

## **OFFEROR QUESTIONS/GOVERNMENT RESPONSES DOCUMENT #1**

1. Section L.14.1, last two sentences. "Other than Formulation Deliverables that will be considered for the Implementation award (Preliminary Design Review, Trade Studies, and Risk Management Plan), information previously submitted, if any, would be considered only to the extent it is resubmitted. Information previously submitted shall not be incorporated by reference."

Just to be completely sure, can we incorporate Formulation Deliverable information by reference?

**Response: Offerors may reference any written material included in (1) the Final Preliminary Design Review that covers information required by solicitation section L.18 items 1-25;(2) Trade Study Reports; or (3) the Final Risk Management Plan.**

2. Section B.2. As structured, Option 4 can be exercised without having exercised Options 2 or 3. Was this your intent or will Option 4 only be exercised if Options 2 and 3 have been previously exercised? There is a modest amount of non-recurring engineering and equipment required to support the option, so the question relates to whether we have to include this in Option 4 or whether it will already have been covered in Option 2.

**Response: The intent was only to be able to exercise Option 4 if Option 3 was exercised. The solicitation will be amended to reflect this change.**

3. Section L.3(c)(9). With regard to alternate launch vehicle proposals, are you requesting a separately bound document with the relevant change pages to the various proposal volumes? Or can these change pages be included as an attachment or additional section to the various proposals? As to the page limits, we understand that the change pages themselves may exceed the page count but when incorporated as replacement pages they will not result in the various volume page counts being exceeded. For example, if we have 3 pages describing the baseline launch vehicle within a 130 page Mission Suitability Proposal, 3 replacement pages describing any alternate launch vehicle would still total to 130 pages and not 133 pages.

**Response: The solicitation will be amended to clarify this issue.**

4. Section L.14.1.Subfactor A. At the end of this section is a statement to "Provide updates in text form to previously provided PDR and/or Oral presentation". We assume that these updates can be in the form of a typical proposal with text, figures, tables, etc. but not in view-graph form typical of a PDR. Is this correct?

**Response: The Offeror may use any format, including view-graph form, as long as the proposed format is consistent with provision L.9(b).**

5. Attachment J, para J.1.3.3.g. Attachment J in various places indicates that "Delivery of the Active Archive Data Packages is not a requirement under this option". The first sentence of paragraph J.1.3.3.g requires that the Contractor conduct a test to demonstrate delivery of the Level 1G-ortho Data and the NSLRSDA Data Packages; while the second sentence refers to Active Archive and NSLRSDA Data Packages. If this option is exercised, is the Contractor required to demonstrate, test, or deliver Active Archive Data Packages?

**Response: The solicitation will be amended to delete the words "Active Archive and" from the second sentence of paragraph J.1.3.3.g.**

6. Is it possible to get the RFP in .doc format rather than pdf format? Of particular use would be Section K to fill in the contract clauses.

**Response: In order to ensure that all offerors prepare and the Government receives proposals based on the same solicitation document, alternative formats will not be provided.**

7. We think there is an error in the "Commercial Build Estimate" tab in the Cost Model on line 14. The formula is incorrectly calculating the launch vehicle cost as six times higher than the input cost on the input tab of the model. The formula on line 14 "Launch Vehicle" has "<>" after each type of launch vehicle and it should be replaced with "=".

**Response: The solicitation will be amended to correct this error.**

8. The LDCM Implementation Data Specification for Pixel-to-Pixel Uniformity (section 6.2.3) was modified just prior to release of the Implementation Phase Solicitation. Please provide the rationale for the modified specification.

**Response: NASA has drafted a Frequently Asked Question (FAQ) regarding the rationale for this change. The FAQ can be found on the LDCM webpage, at <http://ldcm.nasa.gov>.**