% reserved for "Other Center Skill Augmentation Support" be allocated to the CPAF calculation?	A note has been added to Attachment J-4 Draft Award Fee Evaluation Plan section 2.4 as follows: "For award fee purposes, support to SSC will be evaluated as part of other Center skills augmentation support." Additionally, in accordance with 1852.216-76, the Award Fee Plan may be revised unilaterally by the Government prior to the beginning of any rating period to redirect emphasis. Percentage allocations may be changed to reflect the amount and type of work performed at other Centers.
93	In which category is work performed at Stennis Space Center and the Michoud Assembly Facility allocated? Which centers are included in the 5% identified as: "Other Center Skills Augmentation Support"?	Michoud Assembly Facility is part of the MSFC organization. A note has been added to Attachment J-4 Draft Award Fee Evaluation Plan section 2.4 as follows: "For award fee purposes, support to SSC will be

		evaluated as part of other Center skills augmentation support."
94	Will the Government exclude the Property Management Plan from page count?	The Government does not require submission of a Property Management Plan (DRD 1839LS-001) with the proposal. Responses to 1852.245-80 Government Property Management Plan are to be included in Volume I - Mission Suitability. See Section L, Volume I - Mission Suitability Volume Instructions, (d) MTA1 Management approach, paragraph (g). This information is not excluded from the Mission Suitability page count.
95	To help with contract Phase-In tasking, does the current ESSCA Contractor have phase out requirements that need to be considered for ESSCA II Phase-In?	The ESSCA contract phase-out requirements are not relevant to an Offeror's proposed phase-in efforts under ESSCA II.
96	Would the government provide the Model Contract sections A-I and SF33 in Word so that the offeror can fill in required information and keep required formatting?	No. These sections will be provided in PDF format.
97	How the Contractor team can accommodate short-term and long-term increases and decreases in requirements due to critical milestones and program life cycle phases. Could the Government Quantify the definitions of short term & long term?	The Government has revised Volume I - Mission Suitability Volume Instructions. The requirement to describe how the Contractor team can accommodate short-term and long-term increases and decreases in requirements due to critical milestones and program life cycle phases is no longer part of proposal requirements.
98	In MTA3(a), are essential positions limited to management positions? (Context: Proposal space is limited and might lean more towards managerial vs technical?)	Volume I - Mission Suitability Volume Instructions, (d) MTA3(a) has been revised.

99	In MTA1(c) Approach for creating workforce flexibility to support rapid requests, does the Government want Offerors to describe the philosophy behind workforce flexibility or the day-to-day operations supporting workforce flexibility?	The Government encourages offers to communicate an approach and rationale which demonstrates a clear understanding of how the offeror will create workforce flexibility to support rapid requests.
100	Are innovations limited to those that can be incorporated in a J-1 appendix, or can an Offeror proposed innovations that affect other areas of the contract? (In other words, how do we propose innovations that we can't capture in J-1?)	If the Government elects to incorporate innovations into the contract, they will be captured in J-1. This does not preclude the innovations from having an impact on other areas of the contract (e.g. J Attachments). Offerors are encouraged to propose no-cost innovations in the Mission Suitability volume and describe what other sections of the contract could be affected by the innovation, if incorporated.
101	Should an Offeror account for management cost in CMO, even if the specific tier of management is providing onsite support?	The Government will not prescribe an Offeror's management approach and associated costing solution.
102	Approach to assisting the organization in defining and planning support for new programs and projects (see PWS section 2.2.17). Does the Government expect Offeror's to provide their approach to setting up a new program or project at NASA or MSFC?	No. The Government does not expect the offeror to provide an approach for setting up new programs or projects for MSFC or NASA.
103	Can the Government disclose SEB members so proposal teams are aware of any potential conflicts?	The Government will disclose SEB members in this solicitation.
104	How are quality type support requirements handled on skills augmentation? We don't see any quality labor categories or hours in that portion of the EPM.	Quality Assurance Specialist positions are identified for use in end-item deliverable DOs only (i.e., CLINS 0003, 0004, 0009, and 0010). Skills augmentation work (i.e., CLINS 0002, 0005, 0006, 0007, 0008, 0011, 0012, and 0013) will use NASA internal quality assurance support.
105	How is the partnership plan supposed to work?	Expectations are described in DRD 1839MA-009 Pursuits Culture and Partnering Plan.

106	How can an Offeror account for proposed post-award subcontracting? Can "hostile" companies be included in proposal?	The Government interprets “hostile” company to mean a company who elects not to engage with a Prime Offeror in the pre-proposal stage. The Offeror will need to include internally developed estimates for possible additional subcontractors added post-award in the Prime's cost volume.
107	Can the Government provide more context regarding potential 30% increase or decrease to ESSCA II? Will this affect 30% of the full contract or likely be focused on one program?	The Government anticipates any significant increase or decrease impacting ESSCA II to be based on mission priorities. Historically MSFC has experienced mission changes that resulted in a more than 30% decrease in contract requirements.
108	Can the Government confirm the timeframe benchmark rates were pulled and explain how they have been adjusted for the base year of the contract?	Benchmark rates were pulled in 2024 and have been escalated to reflect base year performance in 2027.
109	Will incumbent rate data in L-5 be updated in the final solicitation?	Attachment L-5-A has been updated.
110	Can the Government confirm whether the sample DO is seeking a design & analysis study deliverable or a hardware deliverable?	Attachment L-4 Example End-Item Deliverable has been revised to describe a scenario rather than provide a sample Delivery Order Request.
111	Can the Government explain why there are only 100 labor hours assigned to Quality labor categories and all labor categories at other Centers?	The Government does not have defined requirements for these labor categories from other Centers or for DO quality support at MSFC. The Government has assigned 100 labor hours to any labor categories and locations without defined requirements in order to obtain proposed rates.
113	How will the Draft Award Fee Plan adapt if no other Centers use the contract?	Attachment J-4 Draft Award Fee Plan has been revised.

114	Will the Government consider making subcontractor threshold for submitting a cost volume applicable to a portion of the total contract value? This will prevent prime offeror gaming of subcontractor use in the EPM.	Refer to Section L, Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, paragraph a. 4. for the definition of major subcontractor.
115	Will the Government consider increasing the subcontractor threshold for submitting a cost volume to at least 5-10% of the contract value?	No. Refer to Section L, Volume II - Cost Volume Instructions, paragraph a. 4. for the definition of major subcontractor.
116	Recommend the small business engagement plan be applicable to all prime proposers.	Section L, Volume I - Mission Suitability Volume Instructions, (d) Subfactor C - Small Business has been revised. Small Business Offerors are not required to respond to SB1: Small Business Subcontracting Plan, only.
117	Are Offerors permitted to change the structure of forms in the solicitation if they still adhere to other font and formatting requirements?	Offerors may change the structure of Attachment L-6 Essential Personnel Position Description and Resume; however, Offerors are reminded that the form must include all required information and adhere to solicitation font and formatting requirements.
118	Can the Government make section A-I fill-ins easier to complete. The PDF is not conducive to editing and forces margin issues.	Though Sections A-I are provided in PDF format, they are presented differently than they were in the DRFP. Offerors are encouraged to submit a comment in response to the final solicitation if they find the presented format incapable of supporting required fill-ins.