

After Action Report
Joint Light Tactical Vehicle
One-On-One Meetings with Potential Prime Offerors
October 11, 2011 through October 13, 2011 in Arlington, VA

The Government is providing the following after action report in accordance with FAR 15.201(f) to disclose information presented during meetings. In the event of a conflict between draft requirements (to include clarifications provided herein), and a final RFP, a final RFP will rule.

General Draft RFP Clarification: The Draft RFP was released with Australian requirements included. It is uncertain whether or not these will remain in any final RFP. At time of One-On-One Meetings, website accurately states that Australia has not yet formally committed to the EMD Phase of the program.

Section A - Draft Executive Summary

- The current target RFP release date is the beginning of December 2011, not end of December 2011. Page 5 shows a milestone chart of RFP release what may look like to be the end of Quarter 1 FY12.
- RFP Affordability of \$52 M was based upon a Government conducted bottoms-up estimate based upon EMD requirements. Options for additional level of effort (CLIN 0004) was not intended to be included within the \$52M and intended to be clarified on a final RFP.
- EMD Affordability paragraph is intended to be updated to state that a proposal that requests Government funding in excess of \$52M will be considered unaffordable. (ref Section L+M below)
- Page 4 outlines the Government's intent to award of a single Production contract award consisting of a base three year LRIP with an option for a five year multi-year contract for FRP with possible re-competition after initial Production contract award. This strategy correlates to the Section L + M Unit Manufacturing Cost (UMC) quantities (Army/USMC) and assumptions in Section L.5.1 (b) and (c) of 20,750 Vehicles. (Ref Section L+M).
- Page 4 Cost Target: All costs associated with what goes on every vehicle needs to be accounted for in terms of base vehicle cost target and would include any inherent protection.
- All Production affordability cost targets (AUMC, UMC) are intended to represent the price to the Government, not the cost to manufacture. This is intended to be clarified on a final RFP.
- Status of FY 12 funding: The Government provided that the MDA will not authorize the release of the final RFP unless the FY12 funding marks have been resolved

Section C

- Section 1.2: Section intended to be updated that will state that a CDRL submission is intended to cover all configurations (unless specifically stated otherwise in SOW) and can annotate any differences between configurations.
- Section 1.3: All Production affordability cost targets (AUMC, UMC) are intended to represent the price to the Government, not the cost to manufacture. This is intended to be clarified on a final RFP.
- The Government intends to further clarify the Purchase Description Tiers within the PD. This may include revision of currently defined tiers outlined in PD 2.9A.

- Section 4.3.2: Draft RFP does not currently have EVMS financial reporting requirements (subject to change/pending approval). Draft RFP IBR only intended to be conducted on schedule.
- Section 17.1: The Government intends to clarify the process for obtaining approval for test site to conduct Contractor Testing in Section 17.1. There is not currently a pre-defined list of “approved” test sites. Approval will be governed by the type of test being conducted.
- Section 17.1: Securing all appropriate resources (such as fuel, vehicle operator, etc) to conduct Contractor testing at approved site will be responsibility of the contractor.
- Section 17.1.2: Shakedown testing mileage will not count towards RAM. Shakedown testing is only being performed on 6 vehicles, not 20. (ref Attachment 37 below)
- Section C.17.3.1: The Government’s intent in having contractor conduct certain testing was to inform the kind of failures that could be anticipated prior to Government-run RAM testing. It may help both contractor and the Government to anticipate these issues prior to CAP 1.
- Section C.21: The Government and Contractor will have to both accept risk in not having a configuration vehicle for JLTV-UTL to address any JLTV-UTL specific issues.

Section L & M

- Unaffordable proposals is further clarified to mean proposals that request more than \$52M in Government funding (M.2(g)), and would not include proposed amount in CLIN 0004. Section L.8.8 does allow for Cost-share proposal on cost CLIN(s), which could enable a proposal to exceed \$52M for contract (excluding Option) and still be considered affordable.
- UMC assumption of 20,750 vehicles correlates to the current expected quantities for Army and USMC that align with the Executive Summary Production strategy (page 4) of a single Production contract award consisting of a base three year LRIP with an option for a five year multi-year contract for FRP with possible re-competition after initial Production contract award.
- The Government intends to evaluate current level of maturity of the proposed design, and does not intend to give credit for future maturity.
- The UMC is intended to represent the price to the Government, not the cost to manufacture. This is intended to be clarified on a final RFP.

Attachment 2

- The Government believes the approach in EMD is an NDI approach with a fairly mature design at time of contract proposal. From that perspective, the Government anticipates a minimal amount of non-reoccurring cost during EMD, most of which would be in the GFE integration area, and that would be allocated to the configurations.

Attachment 37

- Only 6 vehicles will be selected for Shakedown Test.
- 20,000 miles are planned for each vehicle designated for Government RAM testing.
- Revised draft attachment intended to be re-released containing relevant new information.

Attachment FF

- This attachment incorrectly has an objective requirement (PDFOV-8201) and contains several requirements no longer in PD. A revised draft is anticipated to be released. The JLTV Purchase Description (PD) tiers were not intended to be relevant during source selection process. The Government intends to provide further explanation on PD tiers.

Purchase Description (PD) 2.9A

- Final PD will be dependent upon completion of CDD JROC staffing. Any changes from the AROC staffing that was just completed or from the ongoing JROC staffing could lead to updates to the PD. JROC review of the CDD is expected to be completed in Nov/Dec 2011. Significant changes are not expected.
- The Government intends to further clarify the tiers within the PD. This may include revision of tiers outlined in PD 2.9A.
- There is a conflict between Annex K and the section following PDFOV-2228 of the Purchase Description. The intent is for final PD to only have one intercom, but has not been resolved yet.
- There is a conflict between PDFOV-880 and Paragraph 1.1 of the Purchase Description. Paragraph 1.1 intended to be updated to "Protection Level 2".
- Clarified that the PD is intended to be modified to require the JLTV to support 2 enclaves (classified and unclassified) plus 1 colorless enclave for WIN-T configurations. This relates to PDFOV-1999 and others.
- PDFOV-7278 was clarified and is intended to be updated to read that part of trailer must be visible, and that requirement shall be met with direct line of sight or mirror(s).