REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

Generation 4: Number 3
RFP No. N66617C

RFP Main Document (Gen4#3-01)

ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES FOR RESEARCH IN ASTRONOMY, INC. (AURA)
Operating the
Gemini Observatory
Hilo, Hawaii and Cerro Pachón, Chile

RFP Schedule

RFP Issued: May 5, 2016

Proposals Due: August 29, 2016
15:00 US Mountain Standard Time

Prepared by:
Karen Godzyk
AURA Contracts Officer
950 N. Cherry Avenue
Tucson, AZ 85719

1. Introduction

a) The Gemini Observatory operates two 8-meter telescopes. The northern observatory is located at the summit of Maunakea in Hawaii, USA (Gemini North); the southern observatory is located at the summit of Cerro Pachón, Chile (Gemini South). The Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc. (AURA) is the managing organization of the Gemini Observatory under a cooperative agreement with the National Science Foundation (NSF) for the benefit of the Gemini partnership nations: The United States of America, Canada, Argentina, Chile, and Brazil. For the purposes of this RFP, AURA and Gemini are used interchangeably.

b) Gemini provides facility-class instruments that achieve excellent spatial and spectral resolving power across the spectrum from optical to near-infrared wavelengths. Gemini also maintains world leadership in the adaptive optics support of the scientific instruments. For more information on the observatory, visit the Gemini Observatory website at www.gemini.edu; for more information on Gemini's current instrumentation visit: www.gemini.edu/sciops/instruments

c) AURA is soliciting proposals to design, fabricate, assemble, test, deliver, and commission the next facility class instrument, Gen 4#3. Gen 4#3 will be a wide-band medium-resolution spectrograph designed to take advantage of the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope (LSST) follow up opportunities.

d) Gen 4#3 will be a highly schedule driven project. The instrument must be commissioned by December 31, 2022, to coincide with the planned start of LSST operations.

e) Funds to support the Gen 4#3 project are made available through the Instrument Development Fund (IDF) as defined in the Gemini International Agreement.

f) Gemini has a maximum available budget of USD 15,000,000 for a Gen 4#3 contract. This amount must cover direct and indirect costs. The selected contractor shall complete Gen 4#3 based on its submitted proposal for a price to AURA/Gemini not to exceed USD 15,000,000.

g) Any work paid from the IDF should be mindful of the baseline IDF contributions of the partner countries. These baseline contributions are:

US	69.8%
Canada	19.9%
Brazil	7.0%
Argentina	3.3%

h) The RFP is open worldwide and not restricted to the Gemini community. The Gen 4#3 contract can be awarded to profit or non-profit organizations or companies.

i) All proposals must be submitted in USD and include the provided budget form (See Proposal Form Gen4#3.02).

j) Gemini encourages collaborations and will provide a forum for those seeking additional partners to complete a team for this work. Groups interested in Gen 4#3 who may lack the expertise needed to complete the work should still submit a notice of intent and use our forum to find additional partners for the work.

k) Gemini will consider providing the selected team or National Gemini Office (NGO) of the selected team with telescope time in exchange for a reduction in the cash cost to AURA. These options would be considered during contract negotiations.

l) Gemini will award up to 12 nights of telescope time to the successful team for effectively managing stage budgets and schedule targets.

m) At the end of the Build Phase, the successful team will be invited to submit a science campaign proposal, following the format of the long and large program proposal process (http://www.gemini.edu/node/12096) for consideration by the Gemini Board. Any time awarded through this proposal will not be included in this contract.

n) To reduce schedule, AURA may select a single team to design and build Gen 4#3. To reduce risk, AURA may decide to fund two or more teams to complete the Conceptual Design (CoD) Stage. If more than one team is chosen for the Conceptual Design, AURA would select a single team after the CoD stage to continue with the remainder of its contract.

o) The RFP Documentation Set is made up of the following documents, which are hereby incorporated into this document by reference:

- RFP Main Document (Document Gen4#3-01)
- Proposal Form (Document Gen4#3-02)
- Contract Main Document (Document Gen4#3-03.1)
- Statement of Work (Document Gen4#3-03.2)
- Terms and Conditions (Document Gen4#3-03.3)

All information provided by AURA in this RFP is offered in good faith. Individual items are subject to change at any time. AURA makes no certification that any item is without error.

p) Schedule of Events: The following schedule will apply to this RFP. It may change in accordance with AURA's needs.

Event	Date / Deadline
Release RFP	May 5, 2016
Proposers Conference (see section 3)	June 8, 2016
Notice of Intent due (see section 3)	August 1, 2016
Proposal due	August 29, 2016
Evaluation Process starts	September 2016
Contract Negotiations start	November 2016

q) Contractors interested in submitting a proposal should send an email to gen4_3rfp_submit@gemini.edu and ask to be placed on the Gen 4#3 notification list.

2. Background and Considerations

a) Gemini Observatory is overseen by the Gemini Board of Directors (GBoD), which is advised by the Science and Technology Committee (STAC).

b) Gemini funded four independent and non-competitive Gemini Instrument Feasibility Studies (GIFS) to help understand the science-capability-cost trade space for Gen 4#3. The final reports for the four studies are available to read on their individual home pages: GEONIS, GMOX, MOVIES, and OCTOCAM.

c) Following the GIFS studies, Gemini assembled an independent Gen 4#3 Steering Committee to advise the Observatory on the Gen 4#3 project.

d) The GBoD, STAC, and Gen 4#3 Steering Committee provided Gemini with the following:
- 2015B GBoD Resolutions (see 2015.B.8)
- 2015B STAC Recommendations (see 9.9, 9.10, and 9.11)
- 2015B STAC Additional recommendations for Gen 4#3 Process
- 2016 Steering Committee Recommendations

e) **Guiding Principles**: Listed in priority order are the following guiding principles for the Gen 4#3 project:
- Providing core capabilities
- Meeting schedule
- Meeting budget
- Providing additional capabilities

The Gen 4#3 core capabilities are provided in table 1 below:

Parameter	Value
Spectrographic	
Wavelength Range	0.4 to 1.6μm
Simultaneous Coverage	Yes
Continuous Coverage	Yes
Resolving Power (λ/Δλ)	≥ 4000
Spatial Sampling	≤ 0.2” at V, ≤ 0.15” at H
Imaging	
Natural Seeing FOV	≥ 170” x 90”
Spatial Sampling	≤ 0.2” at V, ≤ 0.15” at H
Performance	
Throughput	Maximize
Target Acquisition time	Minimize
Reliability	Maximize
Limiting Magnitude	Maximize
Night time calibration time	Minimize

Table 1 *Core capabilities and core efficiency performance parameters*

The desired additional capabilities are provided in table 2 below:

Capability/Parameter	Statement	Relative Priority
Wavelength Range	Extending into the K band	High
Simultaneous Multi-band Imaging	> 2 bands	Medium
AO Capable	Taking advance of Gemini AO systems	Medium
Spatially resolved targets	Ability to obtain spectra of	Medium
IFU	Inclusion of	Medium
Wavelength Range	Extending into the U band (within the telescope capability)	Low
All other additional capabilities		Low

Table 2 *Possible additional Gen 4#3 capabilities and their relative priorities*

Proposers shall provide key requirements that shall equal or exceed those provided in Table 1. Key requirements based on any proposed additional capabilities (Table 2) shall also be provided in the key requirements table.

For further information on the Guiding Principles, see section 2 of the Statement of Work (Gen4#3-03.2).
For further information on the Key Requirements, see section 4 of the Statement of Work.

f) **Project Structure:** Section 5.1 of the Statement of Work contains a baseline project structure. Proposers may suggest deviations from the project structure by submitting a change-tracked version of the statement of work. Proposers must demonstrate a reduction of overall risk (capabilities, schedule, and budget) for their proposed changes. All suggested changes still need to include completion of the original work and deliverables described in each stage.

For details of the project structure see section 5.1 and the Appendix A of the Statement of Work.

g) **Gen 4#3 Contract Deliverables:** Gemini requires the following items to be delivered.
- Gen 4#3 Instrument
- Associated hardware to align, assemble, calibrate, handle, install, maintain, service, test, and transport the instrument.
- Associated software to align, calibrate, maintain, service, simulate, and test the instrument
- Documentation Set
- Data reduction products

The Gen 4#3 Contract Deliverables are more fully defined in section 1 of the Statement of Work.

h) **Project Schedule:** Proposers should assume a start date of February 1, 2017, in their proposals.

For further information on schedule considerations, see section 3 of the Statement of Work.

i) **Budget Considerations:** Proposers should submit a proposal in which the cost to AURA does not exceed the maximum available budget.

For further information on budget considerations, see section 3 of the Statement of Work.

j) **Telescope Time (TT):** There are three types of telescope time associated with this project:
   - **Performance Related TT:** Up to 12 nights of Gen 4#3 time awarded to the Contractor based on meeting schedule and budget targets
   - **Cost Reduction TT:** Negotiated amount of Gemini telescope time awarded to the Contractor or Contractor's NGO depending on the source of funding and negotiation
   - **Science Campaign TT:** Science Campaign Proposal submitted at the end of the Build phase of the project, awarded to project's science team

Cost Reduction TT: Indicate in the proposal the institute's interest in a cost reduction to AURA in exchange for telescope time. Please indicate the proposed amount of the cost reduction.

For details of the performance related telescope time, see section 3 of the Statement of Work.
For details of the Science Campaign Proposal, see Appendix A of the Statement of Work.

3. Proposers Conference and Notice of Intent

Proposers Conference

AURA will hold a Proposers Conference to provide a forum to review the RFP material and encourage potential proposers to ask questions regarding the RFP Documentation Set. Proposers may attend in person or via videoconferencing.

a) Parties looking for additional partners to form project teams may give a presentation to highlight their skills and needs.

b) Attendance at this conference is not required to submit a proposal; however, Gemini strongly encourages teams to attend. Notification of attendance should be made to the AURA Contracts Officer. See section 8 for contact information.

Date:	June 8, 2016
Time:	9:00 to 17:00 (US MST)
Place:	950 N. Cherry Ave. Tucson, AZ

c) Information regarding the Proposers Conference agenda and video conferencing connection details will appear on the Gen 4#3 RFP page 14 days prior to the Proposers Conference.

Notice of Intent

a) Notice of intent to submit a proposal should be mailed to the AURA Contracts Officer by the date in the event table (section1). Include in the email the following:

- A synopsis of the Proposed Project (an abstract of 500 words or less).
- A Point of Contact for communications.
- A list of proposed Key Personnel, including the PI(s), Project Manager and all senior personnel expected to be involved in the project.
- A list of the proposed project team member organizations including all potential subcontractors, collaborators, and partnering institutions and their roles in the project.

b) AURA will use the Notices of Intent to ensure reviewers have the appropriate expertise and are not demonstrably conflicted.

c) Not receiving Notices of Intent may delay the evaluation and selection process.

4. Proposal Content

Proposers should read the entire Gen 4#3 RFP Documentation Set before submitting a proposal. Gen 4#3 proposals must include the following named sections (listed in boldface). Each section must provide the information requested in the bullet points. Proposals must be consistent with the Statement of Work (Document Gen4#3-03.2) and should directly address the evaluation criteria described in section 6 of this document.

The proposal shall be no longer than 40 pages *excluding* named Appendices. Proposers should provide relevant information they may have or can reasonably produce. The appendices are an opportunity to highlight mature elements of the proposal, but are not expected to be complete.

Executive Summary: a one page summary of the proposal highlighting the driving science cases, instrument capabilities, project schedule, and budget.

Science cases, requirements, team and operating modes:

- Provide the instrument's driving science cases.
- Derive the instrument's key science requirements from the driving science cases.
- Provide a top-level description of envisaged operating modes.
- List the science team members and their field of research.

Technical requirements, functionality and instrument design:

- Present a top-level description of the proposed instrument's design and functionality.
- Provide a list of performance/error budgets (Details in Appendix A).
- Provide the top-level instrument requirements derived from key science requirements (Details in Appendix B).
- Provide brief descriptions of the instrument's major subassemblies.
- Provide brief descriptions of the instrument's optical, opto-mechanical, electrical and software designs.
- Provide relevant and available layouts of the instrument's major subassemblies.
- Identify areas of technical risk and describe intended approaches to reduce risk.
- Identify technical trades to be considered during the project.
- Provide viable descope options considering the need to meet the core capabilities and their associated cost and schedule impacts.
- Provide viable upscope options along with their expected cost and schedule requirements.

Project and Technical Management:

- Provide a summary of the project schedule including the critical path, schedule reserve and descope decision points (Details in Appendix C).
- Provide a summary of the budget including a three-point estimation and the risk mitigation budget (Details in Appendix D).
- Provide a summary of the Work Breakdown Structure (Details in Appendix E).
- Provide a project organizational chart.
- Identify key personnel roles, areas of expertise, home institutes and their responsibilities within the project.
- Outline the project's communication plan.

- Provide a summary of how changes in the project cost, schedule and subcontractor performance will be monitored and addressed.
- Provide a description of the project's overall risk management approach.
- Provide a summary of the project's key risks and mitigation plans.
- Provide a description of the systems engineering methodology approach for the project.
- Provide a description of the project management methodology and tools for the project.

Organization, Infrastructure, and Heritage:

- Provide an introduction to the main organization and major subcontractors named in the proposal.
- Provide the institutional motivation behind submitting this proposal (including subcontractors).
- Describe the available facilities relevant to executing this project (including subcontractors).
- Describe the relevant experience, knowledge and strengths of each institute, especially including demonstrated past successes in similar projects.
- Describe the relevant experience, knowledge and strengths of each key member, especially including demonstrated past successes in similar projects.
- Summarize key relevant scientific and technical publications for key team members.
- Provide a description of the project support provided by participating institutions including areas of Project Management, System Engineering, accounting, contracts, finance, procurement, and travel.

Appendix A: Performance and Error Budgets (no page limit)
Provide budgets structures, elements and values if possible. See SOW, section A.2.

Appendix B: Requirements (no page limit)
Provide detailed requirements. See SOW, section A.2.

Appendix C: Schedule (no page limit)
Provide a detailed project schedule or Gantt chart. See SOW, section A.1.

Appendix D: Cost Breakdown (no page limit)
Provide a detailed cost breakdown. See SOW, section A.1.

Appendix E: Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) (no page limit)
Provide a detailed WBS. See SOW, section A.1.

Appendix F: Risk Register (no page limit)
Provide a detailed risk register. See SOW, section A.1.

Appendix G: Surety Plan (2 page limit)
See Gen4#3-02 Proposal Form, section 5.

5. Proposal Format and Submission

a) Each proposal must have a lead institution. AURA will only accept proposals from a single contractor. A group of institutions may not submit a joint proposal in which they are all listed as equal partners. The only way for a group of institutions to submit a proposal is for one institution to submit a proposal as lead institution with the other institutions listed as subcontractors.

b) Proposals are contractually binding offers. By submitting a proposal the institute is making an offer to enter into a contract. The institute also agrees that if it fails to sign such a contract promptly when it is offered, AURA may elect, at its sole discretion, to offer a contract to another proposer.

c) Objections to the Contract form and Terms and Conditions must be submitted as part of the proposal. Proposers must submit the contract template (Gen4#3-03.1) to their legal department to determine contract objections prior to submitting a proposal.

d) The entire proposal must be paginated and not each section individually. Margins in all directions must be at least one inch. Proposal text must be in a standard, single-column format with a minimum 10pt. font size.

e) Proposals must be submitted as a single electronic document in Adobe Acrobat PDF format. Where signatures are required in the Proposal Form, proposer may effectively sign by either:
   1. Electronically signing a PDF file using the Adobe Acrobat Digital Signature Tool; or
   2. Signing a hard copy, scanning the signed page to PDF, and attaching the signature page to the main document.

   AURA may reject any contractor's response if it does not contain the required signatures.

f) Download and complete the Proposal Form (Gen4#3-02), answer all the questions, and provide all the requested information and documentation. Have the completed Proposal Form reviewed, approved, and signed by an appropriate administrative official with contractual authority. In addition, provide equivalent assurances from all subcontractors.

g) Submit the proposal by emailing it to the AURA Contracts Officer (see section 8). All proposals must be received by AURA on or before the due date and time stated on the cover page of this document.

h) Acknowledgement of Proposals - Receipt of proposals will be acknowledged by email by within 3 working days following the deadline for submitting proposals. Please contact the AURA Contracts Officer if an acknowledgement has not been received. AURA reserves the right to accept proposals submitted after the deadline if it can be documented that the failure to meet the deadline was due to technical problems with the transmission of the proposal by email.

i) Modification of Proposal - No oral, telegraphic, or telephonic modifications to proposals will be considered. Modifications to proposals submitted may be made electronically if the modified proposal is delivered to AURA before the proposal due date. Proposals that have already been submitted may only be modified by means of submitting a replacement proposal before the deadline for receipt of proposals. Proposals may not be modified after the due date.

j) Proposal Withdrawals - A proposer may withdraw its proposal by written request (i.e., email) at any time prior to the scheduled closing time for receipt of proposals. Thereafter, all proposals, including all subcontracts, must be valid for six (6) months and cannot be withdrawn or modified

during that period. Contractors must ensure that this requirement is effectively communicated to all their subcontractors.

k) Proposal Representations - By submitting a proposal the institute is representing that it has carefully examined this RFP and its referenced documents, understand all aspects of the work, and is not aware of any ambiguities in the scope of work or specifications that may affect the proposed price or schedule. By submitting the proposal, the institute is also representing that:
   1. It has the technical and management capabilities to perform the work in a timely and competent manner.
   2. It is not aware of any pending legal, financial, or other action that could have a material detrimental effect on the institute's ability to perform the work in a timely manner.
   3. It has the financial resources reasonably required to complete the work in a competent and timely manner.
   4. It has the proposed facilities, tools, staff effort, and equipment necessary to perform the work in a timely and competent manner.

l) Attention to and Understanding Terms and Conditions - Proposers are cautioned to thoroughly understand and comply with all matters covered under the Terms and Conditions (Gen4#3-03.3). The successful proposer is expected to enter into a contract approved by the AURA Board of Directors, the Gemini Board of Directors, and the National Science Foundation.

m) AURA shall retain the proposal and all related documents in original form in an archival copy.

6. Evaluation and Selection Process and Criteria

AURA will follow the evaluation and selection process described below.

AURA will perform a cost analysis and price analysis on each proposal received. In addition, AURA shall internally review contract objections and any proposed Statement of Work modifications. AURA shall also assess how the proposed spending distribution aligns with the Partner IDF contributions. Gemini shall organize an external evaluation panel to assess the proposals.

Evaluation Panel
Gemini will select a team of non-conflicted experts to serve on the Gen 4#3 Evaluation Panel. Panel members are expected to include representatives from the Gen 4#3 Steering Committee, Gemini Board, and the Science Technology and Advisory Committee.

Evaluation Criteria
Each member of the Gen 4#3 Evaluation Panel will evaluate each received proposal against the evaluation criteria below. They will identify relative strengths and weaknesses of each proposal based on the science, technical, and management considerations.

The Gen 4#3 Evaluation Panel will write a report making recommendations to the Selection Committee.

The evaluation criteria and their weights are listed below.

1. **Core Capabilities**: **[Weighting 35%]**

Considering the entire set of information contained within the proposal, how confident are we that the team will be able to deliver a Gen 4#3 instrument with the specified core set of capabilities?

Considerations should include but not be limited to: (considerations not weighted)

- The demonstrated ability of the proposed instrument to produce compelling scientific results for the Gemini community, particularly in response to new data coming from the LSST and similar surveys.
- The team's relative knowledge and experience in building a facility-class astronomical instrument for an 8m-class telescope.
- The infrastructure and heritage of the institutes building the proposed instrument.
- The level of technical risk in the instrument design needed to provide the set of core capabilities.
- The stated descope options. Are they appropriate to help ensure the project delivers the core capabilities on schedule and on budget without significant risk?
- The experience of the science team and their science interests relevant to the core capabilities.
- Technical Management, including requirements, performance and error budgets, etc.
- The project structure (include Work Breakdown Structure) and communication, including subcontractors.
- The envisaged operating modes.
- The scientific motivation for the proposed instrument team in relation to delivering a facility class instrument.
- Organizational support related to project and technical management.

2. **Meeting Schedule:** **[Weighting 25%]**

Considering the entire set of information contained within the proposal how confident are we that the team will be able to deliver the proposed instrument by the completion date?

Considerations should include (but not be limited to): (considerations not weighted)

- The team's record of delivering similar projects on time.
- The institute's record of completing similar projects on time.
- Schedule risk; is the project schedule realistic?
- The schedule reserve; Is the amount of reserve appropriate and well justified given the project's risk register items?
- Schedule reserve management; Is the schedule reserve appropriately funded? Is there a plan to actively manage the schedule by using additional resources or project descopes as necessary?
- The project's critical path; has it been correctly identified?
- The proposed method of schedule tracking and management.
- The contractual relationships with subcontractors; to what extent do they support the team's ability to meet schedule?
- Organizational support and tools related to schedule control and monitoring.

3. Managing Budget: [Weighting 20%]

Considering the entire set of information contained within the proposal how confident are we that the team will be able to deliver the proposed instrument to budget?

Considerations should include (but not be limited to): (considerations not weighted)

- The team's record of delivering similar projects to budget.
- The institute's record of completing similar projects to budget.
- The baseline budget and detailed cost estimation.
- The risk register and risk mitigation budget; is the budget considered realistic?
- Budget management. Is there a well-understood plan for using the risk mitigation budget versus the schedule or scope reserves? Is there a strong system to track liens on and uses of the risk mitigation fund? Is there a strong system in place to manage project costs?
- The contractual relationships with subcontractors; to what extent do they support the team's ability to meet budget?
- Organizational support and tools related to accounting, finance, and procurement.

4. Additional Capabilities: [Weighting 20%]

Considering the entire set of information contained within the proposal, what is the perceived benefit to the Observatory of Gen 4#3 containing the additional capabilities beyond the core capabilities identified?

Considerations should include (but not be limited to): (considerations not weighted)

- The team's knowledge and experience related to these additional capabilities.
- How compelling are the driving science cases associated with additional capabilities?
- The level of technical risk in the instrument design needed to provide the additional capabilities.
- Do clear descope options exist and decision points exist?
- How desirable are the additional capabilities?
- The relative advantage of Gemini having these capabilities over other facilities.
- Do proposed additional capabilities clearly fit with project schedule and budget?
- Can additional capabilities be added after delivery without major rework?

The evaluation scores will provide a guide to the selection committee.

Site Visits:
Gemini may choose to make a site visit to the proposing team.

The purpose of the site visit would be to obtain clarification regarding:

- Proposal content
- Contract objections
- Proposed Statement of Work changes
- Facilities and infrastructure planned to be used for the project

Each site visit should last no more than one day.

Selection:
Gemini will make a best value selection after considering, in relative order of precedence, the following: the Gen 4#3 Evaluation Panel report, cost analysis, price analysis, resolvable contract objections, the proposals, proposed statement of work changes, telescope time compensation for cost reduction options and the proposed cost distribution across the partner countries.

Once a team is selected, the parties will enter a period of contract negotiation. If all differences can be resolved within 21 days, the agreement will be sent for approval to the AURA Board, Gemini Board, and NSF. If differences cannot be resolved with the preferred team, Gemini may begin the process with another team.

Once the review process has successfully concluded, the selected lead institute will be sent the approved contract for signature.

Other proposers will not be notified of the results of this procurement until all relevant contracts have been fully executed.

AURA reserves the right to: (1) accept or reject any or all proposals, (2) withhold an award of the contract for any reason, in its sole discretion, (3) delay an award of a contract for any reason, in its sole discretion, (4) cancel the Request For Proposal; and/or (5) waive any deviations, irregularities, or informalities in the proposals.

7. Communications and Questions

a) Any questions or requests for clarification of the Gen 4#3 Request for Proposals Documentation Set should be directed to:

Karen Godzyk
AURA Contracts Officer
Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc.
950 N. Cherry Avenue
Tucson, AZ 85719
Email: gen4_3rfp_submit@gemini.edu
(520) 318-8357 (US Mountain Standard Time)

b) General procedural questions may be handled by telephone. Questions or requests for clarification regarding the scope of work, requirements, or specifications must be submitted by email and must be received at least 10 working days before the proposal due date. Answers and clarifications that modify or clarify any of the documents included in this RFP will only be made in writing; proposers shall not rely on verbal answers or clarifications. AURA may decide to share any questions and their answers with all of the proposers by issuing a supplement to the RFP.

c) To ensure that all proposers receive the same information, clarification or direction by other persons at AURA or the Gemini Observatory is not permitted during the RFP process. Proposers may not contact any other person at AURA or Gemini regarding this procurement without express permission from the AURA Contracts Officer. Proposers may be disqualified from participating in this procurement if they attempt to communicate about this procurement with AURA or Gemini personnel other than the AURA Contracts Officer.

d) RFP Documentation Set modifications will be made only by means of written amendments to the RFP issued by the AURA Contracts Officer. Verbal amendments will be void. An addendum may be issued to amend and/or clarify certain information contained in the RFP. Addenda will be issued to all proposers via email and will also be posted to the Gen 4#3 website. All information contained in an addendum is binding on all proposers who respond to this RFP. Changes/additions will be highlighted with new language underlined and marked in bold (i.e., **word**) and language deleted marked with a strikeout (i.e., ~~word~~).

e) AURA will make a good faith effort to provide a written response to each question or request for clarification that requires addenda within five (5) working days.