RFP Attachment 3

Responses to Draft RFP Feedback/Questions

1. NASA is encouraged to clarify whether offerors may satisfy applicable spacecraft, mission operations center (GMOC), and ground segment requirements through the use of existing heritage-qualified systems, facilities, and processes, with mission-specific modifications as required, rather than developing new mission-unique capabilities.

   Government Response: The Government intends offerors to utilize any solutions available to them to satisfy applicable spacecraft, GMOC, and ground segments requirements. This includes utilization of existing qualified systems, facilities, and processes, or develop mission-specific capabilities.

2. If Government-directed changes to payload interfaces, operational concepts, environmental requirements, or ICD content occur after contract award, what contractual mechanism will be used to address resulting impacts to cost, schedule, testing, or spacecraft design?

   Government Response: Should this occur, the Government will issue a bilateral modification to address any changes, including impacts to cost, schedule, testing or spacecraft design.

3. The ATSRD states that GLIMR may be hosted on a dedicated spacecraft or share a spacecraft with other payloads. NASA is requested to clarify whether dedicated and multi-payload architectures will be evaluated on a neutral basis provided all mission performance, pointing, jitter, thermal, contamination, and operational requirements are met.
   Government Response: Section M – Evaluation Factors for Award of the solicitation defines the factors for evaluation. Furthermore, Section L.16 (b) – Instructions for Technical Approach/Oral Presentations, Oral Presentation Content, does not specify the offerors to use hosted, dedicated, or shared spacecraft with other payloads.

4. NASA is requested to further define the boundaries between Contractor-operated payload functions and Government-operated science functions. Specifically, clarification is requested regarding command authority, payload planning responsibility, anomaly resolution authority, calibration activities, and operational decision-making during nominal and contingency operations.

   Government Response: The Contractor shall have command authority, payload planning responsibility, anomaly resolution authority, calibration activity authority, and operational decision-making during nominal and contingency operations. However, the Contractor shall coordinate payload planning, anomaly resolution, calibration activities, and contingency operations with the Government.

5. Given the planned payload delivery timeline and the critical-path nature of payload-to-spacecraft integration, NASA is requested to clarify the contractual treatment of Government-caused delays in payload delivery, payload readiness, Government-furnished documentation, or Government participation in integration and test activities.

   Government Response: Government-caused delays will be addressed in a bilateral modification to formalize any changes.

6. Section 4.4.2. states the contract shall "No later than thirty (30) calendar days prior to the review, provide input and presentations covering work detailed in this SOW." We recommend cutting this back to fifteen (15) days at the draft presentation stage, and five (5) days before the final, to align better with fast-moving schedules.

   Government Response: Section 4.2.2(b) of the SOW has been updated to remove "No later than thirty (30) calendar days prior to the review," as the requirements are outlined in the DRD/DRL.

7. Section 4.3 requires that the Contractor provides access to Contractor facilities "beginning three (3) months prior to receipt of the GLIMR Payload through one (1) month following On-Orbit Checkout." It is unclear why three months of advance access would be necessary. Please clarify what is expected to happen in this time period which necessitates this. We respectfully request to shorten this period to just prior to receipt of payload, and similarly, shorten the time period following On-Orbit Checkout, unless there is strong rationale as to why this is necessary.

   Government Response: Section 4.3 of the SOW has been updated to state "….beginning up to three (3) months prior to receipt of the GLIMR Payload through up to one (1) month following On-Orbit Checkout……". The Government may require this time to verify and validate facility safety and readiness to accept the GLIMR Payload. Also, the Government may require additional time on-site during normal operations of the GLIMR payload for troubleshooting and preparing shipment.

8. Please provide details about the "Science Imaging" and "Spacecraft Dynamic Test" required in Section 6.5.

   Government Response: Section 1.2 of the SOW has been updated to define "Science Imaging." Spacecraft Dynamic Test is a test of the hardware to ensure it can survive the intense forces of a rocket launch, that includes sinusoidal vibration, random vibration, acoustic noise and transient methods.

9. Section 3.0 Table 3-1 states several draft DRDs are due "30 calendar days prior to the scheduled review" and final DRDs are due "7 calendar days prior to the scheduled

review.” Adhering to these timelines may impact our standard review cycles and result in later changes to the DRDs. Please reduce the advance submission timeline.

Government Response: The timelines associated with the DRDs is to allow Government subject matter experts to conduct a comprehensive review and provide acceptance or reject/revise guidance to the COR. Any updates will be issued formally through an amendment to the solicitation or bilateral post-award modification. Furthermore, Section L.17 of the solicitation has been updated to provide flexibility to allow offerors to propose deviations from the Government Proposed Payment Percentage (column G), or combinations of, Milestone Payments and associated Deliverables, provided all Data Requirements are met as described in Column D of Exhibit D.

10. Please clarify [GLIMR-REQ-90] GLIMR Spacecraft Angular Rate Knowledge Interface, which requires spacecraft angular rate knowledge delivered at 100 Hz with a data latency not to exceed 5 milliseconds — measured from the time the data is determined by the GLIMR GPS to the time it is received by the payload. We request clarification on the packet size and format for the data being transferred.

    Government Response: As per EXHIBIT C “GLIMR ATSRD”, the packet size and format are determined by the offeror’s solution to provide the Spacecraft Angular Rate Knowledge to the GLIMR Payload. The GLIMR payload can accommodate several packet formats and will adjust to the offeror’s solution.

11. The milestone payment structure, as currently reflected in the draft RFP, appears to be back-weighted relative to the investment profile typically associated with a multi-year spacecraft development program. Section B.3 confirms that CLIN 0001 is a Firm Fixed Price effort with all pricing and period of performance listed as "To Be Proposed," and Section J identifies Exhibit D — the Milestone Payment Schedule — as also "To Be Provided." Because Section M.5 confirms that the Source Selection Authority's comparative assessment will be based on the Total Proposed Price in Exhibit D, the milestone structure will be central to both pricing and evaluation. It is recommended that the Government consider providing greater flexibility in the milestone payment structure to allow contractors to more closely align payments with their actual cost curves. It is also requested that Exhibit D be released prior to Final RFP release, or that the Government provide the intended milestone framework in advance — including approximate payment percentages and any CDRL approval dependencies — to support meaningful proposal development and price calibration.

    Government Response: Section L.17 of the solicitation has been updated to provide flexibility to allow offerors to propose deviations from the Government Proposed Payment Percentage (column G), or combinations of, Milestone Payments and associated Deliverables, provided all Data Requirements are met as described in Column D of Exhibit D. Exhibit D was available with Draft RFP posting, to include the intended payment percentages and corresponding DRL/DRD and is included with the final RFP.

12. Section L.12(c) requires that "the price proposal is consistent with the technical proposal in all respects," and notes that inconsistencies "may be viewed by the evaluation team as a lack of understanding." Under the current structure, Volume III (Price) is submitted in writing at the proposal due date, while Volume II (Technical) is delivered via in-person oral presentation, with logistical details provided "within 3 business days after the specified proposal due date" per Section L.16(c)(1). Because the oral presentation occurs after price submission, and because Section L.13(d) limits Volume III to "price information only," offerors have limited ability to provide technical context within the price volume. Section L.16(f)(7) further confirms that the oral presentation process does not constitute negotiations and that offerors may not introduce new proposal material during the presentation. Please clarify how price-technical consistency will be evaluated under this sequencing, and whether any process exists for offerors to address potential inconsistencies identified following the oral presentation.

    Government Response: Table L.13-1 allows for the submission of a supporting narrative, to include the relationship of the pricing to the technical information. Additionally, Section L.13 (d) has been updated to clarify that price and price supporting information is allowed under Volume III.

13. Section L.15(b)(2)(G) requires 'Total current contract value (including all option periods)' and the PPQ requests 'Total Contract Value.' Please clarify: (1) Does this include both exercised and unexercised option periods? (2) For IDIQ or task order contracts, should offerors report the contract ceiling, total of all task orders awarded, or only task orders performed by the offeror? (3) For subcontractor references, should the offeror report the total prime contract value or only the subcontractor's portion? (4) For ongoing contracts, should this reflect obligated/funded value to date or total potential value through completion?

    Government Response: Section L.15 of the solicitation has been updated to include submission of references that may fall under an IDIQ Contract or Blanket Purchase Agreement. Further, (b)(2) of this Section and Attachment 1 – Past Performance Questionnaire has been updated.

14. Sections L.15 and M.4.1 do not address whether past performance references may include classified contracts. Please clarify: (1) Are classified contract references acceptable? (2) If so, what level of detail should be provided in the offeror's narrative and PPQ given classification restrictions? (3) How will the Government verify performance on classified contracts while maintaining security requirements? (4) Should offerors provide sanitized/unclassified descriptions, or is there a separate process for submitting classified reference information?

    Government Response: Section L.15 of the solicitation has been updated to address the submission of classified contract references.

15. Section L.15(c) states customers must complete and return the PPQ 'no later than the timeframe specified in this solicitation,' but this specific timeframe is not stated. Please

clarify: (1) What is the deadline for customer-completed PPQs to be submitted? (2) Must customer PPQs be received before the offeror's Past Performance Volume I submission deadline (15 days after RFP release)? (3) If a customer fails to return a PPQ or returns it late, how will this impact the evaluation of the offeror's past performance? (4) Should offerors include customer PPQ responses as part of their Volume I submission, or are customers expected to submit directly to the Government?

Government Response: The Past Performance Questionnaire is part of the submission of Volume I and is due in accordance with the deadline outlined in Section L.9 of the solicitation. Section L.15 (c) has been updated to further clarify this due date. The due date is also listed on the example cover letter (page 2) of Attachment 1 – Past Performance Questionnaire. Questionnaires are expected to be submitted directly to the Government as described at L.15(c) and Attachment 1. If the PPQ is submitted after the due date, it will be considered late and not evaluated under Factor 1. The Government may utilize other sources to evaluate references where a PPQ is not submitted, as described in Section L.15(d) and in Section M.4.1(a).

16. Regarding Section L.16(d), if a named participant becomes unavailable after submission of the participant list (e.g., due to illness or emergency), may the Offeror substitute another individual? If so, what is the process and deadline for notifying the Government?

    Government Response: The solicitation has been updated, and this content is now at Section L.16(b), which allows for the submission of one (1) alternate presenter. The alternate name shall be submitted in Volume II of the proposal.

17. Section L.16(a)(1) states no content other than the oral presentation will be considered in evaluation of Volume II/Factor 2, but Section M.4.2(c) states 'slides won't be directly evaluated' yet 'inconsistencies between the slides and presentation may reduce...confidence.' Please clarify: (1) Are offerors permitted/expected to use slides during oral presentations? (2) If slides are used, will they be considered part of the evaluable 'materials presented' per L.16(a)(1)? (3) Should slides be submitted in advance, brought to the presentation, or not used? (4) How are slides both 'not directly evaluated' yet capable of reducing confidence ratings?

    Government Response: Section L.16(a)(1) of the solicitation has been updated to clarify the use of slides or use of additional supporting materials during the oral presentation.

18. Section L.16(f)(2) states “The Government will provide a whiteboard and dry erase markers for use during oral presentations. Offerors will be expected to provide a laptop, internet connection and any other materials required for the demonstration.” (1) Please clarify whether Offerors are responsible for providing all equipment necessary to display or project their presentation to Government attendees (e.g., projector, display screen, HDMI cables, adapters, etc.), or whether the Government will provide projection/display equipment at the presentation venue. (2) Will Offerors be permitted to connect to a Government-provided network, or must they provide their own independent internet

connection (e.g., cellular hotspot)? (3) Are there any Government facility restrictions that would prevent Offerors from accessing outside networks?

Government Response: The solicitation now reflects this content at Section L.16(g)(2), which has been updated to clarify what the Government will provide and what Offerors will be expected to provide. There are no Government facility restrictions that should prevent Offerors from accessing outside networks.

19. Section L.16(f)(5) states “The Offeror’s participants shall not reach back, by telephone, e-mail or any other means, to any other personnel or persons for assistance during the oral presentation.” Does the prohibition on reaching back to outside personnel apply only during the formal presentation, or does it also extend through the Government's clarifying question period that follows?

    Government Response: The solicitation now reflects this content at Section L.16(g)(5), which has been updated to state that reach backs cannot occur during any component of the oral presentation, including the interactive dialogue with the Government.

20. Section L.16(f)(6) states the Government will not interrupt the Offeror’s presentation and will ask clarifying questions only at the conclusion. However, Section L.16.f.(7) describes the oral presentation as including “limited interactive exchanges” between the Government and the Offeror. Please clarify the intended format, will the Government engage interactively during the presentation, or will all Government questions be reserved until the conclusion of the Offeror's presentation?

    Government Response: The Government does not intend to interrupt the oral presentation. The limited exchanges are intended to occur at the conclusion of the offeror’s presentation.

21. Clarification is requested on the cost breakdown and price proposal requirements in Sections L.17(b) and L.17(c) to ensure a shared understanding of what is required at proposal submission. Section L.17(b) states that the offeror's proposed price "shall be fully inclusive of all direct costs, indirect costs, and profit," and confirmation of whether this language is intended to confirm that the proposed price is all-inclusive, or whether it is intended to require cost element disclosure at the time of submission. Section L.17(c) notes that the Government reserves the right to request "other than certified cost or pricing data, to include a cost breakdown to support proposed prices, in accordance with FAR 15.403-1(f)," and that any such communications "will not be considered negotiations as set forth in FAR 15.202(a)(2)(iii)." We respectfully request commercial pricing support — such as market comparisons or catalog pricing as contemplated under FAR 15.403-3(c) —be considered acceptable in lieu of a detailed cost element breakdown.

    Government Response: The Government anticipates adequate price competition. If only one proposal is received, the Government may be able to utilize market comparisons or

catalog pricing; however, will communicate with the potential offeror on whether additional cost breakdown is required at that time.

22. Please clarify in the Final RFP whether a completed lump-sum milestone payment schedule constitutes a complete and sufficient price proposal, and provide any available guidance on the format, scope, and trigger conditions for potential post-submission cost breakdown requests.

    Government Response: Section L.17 (a) of the solicitation requires offerors to complete Section B.3 Exhibit D based on the overall approach to performing this effort. The Government anticipates adequate price competition to determine price reasonableness. Should only one proposal be received, the CO may request further breakdown of pricing to establish price reasonableness at that time.

23. Section M.4.1(a) states the Government will validate each reference for 'both pertinence and performance,' and references that cannot be validated will not be considered. Please clarify: (1) What specific criteria must be met for a reference to be 'validated' for pertinence versus relevance? (2) What constitutes validation of 'performance' - must customer PPQs be returned, must CPARS data exist, or are other verification methods acceptable? (3) If a highly relevant reference cannot be performance-validated due to customer non-responsiveness, will the entire reference be discarded? (4) Will offerors be notified if a reference cannot be validated and given an opportunity to provide alternative validation?

    Government Response: Section M.4.1 of the solicitation has been updated to clarify pertinence and performance. In accordance with (a) of this RFP Section, the Government will consider the questionnaires received, and data the Government obtains from other sources; however, if unable then the reference will not be considered in the evaluation. Offerors will not be notified and given additional opportunities to submit alternative references/validation if a given reference cannot be validated by the Government.

24. Section M.4.2(c) states the Government's assessment will be based on “content and delivery of the oral presentation.” Please clarify what aspects of “delivery” will be evaluated. Will presentation style, speaking ability, or communication clarity factor into the adjectival rating, or is “delivery” limited to the substantive completeness and accuracy of the information conveyed?

    Government Response: Section M.4.2(c) of the solicitation has been updated to remove the word “delivery” from this section.

25. The adjectival rating table in M.4.2(d) references “strength,” “significant strength,” “weakness,” “significant weakness,” and “deficiency” without defining these terms. Please provide definitions for each term to allow Offerors to better understand the evaluation standards.

Government Response: Section M.4.2 of the solicitation has been updated to add the findings definitions at (e).

26. In Section M.4, Factor 1 uses a confidence rating scale and Factor 2 uses an adjectival rating scale. Please clarify how the SSA will compare these two different rating methodologies in the integrated best value trade-off assessment.

    Government Response: The SSA will take into consideration each of the ratings from Factor 1 and Factor 2. The overall evaluation of the offeror will consider the order of importance outlined in Section M.2(b) of the solicitation when finalizing the selection.

27. Section M.5 – No IGCE / No Budget Guidance: The Government's price evaluation methodology, as described in Section M.5, indicates that proposed prices will be compared to an Independent Government Cost Estimate. However, because Section B.3 reflects that the period of performance, quantity, unit price, and contract amount are all "To Be Proposed," offerors currently lack a budget reference point against which to calibrate pricing for this complex, multi-year development program. Section M.5 also notes that an offer "may be rejected, at any time during the Government's evaluation, if the CO determines in writing that it is unreasonable as to price," without specifying a threshold or deviation trigger. It is understood that full IGCE disclosure may not be appropriate; however, the release of a budget range or Not-to-Exceed value prior to Final RFP release would help ensure that competitive proposals are grounded in a shared understanding of program affordability and would reduce the risk of well-intentioned proposals being found non-competitive on price without advance notice.

    Government Response: A price analysis will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.404-1. The Government may use any of the listed techniques to determine price reasonableness, which includes the comparison to the IGCE. Section M.5 of the solicitation has been updated to state “the evaluation may include, but is not limited to….”.

28. Section G.1 (NFS 1852.232-80) – Invoice Backup Documentation vs. FFP Contract: Please clarify the invoice backup documentation requirements in Section G.1 as they apply to FFP milestone invoices under this contract. Section G.1(c)(2) states that both vouchers submitted under cost-type contracts and invoices submitted under fixed-price contracts shall include backup documentation in accordance with FAR 32.905(b), and then enumerates three categories: (i) Vouchers, requiring labor cost breakdowns with rates and hours, ODC breakdowns, and indirect rates; (ii) Invoices, requiring description of goods and services, dates, and progress reports; and (iii) Fee vouchers, requiring provisionally-billed fee listings, reconciliation, and fee calculations. Subsection (ii) appears to reflect the appropriate FFP invoice format, while subsections (i) and (iii) appear more applicable to cost-type contract billing. To avoid any ambiguity during contract performance, please confirm that FFP milestone invoices under this contract will require only the milestone name and number, documentation that accomplishment criteria have been met, references to approved CDRLs where applicable, and the invoice amount — and that the labor rate, hour, ODC, and indirect rate disclosures in Section G.1(c)(2)(i)

and the fee voucher requirements in Section G.1(c)(2)(iii) are not intended to apply to FFP milestone invoices.

Government Response: The resultant contract will be fixed price; therefore, (c)(2)(ii) Invoices, will be applicable to this contract. The voucher and fee voucher sections of this clause will not be applicable.

29. There appears to be a contradiction between the Volume due dates outlined in the cover letter and the industry day slides. For example, the cover letter states proposals due approximately 45 calendar days after the release date of the Final Request for Proposal. Past Performance (Volume I) submission will be due approximately 15 calendar days after RFP release, with the remaining submission due approximately 30 calendar days after Volume I submission. However, on slide 21 from the Industry Day presentation, it states, Volume II – IV will be due 30 days after the Final RFP release. Please clarify that Volumes II – IV are due 30 days after the Past Performance Volume is submitted.

    Government Response: This was a typographical error on the Government side. Volume due dates are specified at Section L.9 of the solicitation. Additionally, this section has been updated from the draft to the final to include the submission of Volume II (Oral Presentation Presenters) at the same time as the submission of Volume I (Past Performance).

30. Confirm that first-tier small businesses can support ground system, mission software, DevSecOps, and data-delivery scope under a prime. Keep the all-inclusive prime requirement clear while allowing specialized first-tier technical subcontractor lanes.

    Government Response: The Government confirms that a first-tier small business can support any portion of the scope under a prime contractor. The Government is requiring an all-inclusive approach; however, requirements can be met with a combination of a prime and subcontractors as applicable.

31. Clarify GMOC, GSDS, payload, prime, and Government responsibilities for command generation, telemetry, anomaly response, and mission software handoff.

    Government Response: The Government will provide GLIMR Payload command generation documentation and training before Payload integration onto Spacecraft. Post GLIMR Payload integration, the Contractor shall have command authority, payload planning responsibility, anomaly resolution authority, calibration activity authority, and operational decision-making during nominal and contingency operations. However, the Contractor shall coordinate payload planning, anomaly resolution, calibration activities, and contingency operations with the Government.

32. Resolve TBC values, known typos, contamination assumptions, and milestone acceptance evidence before final RFP release.

Government Response: The Government has reviewed all documentation and resolved any known discrepancies from the draft to the final RFP release. Remaining TBCs and TBDs will be updated as the information is available, either at contract award or post-award via a bilateral modification.

33. Clarify attendee role rules, permitted demos, allowed artifacts, and whether technical subcontractor SMEs can present within the three-person cap.

    Government Response: Section L.16 of the solicitation describes that the presentation shall be no more than three in-person attendees, with no virtual attendees. This limit is inclusive of subcontractors, as applicable. The Government does not restrict the use of demos or artifacts during the timed presentation and is considered supporting materials.

34. Evaluate practical evidence that reduces time to science and sustainment burden, not only spacecraft or launch narrative strength.

    Government Response: The Offeror's presentation shall present the proposal approach to include the minimum criteria outlined in Section L.16(c) of this solicitation.