

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

Statement of Work

1. In SOW Section 2.14, does the 70% of cargo mean 70% of cargo by mass, volume, or other?
The Final RFP will be updated to clarify the SOW statement in SOW Section 2.14 Mission Integration to be 70% of the volume capability. The exact volume will be documented at the CLIN 3 RFTOP award based on the Contractor proposed vehicle traffic plan.
2. In SOW Section 2.12, clarify intent with NASA flight director in control room. Request NASA clarify whether flight-director presence is continuous or limited to critical operations, and whether the function may be hosted at MCC-H or at a Contractor-provided control room in Houston.
The NASA Flight Director console is required continuously in the Contractor's Destination flight control room, not MCC-H.
3. In table 1.2.5-1 of the SOW, what specifically does NASA mean by having little to no responsibility to perform a mission task for the space system?
As outlined in SOW Section 1.8.1.3 Passenger, "This role would be expected to be one where minimal training was provided and only specifically trained events were planned for the individual." A more detailed definition for Passenger is provided in Section 1.8.1.3 Passenger.
4. In SOW Section 1.8, why has NASA chosen to use the term "Passenger" instead of "Space Flight Participant" or "Private Astronaut"?
Private Astronauts (Non-USG Crew) could be Passengers or Mission Specialists depending on their qualifications. NASA elected to not use the term Space Flight Participants to avoid conflicts with definitions of Crew and other slight differences in 14 C.F.R. §401.7 Definitions.
5. In SOW Section 1.8, to foster the growth of the LEO economy, will NASA consider using the term "Private Astronaut" instead of "Passenger" or "Space Flight Participant"?
Private Astronauts are Non-USG Crew and can be Passengers or Mission Specialists, or even Crew Commanders depending on their qualifications. NASA elected to not use the term Space Flight Participants to avoid conflicts with definitions of Crew and other slight differences in 14 C.F.R. §401.7 Definitions.
6. Table 1.2.5-1 CREWMEMBER DEFINITIONS defines the types of CLDS crewmembers. There is an implication that a High-Net-Worth Individual (HNWI) can only be considered as a "passenger" because they would not be sponsored by a space agency which then limits the ability to assign them as a "Mission Specialist" as defined in 1.8.1.2. A CLD provider could have potential customers who are HNWIs who will want more responsibility than just that of a passenger per NASA's definition. Is NASA's intent that only astronauts sponsored by a space agency would be able to be a mission specialist?
Private Astronauts are Non-USG Crew and can be Passengers or Mission Specialists, or even Crew Commanders depending on their qualifications.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

DRDs

7. Please clarify for proposed tailoring of DRDs, Mission Service Work Plan, NASA Standards & Specifications, etc.; are we to price our proposal assuming the tailoring is accepted, and if not accepted compliance/non-compliance will be negotiated before final CLIN 1 contract award, or when?
Tailoring of Work Plans are expected to be negotiated before CLIN 1 contract award. If the Contractor proposes alternative standards or “meet the intent” tailoring for NASA Standards & Specifications and other documents designated “meets the intent” and they are deemed not to meet the intent, the Contractor will be required to modify their proposed tailoring to “meet the intent.” NASA is not offering a price adjustment if proposed “meet the intent” tailoring is not accepted. Per SOW 2.10.6 Adjudication of Standards, "NASA proposes holding technical coordination meetings shortly after contract award to discuss the alternate standards adjudication process, expectations, and initiate coordination efforts." It is NASAs intent to accept previously Approved Alternate Standards from other NASA programs if they meet applicable CLDS requirements, demonstrate equivalent environments and analysis. NASA will clarify when adjudication is required in the Final RFP.
8. In the DRD file, CLDC-124 is annotated as being submitted with the proposal in draft form. Request NASA confirm that this DRD is to be submitted with the proposal, where within the Mission Suitability volume it should be included, and that it is excluded from the Mission Suitability 200-page limit.
The final RFP will be updated in Section 6.0 Data Requirement List and DRD CLDC-124 Utilization Integration Plan to delete the draft deliveries of the DRD. NASA does not intend to require them for the proposal. DRDs are excluded from page count.
9. In CLDC-103, Please clarify what is meant by Subject Area in the Column 'Denote Subject Area that Standard applies to'.
Offerors should fill in the discipline, system, sub-system, or technical area the Standard (or equivalent Alternate Standard) will apply to.
10. The table in the CDRL list indicated that DRD CLDC-124 Utilization Integration Plan is to be submitted with the proposal. The DRD is not mentioned in the Section L DRFP instructions. Specific questions 1) is the Utilization Plan to be submitted with the proposal? 2) if so, where should this plan be placed within the volumes?
No. The Section 6.0 Data Requirement List and DRD CLDC-124 Utilization Integration Plan will be updated to delete the draft deliveries of the DRD in the proposal.
11. In DRD CLDC-002, this section requires a list of all major subcontractors, vendors, suppliers, partners and definition of scope, status of contracts, and forward plans. What is defined as ‘major’ here? Contract value over a specific threshold? Service supplier for a specific number or amount of services per defined period? Does this definition of major subcontractor apply across all of mission suitability subfactor?
DRD CLDC-002 Commercialization Plan will be updated in the final RFP to clarify the value threshold or services that apply.
12. DRD CLDC-015 Program Management Plan states that Initial Submission is due at CBR and there are no mentions of this DRD in Section L. However, DRFP Attachment J-06 includes a placeholder for the Program Management Plan and states "(as proposed by the Offeror)". Please confirm that the CLDC-015 Program Management Plan is not due with the proposal, but due at CBR.
CLDC-015 Program Management Plan is not due at Proposal submission. The Final version of the plan is due at the Certification Baseline Review (CBR) milestone as the Initial Submission per DRD CLDC-015 Program Management Plan and upon approval will be incorporated in the contract as Attachment J-06.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

13. DRD CLDC-124 Utilization Integration Plan (UIP) requires draft (Sections 1-3 and 6, DRM #1 and DRM #2 only) at Proposal submission; however, this DRD is not included in the dRFP Section L Proposal Outline (Table L.17.1-1) nor in the L.17.3 instructions for Volume II. Will the Government please clarify the requirement for submission of the UIP with the proposal? **The Section 6.0 Data Requirement List and DRD CLDC-124 Utilization Integration Plan will be updated in the final RFP to delete the draft deliveries of the DRD in the proposal.**
14. There are a number of DRD requirements that appear to be overly burdensome/duplicative. For example, is it necessary to have an Acoustics Noise Control Plan, Human Error Analysis Plan, MMOD Report and others be formal DRD deliveries? There are already noise, HEA and MMOD requirements within the CLDP-REQ-1130 specification that will need NASA approval through verification events and success criteria.
NASA has targeted specific areas that are high risk areas where early feedback is necessary to ensure the provider can efficiently affect the design prior to data delivery for verification events. It is NASA experience that design changes after these events are more costly and can drive development schedules. NASA plans to keep these DRDs as deliverables in the Final RFP.
15. Per DRD CLDC-131 paragraphs 1 b and c, is it expected that the contractor provide crew quarters and suit up rooms for NASA crews if/when they provide transportation services? Additionally, why aren't all the items paragraphs 1 and 2 considered part of GFS if NASA provides transportation services as stated in the applicability section of this DRD?
Per J-15, NASA has outlined the associated activities related to crew and cargo transportation and have laid out separation of responsibilities. There are some traditional areas that have been moved to the CLD provider due to key interfaces or interdependencies with other responsibilities or if the task is not directly being done by contracted services and does not substantially utilize NASA expertise. Specifically, for this question, the Contractor is responsible for Quarantine and Suit room services due to their overarching responsibility for the Health Stabilization Plan. However, these services can be requested from the government as part of a Government Task Agreement (GTA).
16. In DRD CLDC-004, has NASA considered a performance-based cybersecurity approach focused on outcomes and risk management rather than prescriptive approval and reporting requirements? NASA should adopt a performance-based cybersecurity framework focused on security outcomes rather than prescriptive tool and process approvals.
NASA's Information Security Program is founded upon industry-recognized best practices as established by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). The agency's cybersecurity strategy is structured around the NIST Risk Management Framework, as well as NIST Special Publication 800-53, which outlines comprehensive security and privacy controls for information systems and organizations. In addition, NASA utilizes other relevant NIST Special Publications to ensure that its cybersecurity requirements remain fully compliant with applicable federal statutes, executive orders, directives, policies, and regulations. The NIST Risk Management Framework is fundamentally not structured as a performance-based model; rather, it offers indicators that assess the probability that threat actors could successfully exploit genuine vulnerabilities within the information system environment, as opposed to merely measuring activity as would be typical in a performance-based framework.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

17. In DRD CLDC-122, request SCV reporting scope be limited to the critical-items list and items within catastrophic/critical hazard chains, rather than all suppliers and sub-tier suppliers. Unbounded sub-tier disclosure chills commercial supplier participation and adds price without improving parts assurance where it matters.
DRD CLDC-122 Supply Chain Visibility (SCV) Reporting is intended to shed light on all supply chain suppliers down to Tier 3. Restricting the data to just critical items will not inform the overall hardware development and sustainment. Per the Remark in DRD CLDC-122 Supply Chain Visibility (SCV) Reporting, "It is not expected that suppliers to the Contractor utilize the SCV reporting tool or provide data directly to NASA in support of this DRD."
18. In SOW 2.12, "The Contractor shall provide NASA access to all electronic tools, templates and other medium necessary for NASA insight, participation and input to the planning, execution, maintenance and operation the CLDS." Request to qualify requirement to include: "...excluding non-NASA customer proprietary data and Contractor competition-sensitive business information, with access boundaries defined in the approved Insight and Collaboration Implementation Plan (CLDC-104)." Full certification and NASA-mission insight is preserved while the destination remains sellable to the commercial customers whose revenue is evaluated under MA.2.
NASA will update the SOW statement in the final RFP to: The Contractor shall provide NASA access to all electronic tools, templates and other medium necessary for NASA insight, participation and input to the planning, execution, maintenance and operation of the CLDS, in accordance with DRD CLDC-104 Insight and Collaboration Implementation Plan.
19. In DRD CLDC-115, does Interrelationship mean requirement or what?
Interrelationships in the DRD template define references to related SOW or contract clause requirements.
20. In DRD CLDC-111, is it correct to assume that requirement 3b should read part 3a?
DRD CLDC-111 Medical Operations Plan has been updated to fix an editorial error, in which "2a" should read "3a" in content Section 3.b. "Identification of contractor and NASA flight surgeon physical location(s) and roles/responsibilities during the events in part 23a"
21. In DRD CLDC-211, required only for Government Provided Crew/Cargo missions. DRD definition does not appear to make allowances for previously certified vehicles addressing requirements via delta-certification approach. Please clarify DRD content requirements for previously certified vehicles.
DRD CLDC-211 Destination to Visiting Vehicle (VV) Integration (DVVI) Documentation is required to integrate all US Government Furnished Crew and Cargo visiting vehicles to the Destination regardless of whether they are previously certified.
22. In DRD CLDC-102/106, as an applicable reference for the scope that is required the VVCP and VCN DRDs refer primarily to CLDP-REQ-1130. There is also a stated cross reference to "SOW 1.3 CLDS Requirements and Standards" which contains also the other essential standards as CLD-STD-1102, -1106, -1150 etc. Please confirm VCNs for all CLD-STD-11XX standards are required.
One (1) Verification Closure Notice (VCN) is required for each standard called out in CLDP- REQ-1130 Requirements and Standards for the Commercial Low Earth Orbit (LEO) Development Program. NASA expects multiple verification events will be required to close out that one VCN.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

23. In DRD CLDC-106, "One (1) VCN per CLDS requirement as identified in CLDP-REQ-1130..." This approach may differ from certification plans developed and presented for CLDP Phase 1 SAA milestones already executed; updating this plan could cause programmatic delays and create overhead for documentation management. Rewrite the requirement to allow providers to follow procedures established during Phase 1 development.
The Commercial Destination Free Flyer (CDFF) Funded Space Act Agreement (SAA) scope did not prescribe SAA partners to deliver VCNs against Commercial LEO Development Program (CLDP) requirements. Commercial approaches can be proposed and negotiated post award as part of the acceptance of the DRD delivery.
24. In DRD CLDC-103, is NASA able to make available all Standards that are applicable to proposers available in the Tech Library?
NASA does not plan to make available through the Technical Library all Standards as some are commercial standards that the Government does not have the rights to distribute. NASA has posted or plans to post all non-publicly available Applicable Documents including Standards from CLDP-REQ-1130 in the Technical Library or will provide references to where they are publicly found.
25. In DRD CLDC-005, the DRD's "Interrelationship" field cites "SOW 2.7 Export Control Management." The relevant SOW provision is numbered "2.6 Export Control." Is this a typo in the DRD that should reference SOW 2.6, not 2.7?
Yes, the DRD contains a typo and should reference SOW 2.6 and not 2.7. This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
26. DRD CLDC-005 appears to describe the scope of the Export Control Plan in two different ways. Box 10, 'Description/Use,' frames the requirements around the Contractor's approach to transactions, i.e., the transfer of commodities, software, technical data, technology, defense services, and/or technical assistance to foreign entities. Box 11, 'Contents,' however, frames the requirement around the Contractor's export control program, requiring the plan to address the expected exports, approval process/authorities, and management of foreign nationals, structured around seven specific program elements. These two descriptions are not identical in scope or framing, and it is unclear whether the Contents section is meant to be a subset of, an elaboration on, or a separate requirement from, the Description/Use section. We request that NASA reconcile these two sections and provide a single, consistent statement of the required scope and content of the Export Control Plan.
The purpose of Box 10 is to offer a clear description of the required DRD, while Box 11 is designated to outline the specific requirements for the DRD Export Control Plan. To improve clarity for the intended audience, NASA intends to revise Box 10 by removing the references to the FAR clauses from its description.

(The Remainder of this page is left Intentionally Blank)

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers

Posted August 14, 2026

27. In DRD CLDC-005, Section 2.6 of the SOW requires the Contractor to 'perform export control in accordance with' NASA's internal governance documents – NPR 2190, NASA Export Control Program, NAI 2190.1H, NASA Export Control Program Operations Manual (and, per DRD CLDC-005, also NPD 2190.1, JWI 2190.1, and JAI 2190.1). These are NASA's internal policy and procedural directives, written to govern how NASA civil servants and the agency administer NASA's own export control program. Contractors already maintain their own export control compliance program, developed and managed to satisfy ITAR and EAR regulations administered by the Departments of State and Commerce. As a result the Contractor is directly and independently accountable to State and Commerce as the controlling federal regulators. We request the SOW 2.6 be revised to require Contractor compliance with the applicable export control laws and regulations, rather than requiring conformance to NASA's internal directives, which are designed for NASA's own internal administration and are not appropriately imposed as compliance standards on a Contractor with its own established, independently regulated export compliance program.

The NASA Policies and Procedures, along with the Data Requirements Document (DRD), are supplemental to Section H – Special Contract Clauses of the Request for Proposal (RFP). These provisions support contractors in establishing their own export control programs in compliance with the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) and Export Administration Regulations (EAR), which are administered by the Departments of State and Commerce. Contractors are obligated to submit an Export Control Plan as specified in the DRD, detailing the processes by which their Export Control Programs are implemented and maintained. Furthermore, the Statement of Work (SOW) imposes adherence to NASA policies and procedures when their contractors interact with NASA employees or NASA support contractors in activities that involve the transfer of commodities, software, technical data, technology, defense services, or technical assistance to foreign entities. For enhanced clarity regarding the DRD and SOW Section 2.6 Export Control as supplements to Section H, revisions are expected to be made to both documents.

28. In DRD CLDC-005, we ask that NASA relocate the NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) clauses 1825.1103-7- and 1852.225-70 currently incorporated in the DRD to Section H – Special Contract Clauses of the RFP. Our primary concern is one of placement. Section H – Special Contract Clauses is the appropriate contracting vehicle for incorporating substantive contractual obligations, such as these NFS clauses, so that they are properly applied to contractors. The DRD, by contrast, is generally understood as a document governing data deliverable rather than a source of binding contractual clauses. If NASA intends for these NFS clauses to be contractually applicable to providers, incorporating them in the DRD rather than Section H may create ambiguity as to whether they carry the force of a contractual requirement.

DRDs are binding contractual documents. The final RFP will correct the reference from 1825.1103-7 to 1825.603-70, Export Control. The inclusion of NFS 1825.603-70 and 1852.225-70 in the Data Requirements Document (DRD) served to clarify the rationale for requiring an Export Control Plan within the contract. For enhanced clarity regarding the DRD, revisions will be made to both section H and the DRD.

Requirements (DRDs, SOW and Program Documents)

29. SOW Section 1.7.2 States: "A continuously crewed mission refers to the Destination that is continuously occupied by USG Crew with no more than a 14 day lapse in USG Crew presence between crew handovers." Does that mean that the station can be completely uncrewed for 14-days or does this only apply for USG crew?
- Yes, a Destination can be completely uncrewed for no more than 14-days, and still meet the requirements for a continuously crewed mission. The purpose of the 14 day allowance is to allow for an indirect handover between crews when required.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

30. Under the DRFP Section J-Attachments, when will CLDP-PLN-2200 Commercial Low Earth Orbit Development Program Risk Management Plan be provided to the technical library? **CLDP-PLN-2200 Commercial Low Earth Orbit Development Program Risk Management Plan is an internal NASA Plan and is not intended to be placed in the technical library. NASA plans to update the final RFP to remove the CLDP-PLN-2200 reference from the Section J-Attachments List.**
31. Under SOW Section 2.12, are NASA personnel required to be in the primary Destination Flight Control Room [FCR], or is an area nearby with the same voice and data monitoring capabilities sufficient? If required in the primary FCR, please specify the number of NASA personnel and capabilities required to enable determining the required size of our flight control and support rooms to include required additional capabilities and determine associated costs.
Yes, NASA personnel are required to be in the primary Destination Flight Control Room (FCR). Details, number, and types of personnel are documented in the SOW Section 2.12 NASA Access to Partner Facilities and Tools. NASA plans to update the final RFP to remove the CLDP-PLN-2200 reference from the Section J-Attachments List.
32. Under SOW Table 3.3.3 (Standard Service Mission Minimum Requirements), states the Number of USG crew as "2". Should "Number of USG Crew" read "Minimum Number of USG Crew"?
Yes. Table 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 should be labeled Minimum Number of USG Crew and will be updated for the Final RFP.
33. The crew accommodations list and SSP 50477 Joint Crew Provisioning Catalog Revision C are both out of date and do not reflect what is flown to support ISS crewmembers today. Are we to respond only to the items in these reference materials or should these be updated to reflect the items and usage rates that are currently support ISS crew?
SSP 50477, the Joint Crew Provisioning Catalog, serves as a reference and does not represent the exact list of items NASA expects the Contractor to provide. The Contractor is expected to supply a list of crew accommodations items in a similar format that meets the needs and requirements of their unique Destination and Crew compliment.
34. Under SOW Section 2.19.4, will there be USG Crew Time available to be utilized for maintenance and other recurring station operations beyond the 4th year of service?
NASA plans to update SOW Section 2.19.4, USG Furnished Crew Time, in the Final RFP to remove the USG Furnished Crew Time table, thus removing the percentages and limitations for the use of NASA Crew. NASA expects all crew, including USG crew, to support assembly, outfitting, maintenance and destination operational tasks.
35. From paragraph 2.12 of the SOW: *"Provide transportation of nine (9) NASA personnel, the USG Crew, plus an additional five (5) NASA personnel per USG Crew from NASA's Johnson Space Center (JSC) to the launch site in accordance with DRD CLDC-131 Pre-Launch and Post- Landing Operations."* (~21 people if its only 2 crew flying) Is it expected the contractor provide this service while everyone is in quarantine along with accommodations for the return the complement of personnel back to JSC and have a plan for any/all these individuals at the launch site including launch scrubs? Recommend NASA provide this capability since it already exists within their capability today.
NASA expects the Contractor to provide transportation for NASA personnel and Crew to the launch site while maintaining health-stabilization protocols consistent with the language in the SOW. Accommodations for NASA personnel at the launch site, as well as transportation for NASA personnel and Crew from the launch site to JSC, are not levied on the Contractor and remain NASA's responsibility.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

36. In the SOW, Table 1.5-1, the SOW shows no Destination requirement for incubation (only during transportation). Is this intentional? -1130 states incubation requirements for destination.
NASA has moved incubation requirements to CLDP-REQ-1130 Appendix D. The CLD offeror may propose to offer incubation capability under CLIN 4 but are not required. If not offered, NASA plans to provide its own incubation capability for its own use on the destination.
37. Under DRD CLDC-004, how does NASA distinguish between cybersecurity requirements necessary to protect NASA interfaces and requirements governing commercially owned systems and infrastructure? What is the mechanism to adjudicate the priorities? NASA should clearly delineate cybersecurity requirements for NASA-facing interfaces versus commercially-owned systems and establish a streamlined adjudication process.
The Information Technology Data Requirements Documents (DRDs) identify the NASA documents that establish the agency's policies, procedures, and practices, including comprehensive governance frameworks and clear definition of roles and responsibilities for cybersecurity across both NASA systems and those of contractors, including commercial partners. These referenced documents set forth the requirements essential for safeguarding NASA's information and information systems throughout their entire life cycle. For matters pertaining to governance and leadership responsibilities in the prioritization of cybersecurity, the following NASA directives and procedure are explicitly cited: NPD 2810.1, Information Security Policy; and NPR 2810.1, Security of Information and Information Systems.
38. Under DRD CLDC-107, recommend deleting CLDC-107 as a standalone Type-1 deliverable and incorporating its software management content into the Systems Engineering Management Plan (CLDC-101). Neither predecessor crewed program placed a standalone Software Management Plan under Type 1: CCtCap carried no standalone software DRD at all — its Software Development and Software Safety Plans were delivered as elements of the Certification Baseline Review Data Package (DRD 102, where unmarked content is Type 3) — and HLS Appendices P and H carried their Software Plan (1780SW-002 / 1665SW-002) and Software V&V and Certification Plan (1780SW-001 / 1665SW-001) at Data Type 2. Type 1 subjects every submittal and interim change of the provider's internal software development and sustaining processes to NASA approval before use — a reach neither comparator required at any phase. Software management for a crewed destination remains substantial and is fully retained: NPR 7150.2D-compliant content would be delivered as a defined section of the SEMP (CLDC-101, recommended elsewhere to be re-typed to Type 2), preserving NASA visibility while eliminating a duplicative standalone approval gate. Note: Further comments are provided on the as-written scope and content of the DRD. This recommendation to delete takes precedence.
The Software Management Plan DRD CLDC-107 is part of several new Agency requirements on new contracts and will not be deleted.
39. Under DRD CLDC-107, please provide the scope/definition of "entity". COTS open source software should not be subject to an entity-specific Software Management Plan (SMP). Please confirm that the Contractor's overarching SMP can serve as an umbrella for the use of COTS software (paid, licensed, and open-source) as entity-SMPs are not practical. Please expand on the definition of "explicitly included" for an over-arching SMP to ensure that the above confirmation is clear.
The term "entity" is meant to encompass key participants that deliver software products for the CLDS, such as subcontracted suppliers, US corporate partners, and international partners if any. The term "explicitly included" is meant to ensure the party supplying the software is identified under the scope of the provider's overall SMP or has their own plan.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers

Posted August 14, 2026

40. Under DRD CLDC-107, please clarify what level of detail is expected for a software Work Breakdown Structure. The level of detail depends upon each offerors software management approach for CLDS (including Utilization). Review SOW sections 2.10.3 Software Management, 2.11.2 Software Safety & Assurance, 2.15.3 USG Payload and Payload Facility Interface Requirements and Testing, and 2.15.4 USG Payload and Payload Facility Software and Commands/Telemetry, and adapt your companies breakdown approach as appropriate.

Contract Mechanism and Structure

41. Under Section H and Section M of the DRFP, the overall small-business subcontracting goal and category sub-goals remain TBD, although proposed goals are evaluated under M.4.3. Will NASA publish the assessed goals in the Final RFP and confirm that small-business participation embedded in mission services, logistics, research integration, and other subcontracted CLDC scope will receive full evaluation credit?
NASA will update the final RFP to clarify the assessed goals. Small Business participation will be evaluated in accordance with M.4.3 SMALL BUSINESS UTILIZATION (SBU) - MISSION SUITABILITY SUBFACTOR 3.

Pricing & Economic Adjustments

42. In DRFP Section L.17.2, "The offeror shall document any relevant assumptions that are major drivers of the price"; however, Schedule B prices will NOT be subject to future equitable adjustment based on "ground rules" or assumptions document in the proposal. If the base ground rules & assumptions upon which the bidders' estimates are changed, how are offerors to offset the risk in a manner that is commercially viable without substantially increasing the costs to the Government?
If the offeror's self-identified assumptions or ground rules change, it is their responsibility to offset the risk without increasing the costs to the government.
43. In the Attachment L-08 Cash Flow Tab, the cash flow table has a requirement for Utilization/Habitation (Rows 11-14) and Seat Sales (Rows 16 - 19). Is "utilization/habitation" referring to payload/scientific/etc. projects on-orbit? Habitation pricing is likely included in seat sale. Suggest: (a) remove "habitation" from Rows 11-14 or include "habitation" as part of "seat sale" (Row 16-19).
Attachment L-08 Business Plan Template will be updated in the Final RFP to delineate Seat Sales cash flow by separating Transportation and Habitation as separate costs.
44. In Section B of the DRFP, is it acceptable for the Offeror to provide pricing only for Mission Aend-to-end service, or must the Offeror also provide pricing for Mission A CLD-only service? Offerors must propose both CLD Only and End-to-End Service pricing.
45. Under Section M of the DRFP, clarify how NASA is conducting the unbalanced pricing analysis and what the potential outcomes are of an offeror triggering rejection at CLIN1 and at CLIN2. As outlined in M.3 PRICE FACTOR (VOLUME I), In accordance with FAR 15.404-6(b)(2), a proposal may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

Utilization

46. In SOW Table 1.5-1, for Deployable Pressurized powered payloads - is there a volume estimation for these?
There is no min or max volume estimate. The intent for deployable pressurized powered payloads is that they do not have to be of the locker form factor and are able to be soft stowed for transport. For example, they could be handheld, mounted to a multi-use bracket, or temporarily attached to a workbench or a wall. The final RFP will provide clarification definition.
47. SOW Section 1.6 states: "USG usage rate for the Glovebox is 100% ". This creates a significant constraint on CLD ability to offer commercial services. If necessary to keep in SOW, suggest language that recognizes Offeror will be able to use all idle capacity on glovebox when not actively in use for a US national project.
NASA is updating the Final RFP to address and clarify through a Section H Clause that contractors will have the ability to utilize Excess NASA Capacity.
48. SOW Section 2.14 states: "For any crew or cargo mission, the Contractor shall ensure NASA has first right of refusal of no less than 70% of the available late load and early destow capability." How does NASA define late load capability? How does NASA define early destow capability?
Late load and early destow capabilities are defined by the time-critical cargo requirements in CLDP-REQ-1130 Requirements and Standards for the Commercial Low-Earth Orbit Development Program. Time critical is defined as "Any cargo that is conditioned, limited life, contains biological samples, a powered payload, or is limited by other factors. This type of cargo may require late load capability within 24 hours prior to launch and early destow on- orbit and post landing, to preserve the integrity of the cargo. This type of cargo also may require a replacement prior to launch due to a launch scrub when necessary." Section 3.5 Commercial Cargo Transportation System.
- When does NASA plan to exercise its first right of refusal of no less than 70% of the available late load capability?
Final NASA utilization needs will be negotiated as part of CLIN 3 mission task order including first right of refusal of capability.
49. SOW Section 2.17 states: "For any crew or cargo mission, the Contractor shall ensure NASA has first right of refusal of no less than 70% of the available cargo not allocated to crew or vehicle requirements. " Does this mean 70% of remaining cargo after all crew and CLD requirements such as: food, water, consumables, preventative & corrective maintenance, and other hardware required for CLD outfitting to reach full FOC capability? At what point in the process will NASA make the request? i.e., how much notice will Contractor get to know how to complete the manifest?
To clarify, the 70% did refer to the remaining cargo after all crew and CLD requirements such as: food, water, consumables, preventative & corrective maintenance, and other hardware required for CLD. . . . However, NASA plans to change the 70% requirement in SOW Section 2.17 Transportation in the final RFP to "no less than 25% of the total available cargo supporting the subject increment, not including cargo allocated to crew or Destination needs, for each seat purchased by NASA".
50. In DRFP Section B and SOW Section 1.2, within the DRFP and the SOW the bidders are required to show how each will meet the capabilities associated with Category 1 - 3 missions. Will NASA require a simultaneous performance, for example, of category 1 and category 3 A, B, & standard missions? If so how many are anticipated, and what is the maximum number of NASA astronauts that could be on the CLD at one time and what is the associated duration for this level of human presence?

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

NASA is not requiring simultaneous performance of multiple mission types by capability category. The NASA crew and duration requirements are defined for each mission type in SOW 3.3 Mission Services Description (CLIN 3) and NASA's intent is to only order a specific mission type, one at a time.

51. In SOW Table 1.5-1, what does NASA intend to use the total MLE for at each category level (3 at Cat 1, 20 at Cat 2, and 58 at Cat 3) and what is the intended utilization of each of these categories? Are there plans to outfit these MLE with standard user facilities (microscope, plant habitat, centrifuges etc.)? Would MLE contents and utilization be negotiable with the contractor for commercial use?

NASA's future forecast of payloads is in work. However, in general, Cat 1 was defined to ensure support for (but not limited to) Human Research efforts; Cat 2 supports (but is not limited to) Human Research, Life Science, and Tech Demos; Cat 3 supports (but is not limited to) Human Research, Life Science, Tech Demos, Physical Science, and Plant Research. If NASA develops facilities that have potential for multi-user capability and NASA has excess capacity, that may be offered to the Contractor. A new H Clause, Excess Capacity will be included in the final RFP.

52. The solicitation clearly defines the laboratory infrastructure that providers must deliver but provides little insight into NASA's anticipated utilization. Providing estimates of expected NASA-sponsored research demand—such as projected payload volume, mission cadence, or broad research areas (e.g., life sciences, technology demonstrations, physical sciences, in-space manufacturing)—would help providers optimize station designs and operational concepts.

NASA's future forecast of payloads is in work. However, in general, Cat 1 was defined to ensure support for (but not limited to) Human Research efforts; Cat 2 supports (but is not limited to) Human Research, Life Science, and Tech Demos; Cat 3 supports (but is not limited to) Human Research, Life Science, Tech Demos, Physical Science, and Plant Research.

53. In SOW Table 1.5-1, the SOW shows volumes for frozen samples, but not temperatures. CLDP-REQ-1130 states frozen from -95 to -10C. Does this mean that all the liters in the SOW are for that explicit range? Are there incremental temperature selections needed? And to clarify, there is no need for -160 or snap freeze?

Yes, the liters defined in the SOW are for that explicit range. CLDP-REQ-1130, R.CLDS.579 outlines the requirements for adjustable temperature setpoints within the required temperature ranges for each utilization sample preservation capability, including frozen. Currently, NASA does not require the Contractor to provide -160 C (snap freeze) capability.

54. Please confirm CLDC-126 obligations apply to USG payload and mission data as described in SOW 2.15.4, and exclude non-USG customer payload data.

In the Final RFP, NASA will update CLDC-126 to be applicable for USG payloads/payload facilities and other USG utilization activities.

55. In DRD CLDC-126, "(3) Ability to meet the Data Security Requirements outlined in CLDP-PLN- 1122, Section 8.1 ...", which includes the following statement: "Sensitive data will be purged from CLD provider systems two weeks after confirmed ground receipt of data." (1) What is considered as "sensitive data" in this context? (2) We recommend restating this requirement to apply to NASA's sensitive data only: "For each type of data there will be an agreement with the customer regarding its retention on the CLD provider systems, not constrained by NASA requirement."

NASA is evaluating this comment at this time. The intention is that this is applicable to NASA's sensitive data only. Sensitive data refers to controlled technical data (ITAR/EAR), crew biomedical and personal data (PII), and high-resolution earth observation data. If any changes to this requirement are applicable, they will be reflected

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

in the Final RFP.

56. In the DRFP Section B, ADDITIONAL SERVICES, The pricing tables on pages 12–14 appear to request pricing based on NASA utilizing 25% of the workbench and 25% of the glovebox. However, Section 1.6 (page 12) of Attachment J-01, Statement of Work (02 CLDC dSOW July 2026) states that NASA plans to utilize 100% of the glovebox and 50% of the workbench. The utilization assumptions appear to be inconsistent between the pricing tables and the Statement of Work. Please clarify the intended utilization percentages for the workbench and glovebox that offerors should use for proposal development and pricing?

The values are accurate. Section 1.6 NASA Usage of Utilization Capabilities of the SOW is related to the expected NASA use of the capabilities. The pricing tables in question are for Additional Services above and beyond Section 1.6 NASA Usage of Utilization Capabilities.

57. In the DRFP Section B, ADDITIONAL SERVICES, please clarify what constitutes a "Deployable Pressurized Powered Payload".

The final RFP will clarify this definition. The intent for deployable pressurized powered payloads is that they do not have to be of the locker form factor and are able to be soft stowed for transport.

58. SOW Table 1.5-1 lists "# of locations for gaseous O2 Access" (0 / 2 / 2 for Cat 1/2/3) right alongside GN2 Access, and the GN2 row is annotated "(CLDP-STD-1106 Section 3)." The GO2 row carries the same Note 2 pointer to CLDP-STD-1106 by implication, but Section 3 has no GO2 requirement to point to. CLDP-REQ-1130 [R.CLDS.619] changed from nitrogen and carbon dioxide in Baseline to nitrogen and oxygen in Rev D. Does NASA intend for there to be a separate gaseous oxygen resource line, not mentioned in CLDP-STD-1102 and CLDP-STD-1106, or should this be interpreted as cabin air usage by payloads, with no specific need to provision oxygen gas interfaces?

NASA is not intending to levy more specific gaseous oxygen requirements as we believe the characteristics of the gaseous oxygen used for ECLSS could be used for payloads as needed. CLD Providers may choose to provide access to the same ECLSS gaseous oxygen resource line to fulfill R.CLDS.619 or a separate gaseous oxygen resource line.

59. The SOW Table 1.5-1 expresses Category 3 as 58 MLE locations. CLDP-REQ-1130 R.CLDS.824 caps payload power at aggregate at 8kW with 11kW peak. However CLDP-STD-1102 defines 250W as the power required for a single MLE which could imply a $58 \times 250 \text{ W}$ (14.5 kW) power requirement for MLE's alone. We understand reconfigurable locations as not the same as simultaneous full-power draw. Can NASA please confirm in the SOW or 1130 that the MLE count is a physical-location population, bounded by the 1130 R.CLDS.824 aggregate power draw? Further, can NASA please clarify if any deployable payloads, gloveboxes, cold stowage (e.g., MLE's providing conditioned stowage) power requirements are included in the CLDP- REQ-1130 R.CLDS.824 aggregate 9kW and 11kW peak?

Yes, NASA can confirm that the NASA MLE count is a physical-location population. These, plus the NASA deployable pressurized powered payloads combined are bounded by the values in 1130 R.CLDS.824, which show applicable values for average continuous and average peak power for the summation of NASA payloads. CLDP-STD-1102 R.CPIS.04 is a reference for the heritage locker payload interface capability, not necessarily what the payload actually will draw. The Table 1.5-1 in the SOW are provisions NASA requires from the CLD Provider. Items in Table 1.5-1 such as on-orbit conditioned Stowage, workbench, glovebox are not provided by NASA, and as such are not considered part of what CLDP-REQ-1130 R.CLDS.824 covers.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

60. In SOW Section 1.5, can NASA please define Deployable Pressurized Powered Payloads as they appear in Draft SOW Table 1.5-1? There is a quantity but no cross-reference to a 1130 or 1106 requirement, no power/thermal/data allocation, and no definition distinguishing it from a "reconfigurable locker location (MLE)" or for example a "Low Power USB device." Are these 4/8/12 payloads a subset of the MLE locations or additive to them? Rationale: this could materially change both the power and the volume budget. If additive, Cat 3's 12 deployables plus 58 MLE locations is a larger interface population. Please clarify counts are location populations bounded by R.CLDS.824 8/11 kW aggregate totals. Please also confirm deployable payload power is intended to be the same 75–500 W configurable feed as R.CLDS.614 (not a separate higher-power interface), so bidders size the power distribution and 28 VDC feed count correctly.

The intent for deployable pressurized powered payloads are that they do not have to be of the locker form factor and are able to be soft stowed for transport. They could be handheld, mounted to a multi-use bracket, temporarily attached to a workbench or a wall, etc. These are in addition to the 4/8/12 MLE payloads. These total counts are indeed bounded by the R.CLDS.824. The deployable power feeds may be the same feed as R.CLDS.614 or a different feed (USB power, 120Vac, etc.) and NASA does not intend to mandate exact implementation. CLDP-REQ-1130 has R.CLDS.693 for power inverter and converter capability as well.

61. DRD CLDC-208 (Payloads Interface Requirements Document / IRD, Data Type 1, p. 224). A payload-hosting destination requires disciplined interface control, so the function is warranted — but CLDC-208 and DRD CLDC-209 (Unique Payload Interface Control Document, Data Type 1, p. 229) split per-payload interface control across two Type-1 deliverables covering a single function. CLDC-209 applies only to interfaces "not covered by the Payloads IRD," and standard payloads under CLDC-208 are closed via a per-payload Applicability Matrix — two overlapping vehicles for the same per-payload agreement. Recommend consolidating CLDC-208 into CLDC-209 as a single per-payload interface deliverable (retaining the Blank Book IRD as the standard-interface baseline within it). The recurring per-payload products — each Applicability Matrix and each unique-payload ICD — warrant a time-limited NASA disapproval right (Type 2), not approval prior to release (Type 1). Type 1 places NASA in the approval path of every individual payload's interface documentation, a recurrence multiplier that scales with utilization tempo. The closest predecessor analogue, CCtCap DRD 206 (Internal Cargo Interface Control Agreement), managed per-cargo-item interface definition at Data Type 2. Recommend Type 2 for the consolidated per-payload deliverable. (Companion comment addresses CLDC-209's own data type.) Note: Further comments are provided on the as-written scope and content of the DRD. This recommendation to delete takes precedence.

CLD Providers may choose to provide a single per-payload interface deliverable as proposed, which will fulfill the 2 DRDs. NASA did not want to mandate that methodology. NASA is considering all DRD recommendations and will respond in Final RFP.

(The Remainder of this page is left Intentionally Blank)

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

62. In DRD CLDC-124, recommend making it clear in the DRD that CLDP-PLN-3017 DRMs inapplicable to the Contractor's offered configuration, for example external or unpressurized payload DRMs where that capability is a later or optional service, may be marked not applicable at baseline and added when the capability is offered. Rationale: The SOW makes certain mission types optional based on the Contractor's configuration. Requiring fully developed integration plans for missions the provider is not offering or offering later in the program produces speculative content NASA must review without a utilization customer who benefits. Marking them reserved keeps the plan accurate and NASA's review effort focused. **NASA is updating DRD CLDC-124 Utilization Integration Plan (UIP) in the final RFP to indicate that CLDP-PLN-3017 CLDP UIP is solely to be considered a reference document at this time. CLD Providers are to propose their own utilization integration plan with regards to how they plan to integrate NASA utilization. NASA plans to update the CLDP-PLN-3017 CLDP UIP document to align with the CLD Provider DRD CLDC-124 UIP. The Offeror should include all Additional and Optional Services expected to be available during the period of performance outlined in SOW sections 3.4 Pre-Priced Additional Service Description (CLIN 4), 3.4.1 Additional Services and 3.4.2 Optional Services. The Offeror is not required to propose all NASA identified Optional Services or may include a subset along with what timeframe the items are available. If the services in 3.4.2 Optional Services are not offered or included in the award, they cannot be evaluated. In accordance with Section H clause titled "TASK ORDERING PROCEDURES – SUPPLEMENT", "After completion of CLIN 1, contractors may propose major changes to the transportation cost, additional enhancements/capabilities ...", and price reductions as part of the CLDC RFTOP process. Contractors are required to provide sufficient detail for NASA to determine required justification to the previously accepted CLDC services and/or a CLDC Configuration Change (e.g., a new Configuration).**
63. In DRD CLDC-124, recommend that NASA's own input milestones, in particular delivery of the payload/facility list for a given increment and research planning data, be assigned committed need dates in Launch-minus terms in CLDP-PLN-3017 or the contract. This may be clarified by Figure 6.3.1.1-1 DRM #1, which is missing from CLDP-PLN-3017 Rev B, which should also be corrected. Rationale: The UIP begins at the Design and Analyze phase, triggered by NASA's delivery of the increment payload list, and every downstream contractor commitment (the CLDC-208 six-week Applicability Matrix, the CLDC-125 schedule template, safety review dates) is keyed to that start. Contractor Launch-minus commitments are only executable if NASA's inputs carry equivalent commitments; a bilateral schedule protects the increment for both parties and gives NASA a defensible basis for holding contractors to the downstream dates. **NASA is updating DRD CLDC-124 UIP in the final RFP to indicate that CLDP-PLN-3017 CLDP UIP is solely to be considered a reference document at this time. CLD Providers are to propose their own utilization integration plan with regards to how they plan to integrate NASA utilization including when NASA data is required for integration and planning. NASA plans to update the CLDP-PLN-3017 CLDP UIP document to align with the CLD Provider DRD CLDC-124 UIP.**
64. In SOW Table 1.5-1, how does NASA intend to provide sufficient powered-locker capacity during launch and return to support projected research demand, including investigations that cannot be accommodated within the powered transportation capacity available for CLD missions? **NASA plans to align transportation cadence needs with budgetary considerations. Current science needs on CLD are approximately 50% of the current ISS. NASA intends to have powered locker capacity for crewed and uncrewed vehicles. Other options, such as unpressurized platforms, could be available as well through different NASA programs. NASA will work with CLD Providers and science community to develop solutions and innovative alternatives to meet science needs.**

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

65. In SOW Table 1.5-1, how does NASA intend to ensure sufficient incubated, refrigerated, and frozen stowage capacity during launch and return, including complementary transportation pathways when CLD mission capacity cannot accommodate projected research throughput or investigation-specific schedule requirements?
Current science needs on CLD are approximately 50% of the current ISS. NASA intends to have powered locker capacity and conditioned stowage capacity for crewed and uncrewed vehicles. NASA will work with CLD Providers and science community to develop solutions and innovative alternatives to meet science needs. In addition, there are opportunities to reduce conditioned stowage needs in the future by using in situ analysis capabilities.
66. In SOW Table 1.5-1, would NASA consider establishing a defined minimum allocation of CTBE capacity for incubated and conditioned stowage to support end-to-end research throughput across CLD and complementary transportation platforms?
NASA's future forecast of payloads and usage of Cargo Transfer Bag Equivalent (CTBE) allocation is in work. NASA is targeting flexibility at this time to allow for many options. Any changes, if applicable, will be reflected in the final RFP.
67. In SOW Table 1.5-1, how does NASA intend to enable high-throughput, crew-independent research in the Category 1 (Mission A) scenario, and would NASA consider incorporating a permanently installed automated glovebox integrated with analytical, stowage, and consumable-reprocessing capabilities? Glovebox capabilities are not included in the Category 1 (Mission A) scenario, limiting research activities to investigations that can be conducted entirely within an enclosed payload format. NASA should consider incorporating a permanently installed automated glovebox capability into this mission scenario to enable higher-throughput research when integrated with appropriate stowage resources. The Category 2 (Mission B) and Category 3 (Mission C) scenarios include a glovebox with a 450-liter workspace. This volume could instead support an automated glovebox facility, including an approximately two-MLE-equivalent workspace, capable of robotic pipetting, microscopy, camera-based imaging, and other analytical operations. The facility could be directly integrated with incubated, refrigerated, and frozen stowage, as well as consumable reprocessing modules requiring approximately six MLE-equivalent locations. This integrated capability would enable NASA-sponsored investigations to be conducted during shorter-duration missions without requiring crew time. It would also increase research throughput and streamline station-wide research operations during periods of continuous crew presence, particularly when resupply opportunities are limited.
NASA is not mandating glovebox capability during this Mission A timeframe accordingly, but CLD Providers may propose one if it meets their business considerations. Category 1 (Mission A) is optional, and intended to not be a steady state capability; Category 3 (Standard Services Mission) is intended to be steady state capability. Category 1 (Mission A) focus would be on demonstrating the viability of the crewed CLD, and since it is unknown the exact sizing of the CLD at this point in time, NASA is allowing flexibility on implementation and buildout of the CLD, yet at Mission A timeframe the volumetric/power needs are envisioned to focus on systems and crew habitability/life support functions.
68. In SOW Section 2.17, CTBE accommodation range is stated from 0.5 to 8.0 CTBE. Does the 8.0 represent a single bag or item? It would be helpful to include bag size (M0x) or item maximum dimensions to help with design. Could drive hatch size.
NASA does not intend to drive changes to the docking hatch size. The 8.0 CTBE bag size would still allow for larger things to be packed inside, and still potentially fit contents of the bag through the hatch if unpacked first. NASA does not want to mandate the specific use of ISS Cargo Transfer Bags (CTBs) or M0x Bags. The 0.5 - 8.0 CTBE range is the rough sizing of bags envisioned which in ISS CTB bag sizes, are in line with projected usage on CLDs.

Crew Members/Selection

69. In SOW Section 3.3, "Contractor shall provide NASA first right of refusal of the Crew Commander role for each service mission." How does NASA define the Crew Commander role?
The Crew Commander role is defined in SOW 1.8.1.1 Crew Commander and roles and responsibilities in Clause Authority and Responsibilities of the Destination and CVV Commander, Chain of Command and Succession On-Orbit; Relationship Between Ground and On-Orbit Management.
70. In SOW Section 2.20.1, all crewmembers are required to meet a minimum criteria for NASA CLDS missions. One of the requirements is "If they are from a Designated Countries Tier II and III, NASA approval must be granted." Is this a requirement if there are no NASA astronauts as part of the mission/increment?
Yes. During the period of performance of this contract, the CLDS shall not be utilized by Tier II and III Designated Countries without NASA approval.

Insight/Oversight

71. In Section H Clause, Government Insight, paragraph is duplicative with paragraph (f)(2).
NASA concurs and has deleted this paragraph.

Medical

72. In CLDC-112, Reference to Final Operating Capability (FOC) remains in the Food and Nutrition Plan. We assume this is a typographical error. May the Government please remove or clarify when you expect the transition from GFE to Contractor-provided food to take place.
For the final RFP, references to Final Operating Capability will be removed and additional clarity provided.
73. In SOW Section 2.20.1, "Negative results of 13-panel drug screen". We are not aware of a standard for a 13 panel drug screen. Please clarify / specify what specific screening is required, or point to a provided document for screening definition.
In reference to CLDP-STD-1123 Medical Standards and Capabilities, the 13 panel drug screen is a common drug screening that includes: Tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) (cannabinoids), cocaine, opiates (3 drugs fall in this category), oxycodone, phencyclidine, amphetamines, Methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDMA) (ecstasy), barbiturates, benzodiazepines, methadone, propoxyphene.
74. In SOW Section 2.20.3, "The Contractor shall allow NASA participation in the mission medical and behavioral health certification process to assess risk to USG Crew and the NASA mission while USG Crewmembers are inhabitants in accordance with CLDP-STD-1123 Medical Standards and Capabilities.". Please clarify whether NASA wants to be involved in the medical and behavioral testing itself or just the certification at the end of the process for non USG crew.
NASA does not require participation in the medical and behavioral testing of non-USG crew but would consider doing so if the contractor requests NASA participation. The Prime contractor is responsible for the delivery of non USG crew medical certification packages in which NASA reviews and assesses the non-USG crew medical certification packages for NASA missions at the end of the process.
75. In DRD CLDC-111, "8b. Thresholds of off-nominal findings and action thresholds to protect crew health and safety.". Please clarify what is needed where "thresholds" are stated. Are these actual numbers or is it how these thresholds will be determined?
The Plan can provide either the actual threshold numbers or how these will be determined and when.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers

Posted August 14, 2026

76. In DRD CLDC-112, per the "Remarks" section, it appears the intention is that NASA would not be a food provider long term. Please confirm if this is the case and in what timeframe they expect a transition to a fully contractor provided service?

The Remarks and references to Final Operating Capability have been deleted in the Final RFP.

77. In DRD CLDC-112, (1) In Step 4, please clarify the scope of mission reporting for food provisioning. (2) What purpose is this food system data exchange? (3) Why is a regular data exchange needed with NASA for a commercially provided food service for a CLDP program during operations for each mission?

The scope of the Plan should include identification of the food system data required for certification of flight readiness for each mission. The purpose of the regular data exchange ensures NASA that the crew has enough inventory of food for the mission. The regular data exchange provides insight to changes to the plan as it applies to each mission.

78. In DRD CLDC-113, "7. Name and location of all quarantine and restricted-access facilities to be used by crew from L-14 days and schedule for the contractor's development or acquisition of those facilities.". Does this exclude the use of soft quarantine, such as a crew member isolated at home during that timeframe?

No, Home quarantine for crew members can still be used from L-14 to when crew depart to launch site. CLDP-STD-1150 CLDP Operations Standard requires that the Health Stabilization Program (HSP) meet the intent of JSC-22538, which requires an alternate to home quarantine (if provided) as a backup in case home quarantine cannot meet HSP requirements.

79. In DRD CLDC-114, "3. Approach to NASA insight and deliverables for contractor's medical and crew health system that is focused on path to successful certification, including process, format, content, data rights, and schedule of data sharing between contractor and NASA.". Please clarify what does data rights refer to? Would NASA have the data rights to non-NASA crewmembers?

Data rights refers to the contractors plan for providing the required data and use rights, including crew health data based on NASA's requirement for insight into non-USG crewmember data as defined in DRD-114 Medical and Crew Health System Plan and DRD-104 Insight and Collaboration Implementation Plan.

80. In DRD CLDC-108, please clarify if the functional definition of the boundaries for crew and ground team task analysis (such as the credible fault depth to which contingency actions will be analyzed) will also be agreed upon through approval of DRD CLDC-108.1?

Yes, task analysis boundaries will be agreed upon via DRD CLDC-108.1 Human Systems Integration Plan. The task analysis should be scoped to meet CLDP-REQ-1130 verifications, including the human error analysis.

81. In DRD CLDC-109, the listed scope of HEA includes "all nominal and contingency mission operations" for both crew and mission control teams. Can NASA clarify if the functional definition of the boundaries for this analysis (such as the credible fault depth to which contingency actions will be analyzed) will be agreed upon through approval of DRD 109.1? Yes, approval of DRD CLDC-109.1 Human Error Analysis (HEA) Plan will define the boundaries. The HEA should be scoped to meet CLDP-REQ-1130 verifications and the objectives of human rating.

Business Viability and Commercialization Plan

82. In DRD CLDC-002, please clarify what is meant by "certified" in regard to financials within the Commercialization Plan. Does NASA require audited financial statements prepared by an independent CPA, officer-certified financial statements, or another form of certification?

In the Final RFP, DRD CLDC-002 Commercialization Plan will be updated to allow "officer- certified" balance

sheets, income and cash flow statements, and changes in equity.

Government Task and Collaboration Agreements and Government Furnished Equipment

83. In the DRFP Section H, Use of Government Resources, Paragraph (c)(2)(4), a CLD provider may have staff that worked in various NASA facilities using NASA equipment. Would NASA allow a CLD provider to utilize its employees within NASA facilities to perform work utilizing NASA equipment? This could potentially reduce costs and schedule toward completing a CLD. The use of NASA facilities and equipment can be requested as part of the GTA or GFP request process, as appropriate. However, NASA facilities and equipment are expected to be operated and overseen by NASA and NASA contractor personnel who have recent training and experience using the equipment and facilities. Contractor employee use of the facilities and equipment are subject to agreement by the Center hosting the facility or equipment.
84. DRFP Section L17.2 directs Offerors to include the cost of all Government Task Agreements (GTAs) in their Pricing Volume. Slide-45 of the Pre-Proposal Conference presents the process for obtaining GTA costs and their inclusion in Offerors' proposal if deemed suitable. On Slide- 45, the first bullet in the second paragraph states "Contractor shall submit GTAs to the Center POC NLT 22 days after Final RFP release for disposition". The figure (Process flow) at the bottom of the slide appears to contradict this bullet by stating in the Box entitled "Draft RFP Release", that "Offeror request GTA proposals from the Center POCs". This is a much earlier timeframe ("upon DRFP release" versus "NLT 22 days after Final RFP Release"). Please clarify when Offerors should request GTA proposals from the Center POCs.
The GTA process defined in the Final RFP shall govern if there are any ambiguities between the two documents. Offerors are encouraged to start exploring and request GTAs as soon as possible to understand what opportunities may exist. The last day to submit a request for a GTA is NLT 22 days after the Final RFP is posted. NASA will return and disposition the GTA no later than 7 days prior to the final proposal due date.
85. Under DRFP Section MA.3, for proposed GTAs, can they be modified post award to better accommodate evolving scope?
Yes. New GTAs and modifications are allowed post-award. Post-award actions will require negotiation with the CO and COR to address scope and cost. These costs may fall to the Contractor, whereas previous GTA costs submitted with the Final Proposal are only assessed as part of the Total Evaluated Price (TEP) and funded by the program.
86. Under DRFP Section H, Use of Government Resources, GTA costs are excluded from proposed prices/NTEs but paid by the Contractor via the changes clause and added to the offeror's TEP.
(1) Are GTA costs recoverable in subsequent task order pricing? (2) Please confirm the GTA submission gate (22 days after final RFP release) and NASA's disposition timeline for our planning.
The Contractor does not pay for the GTA costs that are proposed in the Final RFP. NASA funds the performing organization directly based on the negotiated costs from the GTA. Because this is a cost to NASA on behalf of the Contractor, the value of the GTA is included in the TEP to capture the total cost of the work under this contract. (1) NASA is funding the costs of proposed GTAs; therefore there are no funds to be recovered by the Contractor. As stated in the answer above, any GTAs performed post award are negotiated with the CO and COR and NASA may apply the costs to perform new scope directly to the Contractor in the form of an equitable adjustment to a future milestone payment. (2) The last day to submit a request for a GTA is NLT 22 days after the Final RFP is posted. NASA will return and disposition the GTA no later than 7 days prior to the final proposal due date.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

87. Under DRFP Section H, Use of Government Resources, paragraph (c)(4), the way this paragraph is worded seems to preclude the use of GTA or GCA resources in the execution of actual mission support, whether that's during development or operations timeframe. Please clarify.
Section H Clause titled Use of Government Resources, Section (c)(1)(ii)(A) states 'Collaboration can span Design, Development, Test, and Evaluation (DDT&E) including substantial Subject Matter Expert (SME) involvement in design development and/or use of Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) as well as use support in development of ground and flight systems and real-time operations.' Paragraph (c)(4) is referring to wholesale use of NASA for end item deliverable but does not disallow Offeror to utilize NASA for portions of the service.
88. In DRFP Section H, Associate Contractor Agreements (a): Should the table in this section be populated with "OFI"s instead of "TBD"s? Is NASA or the CLD Provider responsible for filling in the blanks?
. NASA plans to update to OFI in the Final RFP.
89. In DRFP Section H, Use of Government Resources, please clarify whether NASA personnel on loan, e.g., via GCA roles, may be stationed at suppliers with supplier consent. Please additionally clarify whether "ten (10) NASA personnel" are bookkept as "ten (10) NASA personnel at any given time" or "ten (10) individual NASA personnel over the lifetime of the CLIN1 contract", or whether this should be interpreted another way.
The CLD Contract does not preclude Government Collaboration Agreement (GCA) roles to be stationed at Destination or supplier facilities but would need to be negotiated during the GCA request; however, the quantity of GCA personnel provided is based on "at any given time" and availability may preclude being stationed at the facility full-time.

Commercial Activity

90. DRFP Section H, Commercial Activity Guidance, (b) states that all activities are subject to (1) NASA Policies, (2) NASA Media and Branding Guidelines, and (3) Ensuring content is not inappropriate for a general audience. These standards appear to apply to NASA crew and activities as well as to non-NASA crew and activities. Please confirm. If these apply to non- NASA crew and activities, they may limit commercial opportunities for the Contractor and other customers for a destination that is intended to be Commercial. The 'inappropriate for a general audience' guideline is subjective. Recommend this clause be removed and appropriateness of content should be based on crew following an established crew code of conduct and negotiation between Contractor and customer.
As outlined in Section H, Commercial Activity Guidance, all activities that occur during CLD Operations (Ground, Flight & On Orbit) apply to all crew on board the CLD. NASA is evaluating changes to this and other clauses associated with Media and Commercial activities based on industry comment and will provide final redlines in the Final RFP.
91. This appears to require the Contractor to submit a formal letter to the Contracting Officer for approval to conduct commercial activities on the commercial destination the CLD owns and operates. This clause has significant potential to limit revenue streams and commercial opportunities for the Contractor and adds uncertainty for what services may be sold to non- USG customers. Request this provision be deleted.
Only activities outlined in paragraph (c) which include "Military Operations (Excludes: Recruiting, Humanitarian, Science, Training)" and "Activities related to Designated Countries (Tier II & III)" require NASA Contract Officer approval, not all activities. NASA has updated the Commercial Activity Guidance clause in the Final RFP to clarify.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers

Posted August 14, 2026

92. In DRFP Section H, Commercial Activity Guidance, paragraphs (b) and (c) apply to "all activities that occur during CLD Operations (Ground, Flight & On-Orbit)," and paragraph (a) to all external communications during CLD Operations "or related to the Destination." Because the Destination operates continuously, these triggers cover every commercial activity of the Contractor — including foreign sovereign astronaut missions, international research customers, media and entertainment productions, and marketing campaigns — with no nexus to NASA services, funding, crew, or identity. Please confirm whether this reach is intended.

Yes, all Commercial Activities are subject to the terms of the Commercial Activities Guidance Clause.

Program Documents

93. CLD-REQ-1130 Rev D (draft) requirement R.CLDS.821 DESTINATION DEORBIT is as follows: The CLD shall provide the capability to perform a controlled deorbit, that meets Section 4.6 and 4.7 of NASA-STD-8719.14 Process for Limiting Orbital Debris, from the first Destination element's initial orbital insertion through all phases of on-orbit assembly, operational life, and system retirement, including both planned nominal and contingency early end-of-life scenarios.
1. Section 4.6.2.1 of NASA-STD-8719.14C lists the types of re-entry to meet the requirements as "(1) natural reentry, direct reentry, or direct retrieval, (2) storage or Earth escape, or (3) long-term reentry". Natural Re-Entry and Direct Retrieval are conflicting with the language in R.CLDS.821 "capability to perform a controlled deorbit".
 - a. What is the definition of "controlled"?

The intent of requirement R.CLDS.821 is to point the Provider to the direct reentry options within 8719.14C. Section 4.6. 4.6.2.2.b defines direct reentry. Controlled in this instance is the use of a final disposal burn to place any debris footprint into an unpopulated region of Earth to minimize risk to the public.
 2. Is it the intention of this requirement that it is the CLDS that must have this capability, not the CLD?
- This requirement should apply to CLDS to include Destination, assembly components, and any pieces of CaVVs or CVVs that may be left on-orbit following their mission completion.
3. Does R.CLDS.821 supersede NASA-STD-8719.14C, and if so, why?
- R.CLDS.821 is written specifically for the CLDS for a direct reentry that meets NASA risk acceptance for that option.
4. Requirement R.CLDS.821 rationale states: "It is up to the Destination provider to determine the de-orbit method (e.g. a visiting spacecraft tug vs. sufficient Destination delta-V for the Destination to de-orbit itself).".
 - a. Reliance on a VV spacecraft tug as a strategy contradicts with requirement R.CLDS.821 which is requiring the deorbit capability from orbital insertion through assembly sequence, operational life, and system retirement.

The intent of this requirement is to ensure that no elements of the CLDS architecture are placed into orbit that cannot be safely de-orbited to a targeted, unpopulated area in a controlled manner. Using natural decay with a final controlled de-orbit burn is the approach used for ISS and would be a viable OpsCon for new space stations. However, the architecture needs sufficient reliability and redundancy (2 failure tolerance) to survive the decay period and reliably execute the de-orbit burn.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

5. Operationally, utilizing a VV tug would imply periods of the mission/life of the CLD where the VV tug would not be present (i.e., mated to the CLD), and therefore the CLD would not have the capability through all phases of the life/mission. Is the intent that, if using the VV tug strategy, it must launch with and remain with the CLD for all phases?

NASA is not dictating the decision or architecture, only that there must be a plan for safe de-orbit at all phases of the mission.

6. If compliance can be achieved by using the VV tug strategy, launched when needed and not continuously available, then can compliance also be achieved by using a VV to refuel the CLD to enable the deorbit capability, rather than using the VV as a tug?

There are multiple options for meeting this requirement. It is dependent on the Offeror's architecture.

- a. If so, is the can compliance be achieved more generally by either having the deorbit capability through all phases or being able to enable the capability before deorbit and disposal operations?

There must be a plan for safe de-orbit at all phases of the mission.

94. In CLDP-REQ-1130, [R.CLDS.155], a) Includes a toilet that provides collection, containment, and disposal of all body wastes per the maximum volumes listed in the Body Waste Quantities Table, except vomitus, b) Provides collection and containment for vomitus per maximum volumes listed in the Table Body Waste Quantities. What is the rationale for calling out vomitus waste separately from others in the Table for not needing disposal?

The Body Waste Management System can be a combination of many things. The exception for vomitus is tied to the toilet. The toilet is not expected to handle vomitus. Vomitus is typically handled through emesis bags and disposed of appropriately.

95. In CLDP-REQ-1130, [R.CLDS.155], the requirement rationale text "6) efficient means that the system is designed to accommodate the size of the crew and that the entire crew can successfully utilize the system in the allotted time. For instance, if there 6 crew members and it takes 30 minutes to use the system then it will take 3 hours to cycle all crew members through." Is the intent to set a limit to how long a crew member has to wait before being able to use the toilet? What is the maximum time limit?

There is no set time limit or maximum time limit requirement from NASA for how long a crew member has to wait before being able to use the toilet. This will be driven by the design the system has to be able to handle the number of events per day for the number of crew members on the CVV and Destination at that time.

96. CLD-REQ-1130 Rev D (draft) requirement R.CLDS.252 Habitable Atmosphere is as follows: The CVV, Destination, and CaVV shall maintain a habitable atmosphere within the limits defined in Appendix E, Habitable Atmosphere throughout all flight phases. Appendix E states: d. Cabin ppCO₂ No Minimum 3.0 mmHg (0.058 psia) (1 hour average) The ranges/limits provided in this requirement are nominal physiological values for indefinite human exposure without measurable impairments to health or performance. The limits are based on the average one-hour CO₂ partial pressure (ppCO₂) in the habitable volume. Spacecraft CO₂ sensors may report values lower than the inhaled atmosphere, so precautions must be taken to ensure that local (relevant to crewmember's face) CO₂ does not exceed the limit. A ppCO₂ 1 hr average of 3.0mmHg is beyond what ISS has historically operated at. A 3 hr average at 3.5 mmHg is the historical benchmark. Is the intent to exclude leverage of existing high TRL CO₂ control systems by driving redesign to achieve this capability?

ISS partial pressure of carbon dioxide (ppCO₂) levels were reduced over time as the technology allowed, but the current NASA-STD-3001 Vol. 2 standard requirement is a 1-hr average of 3 millimeters of mercury (mmHg), and that is what is being leveraged on all future Programs based on ISS lessons learned.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

97. In CLDP-STD-1123, Section 5.0 and 6.0, are these capabilities and in flight medical exams required from Mission A, or only at Mission C, with a transition from Mission A to Mission C to be detailed within the scope of the proposal?
Capabilities and exams apply to all missions but quantity of medical capabilities may vary based on DRM and duration of mission and are to be defined and approved via DRD CLDC- 114 Medical and Crew Health System Plan.
98. In CLDP-STD-1123, Section 4, does wording of "any" physicians providing medical care to crew during launch/landing contingencies prevent flight surgeons without said qualifications from participating in care? Recommend this be amended to "at least one/two" and crew surgeons can continue in current role.
Yes, the wording of "any" prevents surgeons without qualifications from participating in care.
99. In CLDP-STD-1111, Section 4.2, NASA states they will participate in CLD Providers medical certification process. Request NASA clarify that they plan to provide information on the certification of their crew so that the CLD provider may understand the risk to their systems, and what waivers have been granted by NASA.
NASA plans to provide the certification information related to NASA crew.
100. In CLDP-STD-1111, Section 5.1, NASA states they will complete an Aerospace Medicine Review of new issues identified by medical surveillance during preflight phase that have potential for mission impact or do not meet medical/behavioral standards. Request clarification that these deltas will also be reviewed by the CLD Medical Review Board for its assessment and risk acceptance.
Any change in crew health status is planned to be shared with CLD Provider Medical Board for mission certification.
101. In CLDP-STD-1111, Section 5.2.1.3, this states CLD Provider must provide access to facilities and resources for USG crew to continue pre-flight exercise. This is obvious for quarantine, but what/how much is required for CVV and KSC area operations training? Is access to a hotel gym and Wi-Fi to communicate with their ASCR sufficient?
Yes, access to the hotel gym and Wi-Fi is sufficient for Crew Visiting Vehicle (CVV) and KSC area operations training.
102. In CLDP-STD-1111, Section 5.6.1.2, this states NASA BHP reviews and approves the content of resources provided for all crewmembers for each mission as it pertains to achieving an adequate level of propagated behavioral risk to USG crews. Please clarify, does this mean NASA reviews non-USG care packages and behavioral health resources? Or is the review of only the resources that are widely available to all crew?
NASA Behavioral Health and Performance (BHP) will review the comprehensive behavioral countermeasures strategy to asses behavioral risk to crew on a per mission basis. Intent is not to perform a detailed survey of personal items.
103. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Section R.CLDS.731, currently ISS late load cargo and payloads are not processed in a general clean level facility, not a Class 8 cleanroom. Some payloads are processes utilizing a flowbench to maintain a 200A level. Please confirm this is suitable for CLD and that all payload hardware does not need to be processed in a class 8 cleanroom.
Pre-flight processing requirements will be dependent on payload. The goal was to provide the ability for payloads to process in a Class 8 cleanroom if needed for highly sensitive payloads such as ones with optics, etc. It won't be needed at all times, but need to have the capability.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

104. In CLDP-STD-1106, Section R.BLC.023, "The Destination shall provide a fully sealed and environmentally controlled glovebox with an internal work volume of at least 450 L for cross- discipline experiments in a microgravity environment on the Destination." This wording implies one glovebox would need to meet the capabilities. Request this be updated to show the minimum volume requirements for each capability.
A single glovebox could satisfy all the glovebox capabilities but is not required. Capabilities could be spread across multiple gloveboxes/glovebags. At least 1 should be verified to have 450L sizing capability per this requirement.
105. In CLDP-REQ-1130, R.CLDS.135, 'HATCH WINDOWS' -- Requires that "the CLDS shall provide a window on all sealable hatches for direct non-electric visual observation of the environment on the opposite side of the hatch." This dictates a more complicated hatch design that would drive a specific design solution at a large cost and schedule risk to the CLD developer. Question to NASA: Would a "peephole" style door viewer work in this instance instead of a full hatch window?
A peephole as a design solution for this requirement would raise questions about adequate field of view, optical clarity, restraints needed for crew observation, and other considerations when assessing hazards on the opposite side of the hatch. There are window aperture size requirements in window standards such as those invoked by R.CLDS.760.
106. In CLDP-REQ-1130, R.CLDS.147, 'CONDENSATION LIMITS' -- "...limit condensation persistence on interior surfaces to 1 hour per day within the habitable volume throughout all flight phases..." The stated 1 hour condensation limit for vestibule volumes that experience full vacuum swings assumes a vestibule size that is approximate to the ISS vestibule size. Vestibules of larger sizes may require a prohibitive amount of shell heater power during power-constrained phases of flight. Example: A module transitioning from a cold vacuum condition after a parking orbit will not be able to warm up in only one hour to prevent condensation if that vestibule is larger than the ISS vestibule. On the ISS, there has been an exception to the 1-hour rule that permits up to 72 hour window following vestibule operations for condensation. Will this same ISS exception be permitted to meet this requirement for CLD?
This requirement is not limited to vestibule volumes. It is a control to limit fungal growth that can impact crew health. Requirements exceptions will require assessment within the context of the Destination design and will need to be submitted for approval.
107. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Sections R.CLDS.822 and R.CLDS.375, both the 'Safe Haven in Destination' and the 'Consumable Sizing' requirements require a set amount of reserve consumables to be maintained for contingency. It is not clear if these requirements stack (i.e., must include the amount of consumables for both), or if the greater of the two can be considered sufficient to meet both. Request clarification to ensure that the CLD destination does not over allocate mass for reserve consumables.
These 2 requirements are not meant to stack together. The requirements are to cover the expected nominal consumables and the extra required to handle the worst contingency event for a given consumable. Safe haven is one of the contingencies to consider and may be a driving scenario for items like food, but a MMOD strike and module depress/feed-the-leak may be driving for a consumable like nitrogen. R.CLDS.822 can be considered a lower level requirement of the more generic R.CLDS.375.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

108. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Section R.CLDS.824, 'Average Continuous and Peak Power' -- The requirement does not state which specific phases of flight (mission A,B, or C) that 8 kW power (and commensurate thermal) loads are qualified to. As written, it implies that the destination will need 8 kW, 11 kW peak, available for first 30 day mission. Is NASA expecting 8kW continuous / 11 kW peak be available for Mission A? If not, which mission phase does this requirement apply?
The requirements within CLDP-REQ-1130 are applicable to the Standard Service Mission (also noted as Category 3 for utilization capabilities as referenced in the contract) unless otherwise specified.
109. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Section R.EVA.091, 'Paint ' -- This requirement indicates that Paint cannot be used on EVA translation paths. Does NASA provide a contingency for CLD destinations that use white paint for radiator panels that must also be allocated as translation paths?
R.EVA.091 is a best practice "should" statement. Refer to rationale statement for risks of using paint in vicinity of EVA translation and worksites.
110. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Section R.BER.036, 'CENTERLINE BERTHING CAMERA SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS' -- What contingencies does NASA have for CLD Destinations that do not have the ability to incorporate a CBCS capability after arriving at ISS? For some CLD Destinations that are advanced in their designs (i.e., radial ports that are not intended to interact with other ISS modules), a major and costly redesign would be needed to implement this requirement for berthing ports that do not require it.
For R.BER.036 Centerline Berthing Camera System requirement, the Government has identified there was overlap with R.EVR.015 Berthing Cue System Requirements and deleted R.BER.036.
111. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Table D.2 'Table D-2 Potable Water Physiochemical Limits' -- Note: 1 in the table offers an avenue to utilize a CLD developer's own water quality standard/practices/procedures thru the HMTA Water Quality experts. However, Note 1 is not called out in the table or text so it is unclear where specifically it applies. If there is no avenue to apply Note 1, it risks overburdening the amount of testing needed for on-going station water sample testing and monitoring. Which part of Table D.2 does Note 1 apply, or does it apply to the whole table?
Note 1 can be addressed during verification planning and approval. The intent is to be able to leverage prior testing, such as water provided from municipalities where testing has already occurred. Since that testing may vary, the note can apply to any applicable chemical in the table. The note does not apply to changing the limits in the table.
112. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Section 4.2.13 (V.CLDS.233) combined with the definition of the two types of applicable standards in section 2.1 suggests some of the required vehicle environmental testing specified in SMC-S-016 could be replaced by an alternate approach. SMC-S-016 dictates space vehicle qualification and protoqualification units to be subjected to the following tests: inspection, performance, pressure and leak, EMC, shock, acoustic or random vibration, thermal balance, thermal vacuum, and mode survey. Of these tests, are there any that NASA knows at this point in time that it would not allow a alternate approach, and thus require full vehicle testing as dictated by SMC-S-016? Thermal balance and thermal vacuum testing are of particular interest due to schedule and costs concerns along with the limited facilities in the United States for full module thermal vacuum testing.
NASA expects any CLDS to be fully certified (tested, qualified, etc). NASA experience is that deferral of integrated or system-level testing can delay certification or increase programmatic risk. NASA expects providers to submit test planning through VV&C plan [DRD: CLDC-102 Verification, Validation, and Certification Plan (VVCP)]. Any exceptions should be submitted as a variance request with supporting rationale. NASA guidance on tailoring of SMC-S-016 is covered in CLDP-STD-1140 CLDP Technical Standards and Design Evaluation Criteria.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

113. CLDP-PLN-1110, does NASA plan to make this document available for contractors?

No NASA does not plan to share this document.

114. In CLDP-REQ-1130, will NASA consider reinstating the Appendix G allocation matrix from previous revisions of the CLDP-REQ-1130 requirements? We noticed that you put the specific allocations in the actual Shall statements which is helpful, however, the allocation matrix was also helpful when integrating into our requirements management systems and allowed a better understanding to the applicability to different aspects of a system. (e.g. CTS had CTS IS, MS and GS while now it appears as though a requirement applies across all the parts of a CTS system.)

It may be possible for NASA to provide an allocation-matrix export from the NASA requirements management system for import into the provider's requirements management system. The requirement allocations were also made more generic in many areas, with the expectation that providers will decompose the requirements into the applicable system elements. A detailed review of this decomposition and allocation will occur through VVCP/V&V plan reviews and acceptance.

115. M2M-30159 is now the updated version of SLS-SPEC-159. Where can that document be found?

Although it is not an applicable document, NASA will consider adding this document to the Technical Library.

116. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Section CLDS.029, Failure Tolerance without Emergency Systems has been updated with specific language for use of crew return capability as a third control to the hazard and is applicable to the CTS, CLD and CaTS. However, the success criteria in the verification was left unchanged and seems to be only applicable to the CTS. Can you clarify the intent of the update of this requirement?

The intent of the update to the requirement was to synchronize the language in the CLDP- REQ-1130 with the "verified crew return capability" language in 3102. The overall intent of the requirement is to allow for a verified crew return as a third control to hazards where the catastrophic event is loss of crew. The verification is by completion of integrated hazard analysis.

117. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Section R.CLDS.248, the CTS, CLD, and CaTS shall be single failure tolerant to Critical Hazards, where applicability to Visiting Vehicles is only during Integrated Operations except the capability for safe Destination deorbit must be two failure tolerant. What is the rationale for the deorbit to be two failure tolerant instead of single failure tolerant to critical hazards like the rest of the destination?

118. It is critical that controlled de-orbit of the commercial Destination be accounted for in the design and operation of the CLDS to protect Earth's surface impacts. To ensure public safety, the CLDS (CLD + VV tug if applicable) must be 2 failure tolerant for a safe and controlled de- orbit. Please refer to rationale statement in R.CLDS.248.

119. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Figure 1-1, with the removal of Appendix G, Allocation Matrix, and the requirements being updated from CLDS to CTS, CLD, CaTS are we to assume that a requirement at this level is now applicable to all the elements of the CTS, CLD, CaTS (e.g. CLD MS, CLD GS, CLD IS, etc.)? If not, this adds additional confusion to the updated requirements as documented in Rev D. Recommend clarifying what specific elements of the schema the requirements are applicable to or add back Appendix G. Ref: R.CLDS.029: Was CLDS shall; is: CTS, CLD, CaTS. We don't believe this requirement is applicable to all the elements of these systems.

Yes, CTS/CLD/CaTS includes the MS, GS, and IS for those respective systems. These requirements were written to be independent of a particular architecture, they may or may not apply to all of MS, GS, and IS. The provider is expected to decompose the NASA requirements as applicable to their system elements. The detailed review and acceptance of requirement flow down will be reviewed and approved through the VVCP/V&V plan.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

120. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Section R.CLDS.447, Spacecraft Propulsion Systems; meet the intent of this standard was not originally required for the ISS commercial transportation systems. Is it expected the heritage transportation systems be required to meet the intent of this new standard?
The full scope of delta-certification for previously-certified transportation systems is subject to assessment of system-specific impacts and risks.
121. NASA should consider pre-tailoring the applicable standards and specifications baseline before award — proactively removing or modifying requirements that legacy human- spaceflight programs have historically failed to meet or routinely waived, and modernizing the prescribed program-management and systems-engineering methodology (e.g., DRD CLDC-101 SEMP) to reflect current commercial practices? Leaving "room" for Contractors to propose tailoring against an unmodernized baseline shifts cost, schedule, and risk onto each provider and multiplies adjudication cycles (§2.10.6 items 1–5). Would NASA consider (a) publishing a pre-adjudicated, commercially-tailored baseline as the starting point, and (b) committing to a target reduction in the number of standards/DRDs and adjudication actions, so the acquisition drives modernization industry-wide rather than resolving it one variance at a time?
NASA will consider this comment. Any changes if applicable will be reflected in the final RFP.
122. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Section V.CLDS.234, Destination control ability is required, in part, to be verified with a propulsion hot fire test with flight-like "Propulsion, avionics and structural subsystems". Does the success criteria mean a 3D flight representative geometry is needed with all design thrusters, avionics, primary and secondary structure and harness? How does the word "demonstrate" translate to success criteria for functionality and characterization for the test? Does the testing need to be performed at altitude? We recommend the Government add further details to define minimum requirements and success criteria for this test such that all Offerors will scope this work equivalently.
The evaluation of the success criteria is depending on the specific architecture. The provider is expected to propose the testing, environment, configuration(s), etc. that meet the requirement of this verification in their Verification and Validation Plan. NASA/Contractor must jointly agree on the approach as part of the approval of this Type 1 DRD.
123. In the DRFP Section J-Attachments, this document lists CLDP-PLN-1000 Commercial Low Earth Orbit Development Program Plan, but we don't see this document in the Technical Library. Does NASA expect to provide this document?
CLDP-PLN-1000 Commercial Low Earth Orbit Development Program Plan is an outdated plan and is not intended to be placed in the technical library. NASA intends to remove this reference in the final RFP.
124. In CLDP-PLN-3017, Section 6.3.1.1 (related DRD CLDC-124), "CLDP-PLN-3017_RevB (Draft)" Section 6.3.1.1 states that the Core Utilization Integration Team will be assigned to a Payload during the Early Integration Phase, but "03_CLCD_Integrated_DRD_July_2026" DRD No. CLDC-124 states that the Contractors Utilization Integration Plan begins with the "Design and Analyze" Phase. Please clarify where the Core Utilization Team is housed: is this NASA or a Contractor's Integration Team?
NASA's vision from the CLDP-PLN-3017 CLDP Utilization Integration Plan is that the Core Utilization Integration Team is a collaboration of members from NASA and CLD Providers that work together on the payload integration for mission success.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

125. In CLDP-REQ-1130, 3.6 COMMERCIAL LEO UTILIZATION, the 1130 Certification Requirements now include Utilization requirements that are also in Section 3.6. Would NASA agree to a change wherein those requirements would be captured in the CLDP-STD-1106 Revision B Utilization Capabilities Standard. And 1130 Certification Requirements will then capture the scope for (CLIN 2), while CLDP-STD-1106 Utilization Capabilities captures the scope for utilization (CLIN 3.x). Shouldn't these requirements be in CLDP-STD-1106? Need to clearly understand scope and allocation to CLINs.
Requirements in CLDP-REQ-1130 Sec 3.6 drive design of the CLD or CLDS and should be addressed early in the CLDS design to later accommodate various Utilization capabilities.
126. In CLDP-STD-1140, USE of NASA stand 7009 for simulation, while this is a required document and standard, request that tailoring be allowed to implement compliant yet more efficient commercial approaches.
NASA-STD-7009 Standard for Models and Simulations is levied as "meet the intent of", which, per section 2.0 permits the Provider to submit an Alternate Standard to tailor or replace NASA-STD-7009 Standard for Models and Simulations.
127. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Section R.CLDS.802 A, "1.3 kW of continuous power to each Visiting Vehicle, excluding any powered utilization payloads in the VV, is higher than the value for ISS (500 W specified in SSP 50808 Rev. G 3.2.2.4.1.3 A, and accepted waivers in the 700-800 W range), and higher than the needs of the Visiting Vehicle contractors we have been in contact with (around 800 W)." What is the basis of this value? Does it include margin for potential growth of future Visiting Vehicles' power need? Could the value be reduced?
The 500 W in SSP 50808 was the original ISS design goal, but it proved to be insufficient across the visiting vehicle fleet. The actual power draw required depends on the specific VV, Destination orbit, VV port geometry, and solar beta. Even if periods exist with reduced power-draw (e.g. evolving solar beta over mated-duration), the Destination EPS system needs to be sized to handle worst case loads.
128. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Section R.CLDS.248, does the US Deorbit Vehicle under development for ISS deorbit comply with the 2-FT requirement? Confirm the USDV meets 2-FT requirement for safe deorbit.
Yes, the USDV contract levied a 2-Failure Tolerant (FT) requirement for deorbit capability.
129. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Section R.CLDS.619, the Destination shall provide the capability to access nitrogen and oxygen gasses for pressurized payload utilization. Does NASA see a considerable increase in O2 utilization by payloads in the future?
NASA's future forecast of payloads is in-work.
130. In CLDP-STD-1106, "[R.BLC.099] MEDIUM-ARM CENTRIFUGE CAPABILITY", the Destination shall provide the capability to utilize an environmentally controllable centrifuge with at least a 390 mm radial arm to simulate up to 2 g artificial gravity for physical science research." The required radial arm length (390 mm) leads to a very large payload potentially (1) not compatible with a transfer through the IDSS port and (2) not compatible with CLDP- STD-1102 form factors. Please provide more information on the planned implementation and to revise the radial arm length requirement.
390 millimeter (mm) is for the diameter, not the radius. Requirement is planned to be updated.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

131. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Section R.CLDS.135, "The CVV and Destination shall provide a window on all sealable hatches for direct non-electric visual observation of the environment on the opposite side of the hatch.
Rationale: Direct visual observation of the environment on the opposite side of a hatch allows the crew to determine the conditions or obstructions, such as the presence of fire or debris, on the other side of the hatch for safety purposes. Visibility is also needed for ground crew viewing into the vehicle during pad operations and post-landing. Windows do not have the failure modes associated with cameras and display systems that may not be operable during emergencies when most needed." While the safety rationale for visual verification is clear, requiring a window on all sealable hatches restricts trade space, drives significant design complexity, and conflicts with existing flight-proven architectures (e.g., current ISS docking ports). A strict window requirement could introduce secondary structural, thermal, and micrometeoroid risks that may outweigh the camera failure risks outlined in the rationale. (1) Can NASA clarify if a localized, vehicle-level hazard and safety analysis can be used to determine where hatch windows are critical versus where redundant, isolated camera systems are acceptable? (2) Is there a specific, recent flight lesson learned that prompted this overarching requirement across all hatches? (3) Please revise the requirement to focus on the functional safety capability (e.g., "The system shall provide a means to verify conditions on the opposite side of a sealable hatch...") rather than prescribing a window as the sole solution.
- The requirement addresses NASA's ability to adequately assess conditions on the other side of the hatch without the need for other systems which could drive crew safety. NASA will evaluate provider approaches to ensure the design meets the requirements. In flight on ISS, having a hatch window has aided the crew on at least two occasions to evaluate a possible stuck hatch mechanism on the opposite side. Additionally, if berthing mechanisms are used, a hatch window can be used as a crew aid to verify ready-to-latch status if a switch has failed.
132. In CLDP-STD-1140, pages D-2 and D-3, the definitions of the various levels of Decision Consequence and Results Influence are different in CLDP-STD-1140 Rev A than in NASA-STD- 7009A. To clarify, is it correct to assume for CLDP, the definitions in CLDP-STD-1140 Rev A supersede those in NASA-STD-7009A?
- NASA-STD-7009A Standard for Models and Simulations has precedence, due to being called out in the requirement (R.CLDS.271) in the parent document CLDP-REQ-1130. Appendix D in 1140 is only called out as guidance.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

133. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Section 3.7, the document mentions that requirements in this section are derived from SSP 50808. Can NASA provide a mapping of requirements from the CLDP-REQ-1130 Rev D to the SSP 50808? This will help us determine the "Delta-Certification" needs when discussing cost/schedule with VV providers.
- SSP 50808 is a more detailed requirement set than section 3.7 of CLDP-REQ-1130. Some sections of 50808 with numerous requirements were consolidated/summarized into a single requirement in section 3.7. Section 3.7 is a summarized set of requirements of key constraints and lessons learned from ISS visiting vehicle experience. Below is a high level mapping, however, the offerors are required to meet CLDP-REQ-1130:

SSP 50808	CLDP-REQ-1130
SSP 50808 3.2.2.6.4.1.D	R.CLDS.787
SSP 50808 3.2.2.6.4.5.1, SSP 50808 3.2.2.6.4.5.1 SSP 50808 SSP 3.2.2.6.4.5.2	R.CLDS.788
SSP 50808 3.3.10.1	R.CLDS.791
SSP 50808 3.2.2.1.4	R.CLDS.792
SSP 50808 3.2.1.7.2	R.CLDS.794
SSP 50808 3.2.2.6.4.1.C	R.CLDS.815
SSP 50808 3.2.2.6.1.3.1	R.CLDS.814
SSP 50540	R.CLDS.795
SSP 50808 3.3.9.10.1	R.CLDS.796
SSP 50808 3.3.3.2.18	R.CLDS.797:
SSP 50808 3.3.3.2.18	R.CLDS.798
SSP 50808 3.3.3.2.18	R.CLDS.799
SSP 50808 3.3.3.2.18	R.CLDS.800
SSP 50808 3.2.1.4.1 and 3.2.2.4.1.3 A-D	R.CLDS.802
SSP 50808 3.2.1.4.1.1.2	R.CLDS.803
SSP 50808 3.2.1.4.1.5	R.CLDS.804
SSP 50808 3.2.1.1.2.1.A	R.CLDS.805
SSP 50808 3.2.1.1.2.1.B	R.CLDS.806
SSP 80808 3.2.2.2.5.4	R.CLDS.807
SSP 50808 3.2.1.3.3.1	R.CLDS.808
SSP 50808 3.2.1.3.3.3	R.CLDS.810
SSP 50808 3.2.1.3.4, 3.2.1.3.4.1.3, 3.2.2.3.4.1.3	R.CLDS.811
SSP 50808 3.2.1.5.1.1	R.CLDS.812
SSP 50808 3.2.1.5.1.2	R.CLDS.813

134. In CLDP-PLN-3017, statements in various sections (1.1, 1.2, 4.0) appear to conflict with respect to the expectations and scope of NASA's CLDP Utilization Integration process. Does NASA expect that the CLD provider will run all CLD utilization through this process, or only NASA-sponsored utilization?
- NASA expects the CLD Provider to propose their own utilization integration plan via CLDC-124 UIP (CLDP-PLN-3017 CLDP UIP is a reference only) which should encompass how the CLD Provider expects to integrate NASA utilization but also include how they intend to work with NASA on CLD Provider utilization that requires NASA resources (crew or payload/facility).

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

135. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Section R.CLDS.537, please clarify which CLD station rules and provisions apply to payloads operating in "Extend-the-Lab" or "Attached Cargo Services" mode. Where payloads don't enter the station proper, using this capability for more flexible operations could create additional revenue opportunities. **Extend-the-Lab (utilizing an attached Visiting Vehicle to operate powered payloads during mated operations instead of putting the VV into quiescent) has been used on ISS and could be considered if it meets all the safety requirements and payload mission objectives agreed to for that increment.**
136. In CLDP-REQ-1130, Section R.CLDS.537, please clarify if there are any specific quantities of cargo services that must always be maintained in "Extend-the-Lab" or "Attached Cargo Services" mode. While docked to the station, a visiting vehicle may be operating with reduced power, thermal, and/or data provisions unless provided by the station due to shading, station attitude, inclination or other constraints. Without further clarification, we understand this term to mean "must be able to be offered" and that specific quantities will be specified on a per-task order basis.
Yes, specific quantities would be negotiated on a task order basis.
137. CLDP-STD-1123 §3.2 and CLDP-PLN-3017 §4(g) reference a 'Trusted Provider Approach' and 'criteria for Trusted Provider' described in CLDP-PLN-3016; however, CLDP-PLN-3016 Rev A (Draft) does not contain this term or any associated criteria. Please identify where the Trusted Provider Approach and its attainment criteria are defined, or confirm they will be added to CLDP-PLN-3016 in the final RFP release.
Trusted Provider Approach was an early concept NASA considered for helping to streamline long term collaboration. NASA is no longer pursuing this approach, therefore, references to Trusted Provider Approach have been removed. Instead, NASA plans to enable coordination with providers to develop unique tailored approaches for long term collaboration.
138. In CLDP-STD-1106, Appendix D, several CLDP-REQ-1130 Appendix D optional facility requirements — including open-air plant habitats, centrifuges with temperature/CO2 control and video, and incubation capabilities — specify performance beyond capabilities currently demonstrated on ISS, in some cases requiring significant new hardware development. Recommend NASA distinguish, within Appendix D, between (1) baseline capabilities aligned with current or flight-certified ISS hardware, which offerors can commit to with known risk; and (2) capabilities requiring new development or COTS modification, which should be expressed as stretch goals with specific rationale to inform hardware design, or made orderable as priced additional services (CLIN 4). Where a requirement exceeds demonstrated capability, recommend NASA provide the supporting rationale and measurement intent so offerors can design to the need rather than to an unvalidated point specification. This lets offerors commit to the achievable baseline at firm pricing while giving NASA a defined path to advanced capabilities.
The items in Appendix D are defined as optional services. NASA will assess how to utilize what is offered.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers

Posted August 14, 2026

139. In CLDP-STD-1140, 5.1.1.1 NASA-STD-7009, STANDARD FOR MODELS AND SIMULATIONS, Key Processes, 5th Bullet states, "NASA will audit selected M&S to agree with evaluation scoring, pedigree, credibility with validation and limited or operational use for critical decision making." Recommendation: Provide additional clarity on Audit, review, and adjudication process. As phased, audit process is open ended and unbounded which could result in delays in process. Recommend adding, clarity of audit ownership, clarity of audit timeline, audit decision and impact process, and appeal and adjudication process. As written, NASA audit authority may be too severe, clarity will enable faster contractor implementation and execution.
NASA's audit strategy will be guided by risk-informed assessment of the specific software architecture, criticality of specific models and simulations, development and maintenance plans, and other relevant factors.
140. In CLDP-PLN-1122, Section 8.2, mission data is requested in 5 min intervals. Please provide additional context on whether the request is for data averaged over 5 min or a snapshot of the data at the min mark.
The intent is for CLDP-PLN-1122 CLDP Program Science Data Management Plan to mean 'snapshot of the data'. DRD CLDC-126 Science Data Management Plan will be updated to call out CLDP-PLN-1122 Program Science Data Management Plan as a reference only, therefore the CLD Provider may propose in their Science Data Management Plan their proposed intervals.
141. Does NASA require the CaVV vehicle to have a two fault tolerant propulsion system for the CaVV de-orbit phase of its mission? Or is the de-orbit two fault tolerance requirement across all mission phases refer to the destination needing to maintain this fault tolerance?
The 2FT to deorbit requirement is to ensure that the CLD maintains a two failure tolerant capability to perform a safe deorbit. The CaVV is required to have FAA licensing for its own deorbit. This requirement only applies to the CaVV if it is used as part of the CLD deorbit capability.

CLIN Structure/Workplan

142. In SOW Section 2.10.6, adjudication of alternate standards is expected to be complete by IPR. What NASA Control Board cadence and throughput should offerors assume when planning the volume of tailoring packages within the CLIN 1 period (CDR NLT CA+12 months; IPR NLT CA+15 months)?
The NASA Control Board currently meets weekly to discuss relevant topics. This cadence can be increased as needed to meet the demand of topics.

Sections L&M Mission Suitability

143. In the DRFP, Table L.17.1-1, the Table calls out "DRD-CLDC-115.1 Safety & Mission Assurance Plan..." The DRFP does not seem to have a DRD-CLDC-115.1. Should the table have called out "DRD-CLDC-115?"
No. The whole DRD CLDC-115 Safety & Mission Assurance (S&MA) Plan is not being required to be delivered as part of the proposal. DRD CLDC-115.1 Destination S&MA Plan is a subsection within DRD CLDC-115 Mission S&MA Plan called the Destination S&MA Plan. Only Sections 1-4 of DRD CLDC-115.1 Destination S&MA Plan are due with the Proposal.

Proposal Instructions

144. In the DRFP, JSC 52.215-113, states that "Text in diagrams, charts, tables, artwork and photographs shall be no smaller than 12-point text size. Diagrams, charts, tables, artwork and photographs shall not be used to circumvent the text size limitation of the proposal". Will NASA consider changing this requirement to 10-point as long as it is not simply being used to circumvent the size limitation. There are times when the meaning of a diagram/graphic can be lost if appropriate labels do not fit.

NASA does not plan to update the proposal formatting instructions for the Final RFP.

145. To ensure compatibility with the Government work stations, please confirm the submitted Excel files may be submitted in MS Office 365 formats.

As outlined in DRFP L.5 JSC 52.215-113 PROPOSAL FORMATTING INSTRUCTIONS paragraph (b)(2) "The electronic proposal shall be prepared and submitted in Microsoft Office applications (Word and Excel). Further, the Microsoft Excel spreadsheets shall be submitted in Microsoft Excel format, not in a scanned Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF file. Microsoft Word documents shall be submitted in Microsoft Word format, not in an Adobe PDF file."

Past Performance

146. In the DRFP, Section L.17.4(c), "... from the date of the original CLDC solicitation will be considered in the past performance evaluation." Will it be correct to assume the date of the "original CLDC solicitation" will be the date of this upcoming final RFP?

Yes, in the DRFP Section M.5 JSC 52.215-115 PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR (VOLUME III) (JUL 2022) paragraph (d)(1) the date of the original CLDC solicitation will be the date of the Final RFP issuance.

U.S. Vehicle Restrictions

147. Under Section H Clause, UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL PROVIDER AND DOMESTIC SOURCE CRITERIA, the special clause states: "A launch vehicle will qualify as a domestic end product only if the cost of its components mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States must exceed fifty (50) percent of the cost of all of its components. The cost of each component includes transportation costs to the place of incorporation into the launch vehicle and any applicable duty (whether or not a duty-free entry certificate is issued)." May the contractor propose to launch a NASA payload using a non-U.S. transportation vehicle if such an approach would improve the business viability or mission viability of the Contractor's service offering. The ISS program has established a precedent for this by processing a waiver when utilizing HTV to bring cargo to the ISS.

NASA plans to clarify this information in the Final RFP. Offeror's proposals must comply with applicable US laws and regulations and cannot assume an exception or exemption will be granted. NASA is considering allowing Offerors to propose alternative approaches; however, NASA is still evaluating how Alternate proposal information will be used. This will be clarified in the Final RFP.

148. Under Section H Clause, UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL PROVIDER AND DOMESTIC SOURCE CRITERIA, in the event that a space transportation services (crew, cargo or both) are not available domestically to meet the needs of ISS EOL and CLD Demo, will NASA consider a waiver of this clause until such a time that a US domestic source is qualified and certified?

If there are no US crew and cargo transportation service capabilities available domestically, NASA would consider an exception for CLDC. However, currently there are US owned vehicles that can fulfill the end to end service requirements.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

149. Under Section H Clause, UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL PROVIDER AND DOMESTIC SOURCE CRITERIA, the government restriction on flying US payloads on non-US cargo transport services limits the opportunities for international involvement. What is NASA planning to provide in terms of a waiver process and associated assistance to open such opportunity
See NASA response to Question 145.
150. Under the DRFP Attachment J-15, does the Government still intend to offer Government-Furnished Crew and Cargo Transportation Services? If so, over what period? What is the assumed price applied to TEP if a bidder requests these Government Crew and Cargo Transportation Services?
NASA is evaluating industry comments in this area and will provide clarification in the Final RFP.
151. Under Section H Clause, UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL PROVIDER AND DOMESTIC SOURCE CRITERIA, we recommend allowing NASA to consider waivers on a case-by-case basis when the use of a non-U.S. transportation vehicle would improve the business viability or mission viability of a CLD provider's service offering.
See NASA response to Question 145.
152. Under Section H Clause, UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL PROVIDER AND DOMESTIC SOURCE CRITERIA, from the perspective of supporting the LEO activities of NASA and CLD providers and promoting international cooperation, subject to a waiver of the 2013 Space Transportation Policy and 51 U.S.C. 30703, would it be possible for non-US countries to provide cargo resupply services and transport payloads for NASA and CLD providers?
See NASA response to Question 145.
153. Section H, United States Commercial Provider and Domestic Source Criteria; L.17.5(d) Certification, restricts NASA's ability to take advantage of commercial market for payload deliveries. The statute contains references to the Space Shuttle. Ask: Please clarify the definition of "space transportation services". Does this refer to launch vehicles? Crew delivery vehicles? Cargo delivery vehicles? All? This clarification is important for a commercial station services provider as over time non-US transportation providers may be certified, creating opportunities for greater throughput and price competition.
Space Transportation Services includes both crew and cargo transportation services as well as launch services. Launch services include crew, cargo and CLD module launch services. See also NASA response to Question 145.
154. Under Section H Clause, NFS 1852.228-78, the RFP section on cross-waivers states "For avoidance of doubt, for this contract, crew and cargo transportation vehicles are considered Launch Vehicles." For the purposes of domestic end product calculations, we believe CLDs will be purchasing an end-to-end transportation service, not a crew or cargo vehicle itself. Recommend: Explicitly stating that Domestic Source Criteria applies to the full transportation service, including rocket plus crew/cargo transportation vehicle.
NASA plans to update the final RFP to clarify that the definitions in NFS 1852.228-78 only apply to that clause unless specifically cross-referenced elsewhere in terms of cross waivers. Domestic Source Criteria are covered in Section H Clause UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL PROVIDER AND DOMESTIC SOURCE CRITERIA.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

155. Under Section H Clause, UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL PROVIDER AND DOMESTIC SOURCE CRITERIA, the RFP states "the Contractor shall...comply with 51 U.S.C. §50131 in performance of this contract by acquiring space transportation services from United States commercial providers." This requirement should be clarified to apply only to missions wherein the US Government is paying for a majority of the mission. Waiver processes should also be explicitly considered for cases wherein timely or more affordable access may be available through other commercial alternatives. Recommend rewording this and all related RFP requirements to state ""the Contractor shall...comply with 51 U.S.C. §50131 in performance of this contract by acquiring space transportation services from United States commercial providers for any manifest in which the US Government is paying for the majority of the mission service."
- By law, this requirement applies to missions that support NASA requirements regardless if NASA is not paying for a majority of the mission. See also NASA response to Question 145.
156. Under the DRFP Attachment J-15, current descriptions of GFTSS appear as though they could drive competition between government-to-government (G2G) negotiations and business-to-government (B2G) negotiations for the same services. Please clarify: Under what conditions is direct B2G negotiation (CLD-to-International Partner) for transportation allowed? Under what conditions is it precluded?
- NASA has not provided any restrictions on business-to-government (B2G) relationships; however, compliance with US law is still required which may constrain negotiations between the Provider and a foreign government. See also NASA response to Question 145.
157. Under Section H Clause, UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL PROVIDER AND DOMESTIC SOURCE CRITERIA, paragraph (a) requires the Contractor to comply with 51 U.S.C. §50131 "in performance of this contract by acquiring space transportation services from United States commercial providers," without defining scope. Clarify whether this applies to all launches — crew, cargo, and CLDS element launches — or only to transportation acquired for NASA- procured services. Paragraph (b) of the same clause is properly scoped to U.S.-manufactured vehicles "to launch a NASA payload"; CLDS elements are Contractor-owned property, not NASA payloads, and 51 U.S.C. §50131 governs Federal Government acquisition of space transportation. As written, paragraph (a) could preclude the Contractor from launching its own elements on internationally operated vehicles, including under sovereign customer barter arrangements, limiting commercial viability without a statutory basis. Recommend paragraph (a) be scoped to space transportation services acquired for the performance of NASA-procured missions and NASA payloads, consistent with paragraph (b), with the Contractor's element launches and non-NASA commercial activity outside the restriction.
- NASA plans to update the final RFP to clarify the application for crew, cargo and element launches. Commercial crew or cargo mission not including USG crew or USG payloads are not within the scope of this contract and are not envisioned to be covered by this requirement. See also NASA response to Question 145.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

158. Under Section H Clause, UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL PROVIDER AND DOMESTIC SOURCE CRITERIA, sovereign customers commonly condition purchases of space services on industrial participation arrangements that place work or content in their domestic industry. Two clarifications are recommended: (1) Domestic source: paragraph (b)'s 50-percent domestic component test applies by its terms to launch vehicles used "to launch a NASA payload"; recommend NASA confirm that foreign content resulting from industrial participation arrangements in the Contractor's non-NASA commercial and sovereign business including element launches and services outside NASA-procured missions — does not implicate this clause (consistent with the separate comment scoping paragraph (a) to NASA-procured services). (2) Pricing interaction: recommend NASA confirm, in conjunction with the American Taxpayer Protections clause, that industrial participation and offset arrangements required by sovereign customers constitute "objectively supported differences" for purposes of the uniform-pricing and most-favored-customer provisions — such that offset value, in- country work commitments, and associated price structures in sovereign agreements are not treated as discounts, credits, or barter values establishing a price NASA may claim. Absent this confirmation, the clauses jointly deter the sovereign customer segment the CLD Program depends on for demand.
- 1) Offeror's proposals must comply with applicable US laws and regulations and cannot assume an exception or exemption will be granted. NASA is considering allowing Offerors to propose alternative approaches; however, NASA is still evaluating how Alternate proposal information will be used. This will be clarified in the Final RFP.
- 2) NASA plans to update the final RFP to clarify the application of the American Taxpayer clause in reference to applicability to foreign barter and agreements.

GFTSS and other Transportation Questions

159. A leading CVV provider has expressed that they do not plan to support LEO/CLD post 2028 in favor of their other space exploration products/services. Does NASA plan to use current CVV provider(s), qualify new U.S. launch and CVV providers for post-2028 if it provides GFTSS?
- NASA plans to clarify this information in the Final RFP. If NASA provides Government Furnished Transportation and Support Service (GFTSS), NASA plans to utilize CVV Providers certified on ISS for initial missions but may certify additional vehicles in the future as they are identified and available.
160. Under the DRFP Attachment J-15, if NASA will be providing an offset to the resupply transportation services, what are the particulars of the offset and what is the anticipated start and completion of these subsidies? These will greatly improve the business case for the commercial providers.
- To clarify, NASA is not offering GFTSS at "no cost". NASA plans to clarify this information in the Final RFP.
161. Under DRFP Section L.17.1-1, given that proposed end-to-end service offerings may involve transportation system development effort, will the Government please consider adding 20 pages to the Volume II page limit to allow adequate attention to this subject in addition to CLD development?"
- NASA has re-evaluated this approach and no longer anticipates requiring proposals to include NEW transportation vehicle certification costs in the CLIN 2 pricing but instead plans to request high level data about the certification and development approach including costs to be provided in Letters of Commitment. NASA plans to update the RFP to provide clarity and how this will or will not be used for evaluation.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

162. Under the DRFP Attachment J-15, NASA needs to Finalize the Government Furnished Transportation and Support Services (GFTSS) Strategy. NASA should clearly state in the Final RFP whether GFTSS is a temporary transition capability, an optional long-term acquisition strategy, or an exception granted only under specific circumstances. The current DRFP asks industry to propose GFTSS alternatives and identify when they would transition to full end-to-end commercial services, but it does not define NASA's intended long-term strategy or the approval criteria. This uncertainty affects provider architecture, transportation partnerships, pricing, certification responsibilities, risk allocation, and long-term business planning. Ask: NASA to price out options for industry to consider for both crew and cargo.
- NASA is considering updates and clarity in the Final RFP based on industry's comments.
163. Attachment J-15 notes: "The Government may decide to provide Government Furnished Transportation and Support Services (GFTSS) to the Contractor NASA may choose to fulfill this obligation by on-ramping new certified vehicles and/or utilizing International Partner provided vehicles for transportation missions." Please clarify: Under what conditions does NASA envision electing to provide such support?
- If NASA provides GFTSS, NASA may choose to procure services from US transportation providers or may have opportunity to utilize vehicles bartered with other governments. NASA reserves the right to determine the vehicle to be utilized for GFTSS.
164. Under SOW Sections 2.15 – 2.17, other than the accountability for overall mission success, we believe many of the responsibilities outlined in this section may be shared between the Contractor and their Transportation provider(s). Please clarify whether throughout the document it can be understood that NASA accepts such shared responsibilities, rather than requiring the CLD Accountable party to conduct the work themselves? (For example "The Contractor shall perform the payload integration and de-integration with the Visiting Vehicle." Performance of integration services by a CaVV provider and launch vehicle provider should be acceptable.)
- Attachment J-15 Government Furnished Transportation and Support Services outlines the responsibilities between NASA and the CLD Provider under GFTSS. NASA understands many of the items outlined in J-15 Government Furnished Transportation and Support Services may be executed and provided by the contracted crew or cargo transportation service provider.
165. Under Section H Clause, NASA PRIORITY, "The Contractor shall prioritize NASA requirements with respect to non-NASA customer mission objectives when planning and re-planning operations for performance under this contract and subsequent Task Orders." This term is antithetical to a commercial business and commercial partnerships, unless NASA is willing to pay a high premium for such a privilege. Recommendation: NASA should remove this term or limit it to much more narrow interpretation, e.g., "shall prioritize NASA requirements when NASA is the earliest customer or highest paying customer for a given service on a given mission increment."
- NASA plans to remove this Clause and provide clarity in the Final RFP. It is not NASA's desire to be provided the priority at all times but NASA does require participation in decision making for operational changes that impact NASA mission objectives.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

166. SOW 2.17.1 requires certification of transportation systems without distinguishing previously NASA-certified heritage vehicles, implying full recertification, re-adjudication of each design and construction standard against updated revisions, and full safety review for flight-proven systems. NASA has already established a heritage pathway in CLDP-REQ-1130 Section 3.7 to minimize design changes and delta-certifications of previously certified visiting vehicles with respect to Destination compatibility; no comparable pathway exists for the heritage vehicle's own certification when Contractor-procured. Recommend SOW 2.17.1 reference a heritage delta-certification pathway applicable regardless of acquisition path, with re-verification scoped to destination-driven changes. (See related comment on CLDP- PLN-2000 Section 6 heritage transportation certification.)
NASA will clarify intent for Final RFP. Section 2.17.1 Transportation Certification was not intended to supersede certification approach outlined in CLDP-REQ-1130 Section 3.7.
167. How is NASA planning to structure its cargo acquisition strategy to ensure missions are supported by multiple proven cargo providers—including existing CRS providers like Northrop Grumman and SpaceX—rather than relying on a single vendor for CLD logistics?
NASA is still evaluating all options in providing GFTSS including use of current heritage visiting vehicles and the potential to on ramp new visiting vehicles to ensure transportation stability and competition.
168. Docking or berthing preference is not stated by NASA anywhere in the draft RFP material. Is there a preferred attachment method for transportation visiting vehicles?
NASA is requiring all CLDs to support docking ports and meet requirements of CLDP-STD-1101 CLDP Common Docking System Standard. NASA is not requiring CLDs to support berthing as NASA has no desire to drive robotic operations if CLD architectures do not require it.
However, as part of GFTSS, if CLD designs support berthing and docking capabilities, NASA will provide appropriate docking and berthing visiting vehicles.
169. In SOW Section 2.17, Transportation, "The Contractor shall be capable of accommodating at least one (1) NASA certified commercial crew transportation service provider and one (1) cargo transportation services provider". Ask: Please confirm that NASA will not impose a preferred type of vehicle (e.g. berthing or docking).
See NASA response to Question 166.
170. The Authorization to Proceed (ATP) timeline for an ordered mission (increment) is L-24 months. This would require transportation providers to have a capability to provide a transportation mission launch inside of 24 months after an order from a CLD. Alternatively, this would require a CLD to order a transportation mission earlier than L-24 months at risk. It is recommended that the NASA ATP timeline for CLD mission ordering be at L-30 months.
Offeror's may propose tailoring of work plans based on commercial processes and subcontractor needs.

CLDC Draft RFP Final Industry Questions and Answers
Posted August 14, 2026

171. From Pre-proposal Conference Q&A #19 states NASA "is still evaluating the continuation of Destination CCSC2 Unfunded Space Act Agreements that expire in 2028 post CLDC award." Please clarify the following:
- (1) existing CCSC-2 agreements and executed TIPs continue per their terms through expiration, regardless of an offeror's CLDC award status;
 - (2) whether new TIPs remain executable under those agreements after CLDC award, or whether equivalent support must transition to contract mechanisms (e.g., GTAs per Attachment J-14) — and if so, the transition approach that avoids interruption of in-execution support and addresses the cost difference between no-exchange-of-funds TIPs and priced GTAs; and
 - (3) that continuation of SAA support neither conditions nor is conditioned by CLDC participation.

For Unfunded SAAs associated with developing a Destination:

- If an Unfunded SAA partner is awarded a CLDC contract, work associated with the Unfunded SAAs will transition to the new contract and the Unfunded SAA will be cancelled. NASA will honor agreements associated with GFE/GFS that have already been formalized under a TIP within the new contract.
 - If an Unfunded SAA partner is not awarded a CLDC contract, NASA will honor agreements associated GFE/GFS that have already been formalized under a TIP but future commitment are not guaranteed. NASA will determine whether a new work will be continued based on future discussion with the SAA partner.
- For Unfunded SAAs NOT associated specifically with developing a Destination which would include LEO transportation development:
- At this time, NASA plans to continue these SAAs to nominal expiration.

(End of Document)