



TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-CORPUS CHRISTI
PURCHASING DEPARTMENT 6300 OCEAN DRIVE
CORPUS CHRISTI, TX 78412

RFP Number:

RFP4-0003

PSU-Provider of Services for UAS

Addendum # 1

The University has received the following questions from vendors. The corresponding department has provided answers for the questions provided within the allocated time to respond. The questions and answers should be considered incorporated as part of this Request for Proposals. Please see below:

RFP Date Extension: Request for Proposal RFP4-0003 has extended the due date for Tuesday, May 14, 2024 by 2:00 PM CST.

1. Section II, p3.6(c)(11), page 10 The highlighted paragraph reads as follows:
Negotiates airport access through the airport's sponsor.
Can you please elaborate on this PSU function? Is this intended to capture vertiport requests/approvals by a vertiport manager? Or, engagement with legacy airports? If the latter, can you specify who an "airport sponsor" would be in this context?

Answer: LSUASC is the Airport Sponsor; no coordination will take place directly with the airport (or future Vertiport) by the PSU. All such coordination will be directly with the LSUASC proponent for a given activity.

2. Section II, p3.6(c)(11), page 10 The highlighted paragraph contains the following as a sub-bullet:
Respondents Qualifications and Availability to Undertake the Project:
Can you confirm this is not related to p3.6(c)(11)? Is this perhaps more a reference to CRITERIA FOUR in section 3.7?

Answer: Yes: Amendment to follow.

3. Section II, p2.4, page 7 How is a "Flight Campaign" defined for the purposes of this performance tracking. Is it a series of flights for a given day (e.g., a shakedown or demo day)? Or does it encapsulate an entire initiative (e.g., the entire shakedown or demo events (multi-day))? Other?

Answer: Flight Campaign is defined as a deployed Flight Operation that may range from a single UAS to multiple UAS across multiple days, typically ranging from 3-10. Special or exigent circumstances, for example: public operations supporting emergency response operations, may be an occasion for a Flight Campaign may

exceed 10 days.

4. Section II, p2.4(b), page 7 The highlighted paragraph contains the following:
In excess of one (2) instances
Is it 1 or 2 instances for this performance requirement?

Answer; 2 Instances is the correct performance requirement.

5. Section II, p2.4(b), page 7 The highlighted paragraph contains the following:
In excess of two (2) instances within one (1) flight campaign of which response time exceeds the five (5) minutes.
Can you specify what the "response time" is referring to? Is it the response time of a service to an API call? Is it the response of ANRA technical/project support? Other?

Answer: Response time to address and FIX the noted PSU issue.

6. Section II, p2.4(b), page 7 The highlighted paragraph contains the following:
...IAW the LSUASC Safety Management System
Can you share the LSUASC SMS documentation for review or otherwise elaborate on any requirements surrounding it?

Answer: No. Assume the LSUASC SMS is an FAA approved SMS utilizing FAA approved best practices for complex UAS operations. Complex operations for the purposes of this explanation are defined as 1 to many >55lb UAS flying >400' AGL BVLOS possibly both day and night. Such operations may also take place outside of the State of Texas and possibly within ICAO airspace jurisdiction.

7. In section 3, 3.5 lists Criteria One and 3.6 lists Criteria Three. What are criteria Two?

Answer: Amendment to follow. 3 = 2.

8. Is the university providing the drone surveillance system or looking for the PSU to provide it?

Answer: LSUASC will provide and operate.

9. For question "11.Negotiates airport access through the airport's sponsor" can you clarify whether you are looking for a PSU to engage stakeholders or facilitate a manual process similar to LAANC?

Answer: No. All coordination actions will be through the LSUASC proponent.

10. Can you clarify the requirements of the final submission form? What do you mean by 7 electronic copies? "along with one (1) original and 7 electronic, USB, copies of the Proposal. Proposal pages should be numbered and contain an organized, paginated table of contents corresponding to the section and pages of the Proposal."

Answer: (1) original hard copy and 7 USB drives containing electronic copies of the Proposal.”

11. In preparing to answer the pricing for the scenarios, the costs required to facilitate the scenarios will be allocated over a period of time and can be considered under labor, other direct costs, and travel. However, these costs are not specific for a 5 day flight campaign. How much of the project milestone completion would you like to see priced out in one scenario? Each scenarios requires software development, implementation, maintenance, and training prior to the flight campaign.

Answer: Include all costs to execute a Flight Campaign to include Pre (Planning), During (Flight Campaign Execution), and Post (any AAR input that may be requested).

12. Section 1.5 – If we are not proposing the use of subcontractors do we need to have an HSP.

Answer: Yes, the vendor will be “self-performing” and using #4 on Quick Checklist of the HSP. For further instruction or question you may contact Ruben Gonzalez, HUB Coordinator, 361-825-5822, ruben.gonzalez@tamucc.edu

13. Sect 3.6 © - Please advise the expected response to this section. We have not worked on projects that cover all of the items listed, but we are an authorized USS for providing LAANC services which covers some of the items listed. In addition we have a flight planning system used by domestic US airlines: <https://ettaviation.com/air-operations-suite/skedflex-flight-planning/>

Answer: RFP is sufficient to formulate your response. Provide your best Past Performance and cite all with emphasis on most recent and most complex.

14. I would like to get some clarity around expectations for the scenarios in 6.1. Reading Conops 2.0 the scenarios in 6.1 are not considered.

Answer: The RFP is sufficient to formulate your response.

15. I would be pleased to have a call if that could be arranged to better understand this as Section 2.2 (b) appears to be extracted from Conops 2.0

Answer: The RFP is sufficient.

16. Does TAMU-CC have an existing USS/UTM Ecosystem (DSS/FIMS/Weather SDSP providers) that the PSU provider must be integrated into as part of the offering?

Answer: Not at this time, but it could be a future task.

17. Does TMAU-CC provide Discovery and Synchronization Service (DSS) software for the ecosystem or is it to be required to be included as part of PSU offering?

Answer: The LSUASC provides an Airspace Safety Management Tool and the selected PSU providers will be provided with the Interface Control Document prior to award the Kickoff meeting. The ability to create and

host a DSS would be required to be included as part of PSU offering.

18. Does TMAU-CC provide FIMS token authentication software for the ecosystem or is it to be required to be included as part of PSU offering?

Answer: Include in your PSU offering.

19. Does TMAU-CC provide Demand-Capacity Balance (DCB) software for the ecosystem or is it to be required to be included as part of PSU offering?

Answer: Include in your PSU offering.

Is the Airspace Definition for the volume of airspace defined and available in ASDS Complaint format? If not, should this be considered as part of PSU offering?

Answer: Include in your PSU offering.

20. "Archiving of operations in historical databases." Is there a specific database and format that TAMU-CC wants this data to be archived?

Answer: Yes, will be provided during the Award Kickoff Meeting. Not at this time. This is something to discuss and integrate with LSUASC as to how we can pull the data from their database or whether they need to integrate with our database.

21. How many instances of PSUs are required to be included as part of PSU offering? If more than one PSU is expected to be part of the TAMU-CC ecosystem, will they be from the same PSU provider?

Answer: The LSUASC may award multiple PSU provider contracts and subject to emerging and on-going LSUASC missions, may elect to deploy multiple PSU providers during a given operation. Any integration between multiple PSU providers selected will be based on specific SOWs provided to the PSU.

22. What are the travel requirements, duration of travel for any on-site activities by the PSU personnel?

Answer: Travel will be subject to various missions and flight campaigns and will be approved in advance and will comply with the State of Texas Per Diem requirements.

23. Removing the requirement contained in Paragraph 3.6 C. We can describe how our system will meet these requirements but will not be qualified if past performance in all areas is required.
Rationale- PSUs are relatively new systems within the Advanced Aviation Mobility Ecosystem and therefore there have been few opportunities to provide the requested services to many customers.

Answer: Will not remove para 3.6.C. Provide your best response given your extant Past Performance.

24. Removing TAMU-CC from paragraph 3.7 C.

Rationale- Many PSUs have not had the opportunity to work with TAMU-CC.

Answer: Will not remove TAMU-CC from 3.7.C. Provide the best “relevant and similar” past performance you’re able to cite.

25. Providing the number of flight hours expected weekly throughout the performance period. Please include days of week and hours of operations. Rationale- This information will be used to calculate labor hours and cost estimating.

Answer: For this requirement assume the following for pricing: 5 Day Flight Campaign, with Day 1 and Day 5 being set aside for travel during a given flight campaign week. Assume NTE 7 hours of flight operations on Days, 2, 3 and 4.

26. Providing requirements for onsite support and offsite support
Rationale- This information will be used to calculate labor hours and cost estimating.

Answer: Utilizing the 5-day flight campaign what is the cost for on-site support and off-site support with an understanding that off-site support will be required even if on-site is not.

27. Extending the submission deadline 30 days. Rationale- we believe the additional time will give us a chance to establish teaming arrangements and submit a high-quality proposal.

Answer: The response due date has been moved May 14, 2024, because of the delay in issuing the addendum. Any teaming arrangements they want to make with us will be an effort to modify the way that we look at their proposal. Any teaming arrangements made with other organizations will be moot. We would build our teams based on what we need for individual projects as this is designed to give us a “bench” of PSUs to work with. We will decide for each contract who the best fit is and issue a Task Order from there.

28. WRT pricing: - Should our RFP response for this be FFP or T&M bid? Do you have a preference?

Answer: T&M would be what I expect. We have to build a WBS based on what we think it would take to get the work done anyway. We’re going to provide that information to them so T&M makes the most sense.

29. There is a question around systems mentioned in section 6 that we would integrate with, and would that support fall under the FFP or T&M pricing? We may learn of new integration after we start and T&M would offer flexibility.

Answer: Same answer as 29.

30. Should pricing of system and support be around a long term agreement or times of activity around events, like FAA or NASA funded efforts? We’d need to understand the number and duration of those events to estimate this type of pricing, which could be more beneficial.

Answer: No further pricing guidance to provide; include your assumptions based on the information provided.

This document and attachments shall be attached to and become a part of the contract documents for this project. This addendum shall be signed for acknowledgement that you have received Addendum #1 and shall be returned with your proposal.

COMPANY NAME: _____

STREET ADDRESS: _____

CITY/STATE: _____

TELEPHONE AND FAX: _____

SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____