

Bridge Erection Boat (BEB)
W56HZV-12-R-0445
Question and Answer Log

Question Number	Document	Document Reference	Question/Comments	Answer/Response	Date Received	Date Posted to Web
1	DRAFT Purchase Description	PD 3.4.4.2	Will there be a Navigation System requirement on the BEB?	There is a requirement for a marine GPS in the Purchase Description.	18-Apr-12	8-Aug-12
2	DRAFT Purchase Description	PD 3.4.2.4.4.8	It is believed the keel cooler flushing requirement incorporated in the above clause has probably been included based on Government experience with previous BEB designs. It is believed that this requirement is not necessary for certain types of keel cooler installations on BEBs. Recent experience of lengthy operations in adverse environments (including repeated events of weed clogging jet inlets and silt clogging raw water systems) has proven that certain keel cooler installation arrangements are not subject to clogging in these adverse environments. For these particular installation arrangements a keel cooler flushing system is redundant, and unnecessarily adds to construction cost, adds to the boats weight, and increases sustainment effort and costs. Based on this experience and to avoid the adverse impacts (weight, initial and sustainment costs) of a keel cooler flushing system, when it is not necessary, it is proposed that Clause 3.4.2.4.4.8 have the a following additional statement (or similar) added: "If the keel cooler installation arrangement is such that it has been proven to not clog with weed, silt, mud or other foreign material in adverse environmental operating conditions, the keel cooler flushing requirement may be omitted. PCO approval must be obtained." The above proposed additional statement is similar to the approach adopted in DRAFT PD at Clause 3.2.1.	The Purchase Description is in a review and approval process. Your suggestion will be considered. Please continue to monitor the PROCNET for the posting of the approved Purchase Description.	29-May-12	8-Aug-12
3	DRAFT Purchase Description	PD 3.4.2.4.6.3	The draft calls for a FM-200 fire suppression system: is there any opportunity for "green", other than FM-200 agents? FM-200 heptoflouropropane is extremely effective in the suppression of explosions and is the correct choice, if desiring protection from explosion. Fire protection, alone, can easily be covered through the use of a different non-halon.	The Purchase Description allows for several types of extinguishing agents for the fixed fire fighting system. There is no plan to change this requirement at this time.	31-May-12	8-Aug-12
4	N/A	N/A	I tried to locate the incumbent boat manufacturer but find some confusion, as GDLS mfg'd the old boat and then a company in Washington state, which is now closed? I'd contact the mfg directly, but frankly speaking, don't know to whom we might approach.	The boat is not currently being produced for the Government. However, research and development contracts to build prototypes and support Government testing were awarded to General Dynamics European Land Systems - Germany, Swiftships Shipbuilders, L.L.C., and Kvichak Marined Industries.	31-May-12	8-Aug-12
5	PD and SOW	C.16.4.1 of SOW and A3.1 of SOW - Table 1 of PD and Attachment 0001 of PD	The draft documents PD and SOW make various references to attachments, documents, ... as for example: - Table 1 of the PD: Welding Standards (mentioned in the SOW under para C.16.4.1 on page 39). - Attachment 0001 of the PD (mentioned in the SOW under para A3.1 on page 1). Are all these additional documents classified as CUI? Or will they be published on a later stage?	Table 1 is not CUI and will be added to the PD in a later revision and posted to the website. "Attachment 0001" is ATPD 2393 itself, not an attachment to ATPD 2393.	31-Aug-12	9-Oct-12
Questions from Pre-Proposal Conference						
6	N/A	N/A	a) Will the down select be <u>only</u> between the existing 3 prototypes or will the competition be open to all interested craft builders? b) If fully open competition, what is the reason for not down selecting between the existing 3 prototype builders only? Reopen?	a) This is a full and open competition and any company may submit a proposal. b) There has been a re-emphasis on obtaining competition and the Government will be best served with full & open competition.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
7	N/A	N/A	The original acquisition strategy was to select 3 offerors to build 3 prototype boats. A down select would then be done and construction award would be made to 1 offeror. What was the reason for the change in acquisition strategy?	There has been a re-emphasis on obtaining competition and the Government will be best served with full and open competition.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
8	N/A	N/A	For the production phase contract any offeror proposing BEB solutions reflecting an untested and/or un-validated designs, or only partially tested design, will be evaluated at higher risk. Is an existing design that merely adds pusher pads above the waterline on the bow be considered untested?	Without specifics, this cannot be answered. Testing should demonstrate compliance with all contract requirements, including operation on JP-8.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
9	N/A	N/A	The 3 offerors awarded design and prototype construction contracts appear to have an advantage in the full and open competition as a result of having built 3 BEBs. What evaluation factors will be considered that would help mitigate this advantage?	The Government will maintain as level a playing field as possible. An offeror can mitigate the perceived advantage of others by providing as part of its proposal, test data demonstrating the proposed BEB conforms to all Purchase Description requirements. Specific source selection criteria has not been determined.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
10	N/A	N/A	The anticipated total contract period is five (5) years (Ref F.1). Does the Government have an estimated quantities of BEBs to be delivered for each of the five years?	The five year timeframe includes the base award and four option periods in which options can be exercised. Contract performance and delivery of BEBs may exceed five years. At this time the USG has not finalized the estimated yearly quantities.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12

Bridge Erection Boat (BEB)
W56HZV-12-R-0445
Question and Answer Log

11	PD	PD 2.1.4	Draft BEB Purchase Description, Section 2.1.4, Other Government Documents, List: CBT/BAP/HEMTT tm-9-2320-279-10 IBC TM-5-5420-277-14&P IRB TM-5-5420-278-10 Are these documents available to potential bidders? If so, how can they be obtained?	There is internet availability at no cost to the contractor through Google/search engines. The TMs listed in the PD Section 2.1.4 will be posted to the BEB website.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
12	SOW	C.16.4.8.1	C.16.4.8.1 Visual Inspection "Visual inspection shall be...and after the 48 hr hold period." a) Does the 48 hr hold period apply to all base metals or just high strength metals? b) Would the 5083 aluminum alloy require the 48 hr hold period?	a) The 48 hr hold period only applies to Quench & Tempered steels and Armor steel material such as MIL-DTL-12560 (RHA) and MIL-DTL-46100 (High Hard). b) The 48 hr hold period does not apply to base metals or 5083 aluminum alloy.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
13	SOW	C.16.4	C.16.4 Welding C.16.4.2b, C.16.4.4, C.16.4.6, and C.16.4.8.1 "ATPD 2393 Table 1: "Welding Standard" What is the "Welding Standard" listed in "Table 1"?	Table 1 is a list of Government and Industry Standards, which will be included in a future version of the PD.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
14	SOW	C.16.4	C.16.4 Welding "ATPD 2393 Table 1" is referenced. Document "ATPD 2393" has been found but there is not a "Table 1" within. Where can Table 1 be found?	Table 1 will be added to the PD in a later revision but no later than the release of the final RFP.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
15	SOW	C.16.1	C.16.1 Quality Program Plan "ISO/TS 16949 or commercially equivalent QMS." Is ISO-9001:2008 acceptable?	The ISO/TS 16949 or commercially equivalent QMS requirements are the new push from TACOM/TARDEC Quality and includes all aspects of ISO 9001:2008. The TS QMS goes further to address specific requirements that enhance quality management to more specific technical standards. Therefore, ISO 9001:2008 alone is not acceptable.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
16	SOW	A.3	a) Total number of craft proposed? b) How many in LRIP?	a) Authorized Acquisition Objective (AAO) is 444. b) LRIP will be a maximum 10% of the AAO.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
17	SOW	C.22.4	C.22.4 Care & Storage Prior to Shipping States: "The contractor shall perform the sea trials IAW Section 4 of ATPD 2393 (Section 4 was not included). Does the Government intend a "second" sea trails would be required if craft are "shipped in place"?	No. Other inspections will apply and will be clarified in a future revision to the scope of work.	12-Sep-12	28-Nov-12
18	SOW	C.2	C.2 Hardware and Deliverables a) References ATPD 2393 (Attachment 001) and Section B (neither are included??) b) Will the Government provide a list destinations/quantities to be delivered?	a) Attachment 0001 is ATPD 2393; Section B will be included in the final RFP. b) Section H.6 "First Transportation Zones" in the drafted SOW identifies the destination locations/zones and percentage of boats to be delivered by zone.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
19	PD	3.4.1.16	PD 3.4.1.16 Crew Station 3.7.1 refers to "speed of 16 knots"? Section 3.3.9 states 8 knots at full load.	Paragraph 3.7.1 will be revised to read "... (routine operations include operating at top speed..." in a future revision but no later than the release of the final RFP.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
20	N/A	N/A	Can each contractor submit two proposals and an alternate proposal? Or, is the alternate proposal considered one of the two?	The alternate proposal will be considered as the second proposal. Only two proposals will be accepted from each offeror.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
21	N/A	N/A	What will the CLIN structure be?	The CLIN structure is based on the requirements. The CLINs currently being considered will be: CLIN for BEBs CLIN for PQT Support CLIN for LOG Demo CLIN for PQT Test Support Package CLIN for TDP (Options) CLIN for Contractor Support Representative (CSR) for FAT CLIN for LUT Support (Option) CLINs for options for production boats and crew protection kits in four separate time periods CLIN for BEB System Hand-off CLIN for Data CLIN for Contractor Manpower Reporting	12-Sep-12	6-Nov-12
22	SOW	C.16.4.8.1	It appears that the 48 hour hold for weld inspections applies only to high strength steels such as may be used in armor. Is this requirement to be applied to AWS D1.2 aluminum welding? (Recommend this does not apply to aluminum.)	The 48 hr hold period only applies to Quench & Tempered steels and Armor steel material such as MIL-DTL-12560 (RHA) and MIL-DTL-46100 (High Hard).	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
23	SOW	C.16.4.8.2	It is up to the contractor to determine extent on NDT (other than visual inspection)? The SOW states "when NDA is required..." Is this clearly defined when required means?	Non Destructive Testing (NDT) will be determined by the class of weld for in process work. The contractor is responsible for applying NDT to the control plans to show where NDT will be applied.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12

Bridge Erection Boat (BEB)
W56HZV-12-R-0445
Question and Answer Log

24	SOW	C.6.8.2.1	Will 3D engineering deliverables, as defined by the MIL-STD-31000 revision currently being adopted, meet the requirements of the Technical Design Package (TDP)?	Yes. 3D engineering deliverables shall meet the requirements of the Technical Data Package (TDP) as defined by the version of MIL-STD-31000 in effect at the time of RFP release.	12-Sep-12	28-Nov-12
25	N/A	N/A	When will the final RFP be released?	The Government anticipates release of the final RFP around the December 2012 timeframe.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
26	N/A	N/A	What is the status of the BEB contract funding?	Currently, the Government has funding for the initial quantity of BEBs (for testing), ILS requirements, test support. That is, all of the non-option items.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
27	N/A	N/A	Why is this not a 100% small business set aside program?	Pursuant to FAR 19.502, we do not anticipate adequate competition as a small business set aside. The local Small Business Administration Representative has concurred with full & open competition.	12-Sep-12	6-Nov-12
28	N/A	N/A	a) Is a proposal submitted to meet all threshold items with options to meet objectives acceptable? b) Please clarify how many total proposals may be submitted by a single offeror?	a) No, each proposal must be a stand-alone, firm-fixed price proposal, but up to two proposals with varying approaches are allowed. b) Per Section A.6 of the draft RFP, an offeror may submit up to two proposals.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
29	PD	3.4.2.4.4.5	Engine Hour Meter Engine hours are accurately maintained in the engine mounted ECM (Engine Control Module) and broadcast on the J1939 data link to dash gauges. If engine is replaced, hours stay with engine. Analog hour meters are not accurate. Engine mounted J1939 hour meters are unreliable. Suggest not requiring on engine hour meter. There are no advantages and only disadvantage of decrease in reliability.	An on-engine hour meter will be required.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
30	PD	3.4.3.10.2	Color Code on Gauges Three dimensional alarm strategy of oil pressure alarms makes color coding of gauges problematic. 5 psi limit at idle – 30 psi limit at speed. Where to put red limit? Suggest engine ECM alarm system is more accurate and reliable.	PD Paragraph 3.4.3.10.2 states that red/yellow/green markings for operating limits are an objective and are to be used "as applicable". There are no thresholds for color coding.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
31	PD	NA	Engine Duty Cycle The duty cycle in the pre-solicitation is 85%. This very high and limits engine choices. Real world duty cycle is likely much less and would allow more engine choices. Can real world, not test plan, duty cycles be included in the solicitation?	The duty cycle required is representative of BEB operation and the BEB shall be designed accordingly.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
32	N/A	N/A	Launching of the BEB – Current procedures utilize the IBC to launch the BEB which is orientated bow facing toward the rear. Will the US Army allow switching the orientation so that the bow faced forward?	As long as all PD requirements are met, the design, including BEB orientation during launch, is up to the offeror.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
33	N/A	N/A	Why was phase 2 opened back up to full and open competition? Please clarify?	There has been a re-emphasis on obtaining competition and the Government will be best served with full and open competition.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
34	N/A	N/A	What is the estimated impact of sequestration on: 1) Acquisition sked (schedule?) – particularly pre award sked (schedule?) 2) Funding for program	We cannot answer that as this is a Congressional action.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
35	N/A	N/A	a) Were previous BEB prototypes required to perform all testing with JP8 fuel? b) If yes, were all requirements met?	a) Yes. b) No JP-8 related failures were noted.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
36	N/A	N/A	Re' Contractor Secret Classification slide stated contractor requirement...can this be at the subcontractor level? (as indicated in draft SOW/PD).	Yes. Note: the subcontractor will not be able to share the secret information with the prime.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
37	N/A	N/A	Re' Eval/Source Selection Criteria, will the criteria be published in the <u>draft</u> RFP?	No, the evaluation criteria will be included in Section M of the final RFP.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
38	N/A	N/A	TIQ Go/No go Decision Evaluation Can you provide estimated date for Go/No Go decision notification in context or anticipated Aug 13 contract award?	Because so many factors are involved, the Government cannot predict specific milestones within the source selection process. An offeror would be notified of a No Go decision soon after the decision is made.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
39	N/A	N/A	Tech Info Questionnaire, will a comprehensive TIQ be included in the draft RFP?	Although the TIQ has not been finalized it is unlikely the TIQ will cover all BEB requirements. The TIQ will be published with the final RFP.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12

Bridge Erection Boat (BEB)
W56HZV-12-R-0445
Question and Answer Log

40	N/A	N/A	<p>a) Please provide history of this procurement - last 10 years.</p> <p>b) Please confirm all presentations will be posted on website.</p> <p>Is there not enough competent and interested small businesses to make this procurement a small business set aside?</p>	<p>a) History of the BEB Program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MKI Bridge Erection Boat (BEB) Acquired in 1970s • MKII BEB Acquired in 1980s • Kit integrated to upgrade powertrain through Army RESET program starting in 2004-2005 • The Service Life Extension Program (SLEP) program was cancelled in May 2008. Multiple issues with JP-8 Fuel Testing and Fuel System Configuration • BEB Program of Record (POR) approved Dec 09 • BEB POR Engineering Manufacturing Design (EMD) Phase current <p>b) Yes, all presentations will be posted on the BEB website.</p> <p>c) See response to Question 27.</p>	12-Sep-12	6-Nov-12
41	N/A	N/A	<p>a) Is TIQ going to be posted with RFP?</p> <p>b) PQT testing may result in a revision to TM's. How complete does the Government expect initial TM rev to be?</p>	<p>a) The TIQ will be posted with the final RFP.</p> <p>b) TMs are not due until AFTER PQT. Therefore, TMs should have incorporated any revisions as a result of PQT testing.</p>	12-Sep-12	28-Nov-12
42	PD	N/A	Define 48" armor protection from deck. Is deck at crew platform deck or bow deck height?	Deck at crew station - this will be clarified in a future revision of the PD.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
43	SOW	C.20	USG inspection during FAB. Will inspection be on a non-interference basis?	Inspections will be performed on a non-interference basis to the maximum extent possible and in compliance with the FAR Inspection of Supplies and Inspection of Services clauses.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
44	N/A	N/A	Who is the product support manager (PSM) for the BEB program?	During production, it is the contractor working with the Product Support Integration Directorate (PSID) of TACOM.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
45	N/A	N/A	Why is SDDC not tasked with conducting the transportability analysis as per current policy and statutes?	Surface Deployment and Distribution Command (SDDC) will be tasked with the final transportability approval; the transportability report provides input to SDDC.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
46	N/A	N/A	<p>a) Will USG provide training (operator) on GFE supplied to contractors facility?</p> <p>b) Is USG responsible for GFE maintaining at contractors facility?</p>	<p>a) Yes.</p> <p>b) Contractor will maintain GFE in accordance with published TMs, field level repairs above operator level would be performed by the Government.</p>	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
47	N/A	N/A	You have issued a draft purchase description & solicitation / what is the response date for questions & comments on this draft?	A cutoff date for receipt of questions has not been established yet. However, this is generally two weeks before receipt of proposals to allow the Government the time to answer questions.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
48	N/A	N/A	What is the weight of bridge sections both dry (on land) and wet (floating weight)?	The weight of the bridge sections is available in the IRB Tech Manual. The IRB Tech Manual will be posted on the BEB website no later than the release of the final RFP.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
49	N/A	N/A	Must TDP, drawings, BOM, etc...must be in English?	Yes	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
50	PD	3.7.1	<p>Draft PD 3.7.1 Appliqué Panel Support Structure</p> <p>a) Is the overhead hoist part of the BEB or non-BEB special equipment/common equipment?</p> <p>b) Is the hoist a hook, etc.?</p>	<p>a) The overhead hoist will not be integral to or provided with the BEB and therefore will not be contractor provided.</p> <p>b) The PD requires compliance with MIL-STD-209. This includes the lift fittings for appliqué and surrogate panels that weigh more than 500 lbs.</p>	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
51	PD	3.8.1	<p>3.8.1 Corrosion minimized</p> <p>Previously, "electrolytically dissimilar metals shall be isolated (threshold) or eliminated (objection). Now - shall be isolated or eliminated. Clarification - there is no preference. i.e. isolated v. eliminated?</p>	There is no preference.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
52	PD	3.5	PD 3.5 Transportation. Reconfiguration requirement - 30 mins - Does this requirement include appliqué install/removal?	This depends on the design of the BEB. If removal and installation of the appliqué panels are required to meet the transport requirements, then the removal and installation of the appliqué panels would be included in the 30 minutes.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
53	PD	3.5.7	Draft PD 3.5.7 external air transport rev. does not state specific number of lift points. Is this a specific requirement?	Please refer to MIL-STD-209.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
54	PD	3.4.1.4	Draft PD 3.4.1.4 buoyancy (objective). What is the threshold? Objective?	There is no threshold in this paragraph.	12-Sep-12	6-Nov-12
55	PD	3.3.3	Draft PD 3.3.3 Temporary Bridge Anchoring. Is the spec calling for max of (l) MLC 100 or (l) MLC 85 spaced out every 18 bays?	Correct, only one vehicle per 18 bays.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
56	N/A	N/A	Will the TDP requirements be consistent w/maintenance / repair levels. E.g. will engine OEM full IPB (including internal engine components) be required if only engine maint/repair if field/intermediate level (i.e. no internal engine maint/repair)?	Yes. The TDP requirements shall be consistent with Government maintenance / repair levels.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
57	N/A	N/A	Is the water jet required to be engaged during the 10 minute dry run requirement, or will it be taken out of gear with trans?	There is no requirement to engage the water jet when the BEB is out of the water.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12

Bridge Erection Boat (BEB)
W56HZV-12-R-0445
Question and Answer Log

58	PD	3.9	Will the contract awardee be responsible to provide all diagnostic tools as identified in Section 3.9 at the draft Purchase Description or will this be the responsibility of the Government PM.	Tool sets found in Paragraph 3.9 of the PD are Government furnished. Special tools required to maintain BEB that are not components of listed tool sets must be provided by contractor. 3.9.1.1 MSD/MSD-ICE do not need to be contractor furnished.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
59	SOW	C.17	C.17 IUID on BEB and significant components?	IUID requirements will be included in the final RFP.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
60	N/A	N/A	a) Will the results of the recent engine E&D efforts be made available? b) What where the results or the present recent engine R&D test?	a) The results of the engine tests are proprietary, and will not be published. b) The results of the engine tests are proprietary, and will not be published.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
61	N/A	N/A	a) Are there any spare engine requirements in the 444 BEB scope of production? b) Is the engine quantity 2 eng for one BEB direct relationship?	a) Spare engines are not included in the RFP. When needed they will be acquired under a different contract. b) Two engines installed per BEB are required.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
62	PD	3.5.4.1	a) Will interface control drawings (ICD) as part of the RFP? Specifically ICD for the CBT, PLST, BAP, and the IBC. b) 3.5.4.1 MRBC transport system. Will ICD be provided for turning diameter of the loaded CBT/PLCT combination?	a) No. ICDs are not available for these items. Reference information will be provided, but compliance is a contractor responsibility. b) No. An ICD is not available for this item. Reference information will be provided, but compliance is a contractor responsibility.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
63	N/A	N/A	a) What format is needed for technical publications? b) How many LRIPs? c) How many BEB's desired per year?	a) Please see Draft SOW C.13. b) The contract award will include 17 BEBs. The whole LRIP quantity is 44 (10% of the authorized acquisition objective of 444). c) The final RFP will contain a schedule showing the distribution of BEBs by year.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
64	N/A	N/A	a) Is a boat competition (run-off) planned? b) Is a working prototype / parent craft required? c) What thrust is required to hold IRB in place? d) Operate out of the water for 10 minutes at what RPM?	a) No, a single award is planned. b) No, but test data will lower risk. c) IRB drag information will be provided on BEB website. d) Out of water operation is at idle speed.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
65	N/A	N/A	CBT Version. Draft PD is repeatedly spoken of a CBT but no version is mentioned. Is this the latest CBT version M1977 A2 meant?	The CBT will be version M1977 A2 or later.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
66	N/A	N/A	a) If initial boat doesn't do well in PQT, will solicitation process be restarted? b) Explain "option periods" more in detail.	a) If there are significant failures during PQT the Government may choose to terminate and re-solicit if it is in the best interest of the Government. b) Option periods are the timeframes during which the Government may unilaterally and incrementally exercise an option.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
67	N/A	N/A	a) Will contractor be required to have a crew available at Aberdeen during PQT to perform maintenance? b) Traditionally, it has been difficult to find 8A and HUBZone qualified suppliers/vendors. Can the Government explain more in detail the specifics of meeting this requirement?	a) Yes, the contractor shall provide a representative during PQT. See SOW C.18.3. b) No. The contractor must develop its own vendor base including those to meet the 8(a) and HUB Zone goals.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
68	PD	3.7.1	Section 3.7.1. PD states: "panels shall match the configuration of the operator's station and provide 100% coverage from the deck up to 48" for the front and sides..." Please confirm whether "deck" is referring to the surface that the driver is standing on.	Correct, 48" up from where operator is standing. This will be clarified in a future revision of the PD.	12-Sep-12	6-Nov-12
69	N/A	N/A	Our understanding is that the options after LRIP completion may be openly competed. Pls confirm our understanding.	The Government will award a single firm-fixed price contract to one offeror for LRIP and the options.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
70	N/A	N/A	How long after the contract is awarded before the first boat will be delivered?	Per the draft IMS, delivery of the first boat will be due 8 months after contract award.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
71	SOW	C.6.8.1.2	a) Is Option 2 on the Tech Data mandatory? b) Should PRO-E be pursued by a contractor to support this contract if they are selected?	a) Yes. To provide a responsive proposal to the RFP, all options must be priced. b) Although PRO-E is the preferred program, it is not required to meet contract requirements. However, the resulting product must be able to be used by PRO-E.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12
72	SOW	A.8.1	A.8.1 SECRET Facility Clearance This paragraph states that "The prime contractor OR their armor subcontractor is req'd to have a SECRET Facility Clearance. Does it in fact mean that BOTH have to be a SECRET Facility Clearance?	No. The prime or subcontractor must have a SECRET Facility Clearance. However, neither the prime nor sub may share classified data with the other unless both have the appropriate clearances.	12-Sep-12	9-Oct-12

****End of Questions from Pre-Proposal Conference****

Bridge Erection Boat (BEB)
W56HZV-12-R-0445
Question and Answer Log

73	PD	3.4.3.7	<p>a) Is it acceptable to perform the 360° swivel motion at two separate positions, one at the operators position and one at the deckhand's position, with a clearance degree of 180°, minimum, each?</p> <p>b) Is it acceptable to have two searchlights on board?</p>	<p>a) No. One searchlight in one location must meet the 360° rotation requirement.</p> <p>b) Yes, but one of the searchlights provided must meet all of the requirements in paragraph 3.4.3.7.</p>	19-Sep-12	6-Nov-12
74	PD	3.4.1.6	<p>a) Is it acceptable to design the payload area as a single area in a width of 2.25 ft and a length as required for (3.5 x 3.5 =) 12.25 ft²?</p> <p>b) Is it acceptable to design the single payload area in a rectangular area of minimum 12.25 ft² with a width-and-length of = 1:2.5?</p> <p>c) Can the qualification of the payload area reflecting a relation of 1:2.5 and minimum 12.25 ft² area be verified by loading studies using, for example, IRB rafting brackets?</p>	<p>a) No, because of the payloads the BEB is required to carry, a payload area must be provided that meets the 3.5 foot by 3.5 foot requirement.</p> <p>b) No, because of the payloads the BEB is required to carry, a payload area must be provided that meets the 3.5 foot by 3.5 foot requirement.</p> <p>c) No, verification of the requirement for a payload area 3.5 feet by 3.5 feet will be performed by measuring the payload area. Verification of the requirement for storage space for two IRB rafting brackets will be performed with actual hardware.</p>	19-Sep-12	6-Nov-12
75	PD	3.4.1.2	<p>According to the Draft PD / Para 3.4.1.2 Hull Material, extruded shapes of 6061-T6 aluminum alloy are basically allowable. Thus extruded shapes of 6061-T6 aluminum alloy can be used for the skin of the hull! Pls. confirm. This material offers excellent welding and seawater resistance properties.</p>	<p>No. The use of 6061-T6 for the skin of the hull is not allowable even if the skin is extruded. The ultimate strength of 6061 is greatly reduced when welded. Even if the welding is avoided during construction, welding of the skin will be required for repairs throughout the life of the BEB. This will be further clarified in a subsequent revision of ATPD-2393.</p>	28-Sep-12	6-Nov-12
76	Draft RFP	N/A	<p>a) Will the final RFP contain contract financing clauses such as progress payments?</p> <p>b) Since this contract will be awarded over several years. Will the RFP contain inflation adjustments?</p>	<p>a) Yes</p> <p>b) RFP will ask offerors to propose range pricing over several years. This will allow offerors to offer different prices for the various years.</p>	5-Nov-12	28-Nov-12
77	Draft RFP	N/A	<p>Draft Proposal schedule is too short. The draft schedule only allows 54 days to prepare a very comprehensive proposal and this period includes the Christmas holidays. Request the proposal period be extended to at least 90 days, 180 days would be better.</p>	<p>The Government typically allows 45 days for proposals such as the BEB. It is noted that the proposal period falls over the holidays, therefore the Government intends to allow 60 days for proposals on the BEB production contract.</p>	5-Nov-12	28-Nov-12
78	Industry Briefing & PD	Slide 50 & PD 3.7	<p>a) This slide states "Post award, the contractor will receive armor test results which will be classified Secret. The contractor will need to obtain a facility clearance and have personnel with a Secret clearance. Also, the Draft RFP states that offeror will need a Secret facilities clearance in order to receive armor ballistic data.</p> <p>b) The PD 3.7 implies the contractor will be required to purchase the armor plate. Most armor manufacturer's have the necessary clearances to view armor ballistic data. Purchasing the armor plate does not require the prime contractor to access classified information as this can be obtained directly from the Contracting Officer with authorization from the Prime. As an alternative, the armor could be GFE.</p> <p>1) Please remove the requirement for the Offeror's to view armor ballistic data. The prime does not have a need-to-know this information in order purchase and provide the armor plate as this will require a Secret clearance.</p> <p>2) The process to obtain a Secret clearance is difficult and quite time consuming. There is not sufficient time to obtain such clearance before the proposal is due.</p> <p>3) This requirement will have the effect of limiting competition to only those firms who already have Secret facilities.</p>	<p>a) There is no question identified here.</p> <p>b) The Government will not provide the armour as GFE.</p> <p>b-1) Agreed that the prime does not have a need to know ballistic test results, but in the event of a failure or design concern during testing, the Government must have the ability to convey this to the contractor. Please note that draft SOW section A.8.1 states: "The Prime Contractor or their armor subcontractor is required to have a SECRET Facility Clearance to be eligible for award." A prime contractor can meet this requirement by selecting a subcontractor with a SECRET facility clearance.</p> <p>b-2). By selecting a subcontractor that has a SECRET Facility Clearance, an offeror can satisfy the requirement before proposals are due.</p> <p>b-3)There is no of limiting of competition. An offeror has the opportunity to subcontract with a vendor that already has the necessary clearance.</p>	5-Nov-12	5-Dec-12
79	PD	3.2.4.1 / MRBC Transport System	<p>Reference: a) Interface Control Drawings b) Questions and Answers, Part 62</p> <p>Due to additional drawings, the BEB website now provides supplementary information on the critical angles for the MRBC driving situations "Entering Turn" and "Exiting Turn".</p> <p>Apart from that, the drawing illustrating the "MRBC Transport Equipment" now also includes a critical distance dimension for the interface area of the hydraulic drive unit of the winch on the BAP, i.e. dimension 490. However, the ladder on the BAP is also a critical area. Please let us have the critical distance for this area, too.</p>	<p>The .dxf versions of the MRBC transport drawings have now been uploaded to the BEB website. Dimensions can be taken from the .dxf drawing. The horizontal distance from the front of the CBT bumper to the front of the BAP ladder rung is approximately 497 inches. Note that the drawings provided on the website and the dimension given here are for information only and it is the Offeror's responsibility to meet all requirements of ATPD 2393. Also, all dimensions are approximate because of the play in the system between the CBT and PLST connection points and BAP to PLST connections.</p> <p>The Government highly recommends scheduling a visit to Selfridge to measure the MRBC equipment in person for any critical dimensions. The date to request a visit will be extended.</p>	20-Nov-12	5-Dec-12

Bridge Erection Boat (BEB)
W56HZV-12-R-0445
Question and Answer Log

80	PD (dated 4 DEC 2012)	3.5.4.1 / MRBC Transport System	<p>3.5.4.1 MRBC Transport System.</p> <p>The CBT with the BEB System shall tow a loaded PLST (required loads include IRB/BAP, loaded CROP flatracks, and DSB/M1077 flatracks) with the draw bar in the extended position and the extended drawbar/light bar (NSN 2540-01-460-5784) installed without restricting the turning diameter of the CBT/PLST combination. The BEB System loaded on a CBT towing a PLST loaded with a BAP shall not contact the PLST or BAP while climbing the 20% grade longitudinal slope at the Aberdeen Test Center (ATC) Munson Test Area."</p> <p>The 20% grade value at Clause 3.5.4.1 for climbing on a longitudinal slope seems less than the usual requirement. The 20% grade equates to approximately 11 degrees whereas the requirements throughout MIL-STD-1366E – Interface Standard for Transportability Criteria, specifies 15 degree ramps (~26.8% grade). The 15 degree ramps are referenced at: pages 13, 41, 63 and 77 of MIL-STD-1366E (extracts from those pages are provided for information).</p> <p>The PD also refers to an Aberdeen Test Centre (ATC) slope – There maybe multiple test slopes at ATC, but similar previous tests have been performed at ATC using a 15 degree slope (a test report extract is provided for information).</p>	No question	21-Dec-12	10-Jan-13
80.1	PD (dated 4 DEC 2012)	3.5.4.1 / MRBC Transport System	Is the 20% grade value at Clause 3.5.4.1 the intended value/requirement?	Yes, the 20% grade requirement in ATPD 2393 3.5.4.1 is correct.	21-Dec-12	10-Jan-13
80.2	PD (dated 4 DEC 2012)	3.5.4.1 / MRBC Transport System	If it (20% grade ~ 11 degrees) is correct, it is suggested that this lower than usual grade/slope value be set as the threshold requirement and that a 15 degree slope be set as the objective requirement (this has the potential of providing TACOM with a BEB system capability that meets 15 degree requirements of the transportability standard).	Although 15 degree ramps are used for air transport and for marine transport, when the BEB is loaded for air and marine transport on a CBT, the CBT will not be towing a loaded PLST. The PLST is loaded separately for air and marine transport, therefore there is no need for the CBT loaded with a BEB and towing a loaded PLST to traverse a 15 degree ramp. This is noted in ATPD 2393 3.5.3 and 3.5.5 which state, "Marine transport of the BEB System loaded on a CBT towing a loaded PLST is not required" and "Air transport of the BEB System loaded on a CBT or PLST is not required" respectively. A detailed drawing of the 20% longitudinal grade at the Aberdeen Test Center (ATC) Munson Test Area will be provided on the BEB website in the near future. The Government's requirements as stated are correct.	21-Dec-12	10-Jan-13
81	Draft RFP	Provision L-12	<p>Reference Solicitation provision L-12 on page 157 of the draft RFP, entitled: "52.215-20 REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFIED COST OR PRICING DATA AND DATA OTHER THAN CERTIFIED COST OR PRICING DATA (OCT 2010) -- ALTERNATE III (OCT 1997)</p> <p>Under FAR (15.403), certified cost and pricing data "shall not" be required when the reasonableness of prices can be determined based on adequate price competition. These are the circumstances that exist for the BEB acquisition. It is therefore requested that the requirement to submit cost and pricing data and certify the date be deleted from the solicitation.</p>	The Government has reviewed the provision, and determined that this is not needed for this procurement. This provision will be removed when final RFP is released	11-Jan-13	23-Jan-13
82	Draft RFP	N/A	<p>The Government issued the draft RFP without the proposal preparation instructions and selection criteria of sections L & M. This omission significantly hampers all offerors' abilities to submit a responsive proposal within the expected proposal response time of only 45 days after release of the final RFP.</p> <p>When will the Government release these very critical sections of the RFP?</p> <p>If the formal release of the RFP is further delayed for reasons unrelated to the proposal preparation instructions and selection criteria, will the Government release them, as a minimum in final draft form, in advance of formal RFP release so that offerors' can get a head start on meeting the stated 45 day proposal preparation period?</p>	<p>Sections L & M will be included in the release of the final RFP.</p> <p>The Government does not intend to release a draft of sections L & M. It will be included in the release of the final RFP.</p>	11-Jan-13	23-Jan-13
Questions After RFP Release						
83.1	RFP	Section H.3 - Foreign Access to Technology	Who is the PM mentioned in section H.3 (b)(2) (A) and is this person responsible for coordinating the affirmation process with DASA DE&C?	<p>The PM mentioned in section H.3(b)(2)(A) is the Government's "Program Manager." However, prior to contract award, all communication with offerors or potential offers shall occur through the Contract Specialist and Contracting Officer.</p> <p>The offeror is responsible for coordinating the affirmation process with DASA DE&C.</p>	28-Jan-13	6-Feb-13
83.2	RFP	Section H.3 - Foreign Access to Technology	<p>How does the affirmation process work for submitting a request to the DASA DE&C?</p> <p>How do we get it started and what information needs to be submitted?</p>	Offeror should refer to DFARS 252.204-7008(c) regarding questions related to Export Controls, which is incorporated in the RFP. The Department of State publishes guidance regarding ITAR compliance at http://www.pmdtc.state.gov/compliance/index.html .	28-Jan-13	6-Feb-13

Bridge Erection Boat (BEB)
W56HZV-12-R-0445
Question and Answer Log

83.3	RFP	Section H.3 - Foreign Access to Technology	What is the timeline for responses from DASA DE&C?	See response to 83.2.	28-Jan-13	6-Feb-13
83.4	RFP	Section H.3 - Foreign Access to Technology	Regarding section H.3 (b)(3); since we are looking to exercise exemption 125.4 (b)(1) and not 125.4(b)(3), will the disclosure guidelines for BEB still apply? If so, where can I find the disclosure guidelines for BEB?	Yes, the disclosure guidelines for the BEB still apply. The disclosure guidelines for the BEB are identified in #13 of Attachment 0002 - DD254, PEO CS&CSS Armoring Systems Security Classification Guide effective 31 Aug 2012. Security Classification Guide cannot be released until after award.	28-Jan-13	6-Feb-13
83.5	RFP	Section H.3 - Foreign Access to Technology	A complete explanation of section H.3 (b)(4) would be very helpful.	The PM Disclosure Authority has ensured the RFP contains the necessary clauses, and authorize disclosure as appropriate upon request.	28-Jan-13	6-Feb-13
84	RFP	Section C.16.1	In order respond to the relevant sections in the RFP for the Quality Management System we need to understand what ISO specification the Army is preferring or asking us to use. Section C.16.1 specifies that we must have a documented "Quality Manual/Program Plan" which shall follow the guidance of ISO/TS 16949. C.16.1.1 specifies that we shall have a supplier quality assurance program that follows ISO/TS 16949 for each of our suppliers. Section L-30 does not require ISO 9001:2008 as the Quality Management System standard to use but clearly implies that they prefer it to proprietary quality systems. ISO/TS 16949 contains all of the content of ISO 9001:2008 with additional requirements tailored to the automotive manufacturing industry. We need clarification between the requirements of C.16.1/C.16.1.1 and L-30. The way I interpret the requirements without clarification is that they prefer our QMS to be based on ISO 9001:2008 and we shall only use the guidelines from ISO/TS 16949 for our Quality Manual and Supplier Quality System as part of our ISO 9001:2008 based QMS. The requirements for the Quality Manual are the same between the two specs but the supplier quality requirements in ISO/TS 16949 offer more control of suppliers than does ISO 9001:2008. This makes sense to me where ISO 9001 is a generic guideline for a QMS and ISO/TS 16949 contains additional controls for automotive manufacturing which has vast supplier networks. I guess the question is whether or not my interpretation is correct. If I'm wrong and ISO/TS 16949 is the standard we should be using for the entire QMS we need to know. It makes an enormous difference in how we will respond to the RFP regarding our QMS for the contract.	Amendment 0002 will be updated to remove L-30 (52.246-4001 Offerors's Quality Assurance System) from the RFP, and clarify section C.16.1 and C.16.1.1.	28-Jan-13	6-Feb-13
85	RFP	Section J	In the Jan 29 change announcement (on FBO), the only areas highlighted in blue are on page 142. Attachment 0001 is highlighted but the date listed for the document is Dec 2012. Can you advise if the PD changed on Jan 29th? If yes, where can I find the latest copy? It was not attached to your announcement.	Amendment 0001 to RFP has incorporated the revised PD, which is to remove the word "DRAFT" from the PD. Amendment 0001 to RFP also corrected the date next to Attachment 0001 on page 142 of RFP to reflect date of 31 JAN 2013. The RFP contains the latest PD. The hyperlinks are active and will take you to the PD.	30-Jan-13	6-Feb-13
86	RFP	N/A	I reviewed the RFP and I can't find where it states when questions can be asked. Can you guide me to that or tell me how long all the builders will have to ask questions and receive answers on the RFP?	Please see BEB homepage on PROCNET for updates to the Question and Answer period.	30-Jan-13	6-Feb-13
87	RFP	Attachment 0005	I looked at the MS Project and saw that the Final day for industry questions was 15 Feb but that was based on the RFP issue on 1/15/13 as stated on Attachment 0005 to the RFP. Are you going to update this or just post a new date on your web site?	Please see BEB homepage on PROCNET for updates to the Question and Answer period.	30-Jan-13	6-Feb-13
88	RFP	CDRL A027	In Block 5 of CDRL A027, it references sections C.7.3, C.7.3 and there is no section in the RFP - only a Section C.7.1 and C.7.2.	Amendment 0001 to the RFP has incorporated the updated Exhibit A to correct the section reference in CDRL A027.	31-Jan-13	6-Feb-13
89	RFP	Section M.1.2	Section M.1.2 Export Controlled Information states that it is the responsibility of the offeror to obtain the necessary export licenses to share any information with foreign persons. Under section H.3.b, the possibility exists that the U.S. Army can provide an exemption to the ITAR via a letter from the U.S. Army to direct/authorize an export. Section L.2.1. requires that the stability and structural calculations require review and stamping/signing by a Notified Body under Directive 94/25/EC for Recreational Craft. Will the U.S. Army provide an ITAR exemption to allow for the timely export of this data to the U.S. Government-required foreign certification organization?	The Government has reviewed the requirement for a notified body to review the stability and structural calculations in accordance with Directing 94/25/EC and understand that it is unlikely offerors can comply with ITAR regulations and have the calculations reviewed in the time allowed for the preparation of proposals. As such, Attachment 0023 has been revised to eliminate the requirements for the calculations to be reviewed by a notified body. Please note that the calculations are still required to be provided in support of the offeror's response to the Attachment 0023.	31-Jan-13	11-Feb-13
90	RFP	N/A	If a Notified Body has not provided approval by the proposal submittal date will that render a submitted proposal ineligible for award?	No. With the most recent revision to Attachment 0023, a notified body review is no longer required. Please see the full response to question #89.	31-Jan-13	11-Feb-13
91	RFP	N/A	The word DRAFT still appears on the specification. Is this a final version of the document?	Amendment 0001 to the RFP has incorporated the revised PD, which is to remove the word "DRAFT" from the PD.	31-Jan-13	6-Feb-13
92	RFP	N/A	What is the last day that the Army will consider questions by Offerors?	Please see BEB homepage on PROCNET for updates to the Question and Answer period.	31-Jan-13	6-Feb-13

Bridge Erection Boat (BEB)
W56HZV-12-R-0445
Question and Answer Log

93	PD	N/A	<p>The Purchase Description includes many items where performance is expressed in terms of both a threshold and an objective. Only a few of these items are required to be proposed and evaluated in the competition 3.3.4 and 3.3.9. Solicitation paragraph M.8.8 says in part "Offerors will not be granted extra evaluation credit for achieving performance up to the objective for any other requirements in ATPD 2393". An offeror who may have an existing design is being encouraged by the RFP to reduce performance to be cost competitive.</p> <p>Why is the Government specifically discouraging offerors of increased performance up to the objective by not evaluating these areas of the purchase description? If the additional performance is unwanted, why was the purchase description issued to include these increased performance levels?</p>	The RFP is not intended to discourage achievement of objectives that are not being evaluated. The RFP is written to give evaluation credit to the areas that the user and PdM Bridging have identified as most important. Achievement of objectives not identified in section M.8.8 will not be given additional evaluation credit.	1-Feb-13	6-Feb-13
94	RFP	N/A	<p>Company XXX supports the full and open competition for the U.S. Army's acquisition of Bridge Erection Boats (BEB) pursuant to Solicitation Number W56HZV-12-R-0445. It is XXX's intent to construct a prototype BEB in order to test and validate its design against the U.S. Army's purchase specifications, including the requirement that the procured design be certified by a Notified Body pursuant to Section L.2.1 of the solicitation. In order to construct its prototype, fully test and validate its design, and obtain certification from a Notified Body, XXX respectfully requests an extension of the proposal deadline from March 11, 2013 to April 11, 2013.</p>	The Government does not plan to extend the response date for proposals at this time. Please see response to question #89 for more complete information on the requirement for a notified body signature.	1-Feb-13	11-Feb-13
95	RFP	Section L.3.1.1	<p>The first item to address is that the solicitation advises that "government tested" responses will be favored higher than responses that have not been tested by the government. Our understanding is that the current solicitation is to be considered a "fair and open solicitation". To our knowledge there have been a total of 3 prototype BEBs built that have been government tested. This would lead us to believe that the 3 manufactures have an unfair advantage in winning the award due to the vessels already being tested by the government. (Section L.3.1.1) Please clarify.</p>	The RFP is being issued for Full and Open Competition. Prior BEB development contracts were also awarded under Full and Open Competition. FAR 9.505-2(a)(3) acknowledges that development contractors may have a competitive advantage over those that did not participate in a development program, however such advantages are not considered unfair. The RFP was written to allow offerors to submit other forms of testing for evaluation by the Government in accordance with section L.3.1.1 in order to maximize opportunity to industry.	4-Feb-13	6-Feb-13
96	RFP and PD	Attachment 0023, PD 2.2.7, PD 3.2.1, PD 3.4.1.4 and PD 4.2.1	<p>There is a requirement that is not clear as there is a contradiction with-in the provided documents. The TIQ advises that the requirements listed require that it be "signed by a notified body". The reference to this is listed below: PD 2.2.7 European Commission PD 3.2.1 EU 94/25/EC. - "...be in compliance with..." PD 3.4.1.4 Buoyance. (Objective) - "...in accordance with Directive EU 94/25/EC." PD 4.2.1 EU 94/25/EC. - "...contractor shall provide certification that the BEB meets requirements..." and "A Notified Body is not required."</p> <p>This is understood that the EU 94/25/EC directive should be used as a guide or specification. However the (TIQ) Technical information Questionnaire definitely states "signed by a notified body" for Stability item #4, Structure item #6, Additional information #17, #18. Please clarify.</p>	Signature by a notified body is no longer required in response to the TIQ. Please see response to Question #89 for more complete information.	4-Feb-13	11-Feb-13
97	RFP	N/A	<p>We noted that the details of section L and section M were not included in the draft purchase description. The key elements of these two comprehensive sections add significantly to the scope of the requirements for the solicitation. This combined with the testing and documentation required by section L & M, and slow parts delivery from vendors, Company XXX. Requests an extension of 60 days be added to the due date of the solicitation.</p>	Sections L&M are not part of the purchase description or scope of work and in no way modify the requirements for contract execution. Potential bidders were advised in advance (via PROCNET) that test data would be considered in the selection of the production contractor. The Government cannot alter the current proposal due date due to vendor parts delivery delays.	4-Feb-13	6-Feb-13
98	PD	PD 3.4.4.2	<p>The crafts specification, 3.4.4.2 calls for a Global Positioning System (GPS) to be loaded with "world maps". The world maps loaded into a marine chart plotter sized for this craft will be rudimentary at best with no navigational detail. The detailed portion would come from the chart card, typically in SD card format, loaded into the machine by the operator for a particular region. A chart plotter with fully loaded world charts (maps) would be an Electronic Chart Display Information System (ECDIS) which is not appropriate for this platform.</p> <p>Is the intent of this specification to have a COTS marine chart plotter with a basic base world map and use a chart card for detailed chart information?</p>	The intent of this requirement is for the GPS to be delivered loaded with basic world maps. Any additional navigational data cards would be supplied by the end user.	6-Feb-13	11-Feb-13
99	PD	PD 3.4.3.3	<p>The crafts specification, 3.4.3.3, states the Battery Disconnect Master Switch shall disconnect all power from the batteries with the exception of the SINGARS radio and the bilge pumps. Craft specification section 3.4.4.2 states the GPS shall be wired to the BEB batteries.</p> <p>Please clarify if the GPS is wired directly to the batteries or wired through the circuit breaker panel.</p>	In this instance, wiring to the BEB batteries requires that the chart plotter be powered via the BEB batteries, rather than to a separate battery source. The chart plotter shall be wired through a circuit breaker in accordance with 3.4.3.6.	6-Feb-13	11-Feb-13
100	PD	PD 3.4.1.20	<p>Specification 3.4.1.20 calls for a removable crew station top designed for 25 knot winds and a 4-year service life. This requirement does not specify a hard top. Please clarify if the spec implies that a fabric top will meet the Army's intent.</p>	Any material that will withstand the requirements of 3.4.1.20 may be used for the crew station top.	6-Feb-13	11-Feb-13

Bridge Erection Boat (BEB)
W56HZV-12-R-0445
Question and Answer Log

101	PD	PD 3.4.1.21	<p>Specification 3.4.1.21 calls for a collapsible marine-grade enclosure for the crew station. The enclosure is to be designed for maximum field of view with transparencies, with a 4-year service life and shall not use hook and loop fasteners.</p> <p>Please confirm that the intent was for snap-on transparencies similar to marine applications such as "Eisenglass", or is it the Army's intent to have the enclosure designed with a rigid type material.</p>	Any material that meets the requirements stated in 3.4.1.21 may be used for the crew station enclosure.	6-Feb-13	11-Feb-13
102	RFP	Section B and section C.17.3	BEB RFP states that 11 BEB are to be priced under Item Number 0001. Ten BEB's for Production Qualification Test and one BEB for Logistics Demonstration. RFP Section C.17.3 Limited User Testing (LUT) requires for contractor support in the form of repair parts and technical support. Are LUT BEB's additional crafts to the Item Number 0001 11 BEB's? If so, how many?	Yes, LUT BEBs may be procured in SLIN 1001AA - BEB (OPTION 1). There is no definite quantity specified. See SLIN 1001AA for details.	6-Feb-13	11-Feb-13
103	RFP	FBO	Why does FEDBIZOPS announce that Amendment 4 was released when in fact the document itself is Amendment 0002? The last one said Amendment 3 but in fact the document was Amendment 0001. Now, I know that Amendment 1 and 2 were sent out prior to the issuance of the RFP and that they had no official Amendment number attached. My question is, the first two Amendments were two of seven changes to the original Presolicitation issued 9 Aug 2012, with the seventh Issued change being the Solicitation on 29 January 2013. What is the significant difference between the two changes that got an amendment number and the four (not five because the last was the Official RFP) other changes issued?	RESPONSE PENDING	7-Feb-13	
104	RFP	FBO	<p>I have received notice that Amendment No. 3 and Amendment No. 4 have been released. When clicking on the link to the Amendments, there are only Amendments "0001.pdf" and "0002.pdf" – both of which when opened are indeed, No's 0001 and 0002.</p> <p>I cannot seem to find 0003 and 0004 in the links provided under each Amendment notice.</p> <p>Am I missing something? Please clarify.</p>	RESPONSE PENDING	7-Feb-13	
105	PD	N/A	Wondering if the applique armor that is described within the solicitation is considered GFE (?)	RESPONSE PENDING	7-Feb-13	