

## Joint Light Tactical Vehicles Low Rate Initial Production and Full Rate Production 1st Draft RFP Q&amp;A Spreadsheet

The Government has considered all questions raised during the One-on-One meetings and submitted through the JLTV email box [usarmy.detroit.acc.mbx.wrn-jltv-rfp@mail.mil] by July 15, 2014, in response to the June 26, 2014 Draft RFP release. To the extent appropriate, your questions have been addressed either in the updated Draft RFP released on October 08, 2014, or will be addressed in the final RFP, scheduled to be released in early November. For those questions that have not been addressed in either the updated draft or the final RFP, those responses are answered below. If offerors still have questions after the Final RFP is released, the Government encourages raising these questions for further adjudication in accordance with the instructions provided on the website at the time of Final RFP release.

Question No.	Subject / RFP Reference (26Jun2014)	Question	Answer
1	Section E, E.3.1.7, E.9.2.1	E-6, E.3.1.7, E.9.2.1: Can the government confirm that welds determined to be ballistic, that have joint designs or thicknesses not covered in Appendix B and table B3.1 of GCVWC – Steel, are considered to be validated through the prototype structure test weldment provision in the general qualification section (4.3.7) of GCVWC-Steel?	All Ballistic Welds for steel have to conform to Appendix B of the GCVWC 12479550. Different Armors Ballistic test plates shall be prepared for each type and class of armor used. The Thickness ranges per Table 3.1 in GCVWC 12479550 explain thicknesses from 1/8" to unlimited. Ballistic welds for steel require qualification of a H-Plate per section B3.7 and shall be qualified as such.
2	Attachment 70, Installed Kits Tabs	Since the BII is identified and priced on the Installed Kits tabs should industry exclude BII from the Vehicles tabs?	BII is identified as a kit, separately from the vehicle price, as Installed Kits and Packaged Kits. BII should be priced as shown on the applicable kit worksheets in Attachment 0070. BII should not be included in the Offeror's proposed vehicle prices.
3	PD Spec, Annex G	Industry interprets this requirement to mean that on at least two successive occasions the loader shall be able to select a missile of any desired type and remove it without removing any other missile first. If this is not correct please provide clarification.	The assumption is wrong. Annex G V0.AB.02, requirement PDG-68 means that the loader always needs to be able to access missiles from the rack regardless of the number of missiles in the rack.
4	Section C, SOWC-4251	"The Contactor shall make the quantity per assembly, and the quantities per end item, the same to ensure compatibility with the US Army Logistics Modernization Program (LMP). Does the USMC use LMP? Is there an equivalent USMC program for which we will be required to enter the PPL data?"	USMC does not use LMP and does not require a separate program for PPL data.
5	PD Spec, PDFOV-8804	Requirement states "...mounted weapons or and ammunition...". What does "or and" mean in this context?	The "or and" is an editing error. It should say "and". The or will be removed in the Final RFP.
6	Section C, SOWC-4245, page 67	How many workstations/vehicles will be running at the same time during the Log Demo? Will the Log Demo include insertion of faults into hardware?	Question: How many workstations/vehicles will be running at the same time during the Log Demo? Answer: Six production representative vehicles will be available for LOG Demo. The Government expects to establish a minimum of 3 workstations (6 max).  Question: Will the Log Demo include insertion of faults into hardware? Answer: Yes, Government expects that some hardware and some simulated faults will be inserted. Goal is not to break or damage any parts/components. Reference C.2.3.3.11 (Fault Inducement Kit).
7	Section L, L.2.3, page 240	The Government has specified that each paragraph of the proposal include a reference number. As was provided for the CD Labeling convention, can the Government provide an example of the paragraph referencing convention that Offerors should use to make the evaluation process uniform and in accordance with evaluator expectations?	The Contractor may utilize any Contractor formatted paragraph referencing convention as long as that convention does not conflict with any of the proposal preparation instructions contained within Section L or any other instructions of the RFP.
8	Section L, L.2.7, page 241	Classified information must be delivered separately from the unclassified proposal, and classified information will not be included in whole or in part within any unclassified volume proposal response. However, if the Offeror chooses to hand-deliver the proposal response in person, can BOTH the classified and unclassified proposal responses be delivered at the same time, separately packaged and marked accordingly, to ensure the data/time stamp validates that the entire proposal response - classified and unclassified - has been received on time?	No. Offerors must follow the instructions for submitting proposals in L.2.7 (Unclassified Proposal Submission Address), L.2.6 (Method of Submission for Unclassified Proposal), and L.2.7 (Procedure for Submitting Classified Info) in the final RFP.
9	Purchase Description, PDFOV-875, page 19 and PDFOV-8761, page 92	PDOV-875 states that everywhere in the ATPD where it says 'JLTV' means all JLTV variants, base vehicle platforms, mission package configurations, all Contractor-furnished (CFE) kits, contractor furnished GFE integration kits/components, and the companion trailer. PDFOV-8761 states the JLTV shall demonstrate a point estimate for MMBEFF. This infers that the MMBEFF requirement is against the vehicle and the trailer combined. Please clarify what the 325 MMBEFF requirement applies against.	The reliability requirement for mean miles between essential function failure applies to the both the prime mover and the companion trailer. Essential function failures attributed to the prime mover will be used in the reliability calculation for the prime mover. Essential function failures attributed to the companion trailer will be used in the reliability calculation for the companion trailer.  The requirement will be used to calculate MMBEFF for the prime movers and trailers independently.

10	Section C, SOWC- 2738 1.3.5.3.1, page 35	When is the TDP required to meet the modeling standards listed in attachments 0023 and 0024? Assuming Gov Part Numbers are issued at contract award, 150 days is not enough time to have all models/drawings/lists converted to meet the TDP standards in Attachment 0023 and Attachment 0024 (SOWC-4147).	During the PBR, only the assembly level TDP is required to be displayed/reviewed. But during the initial PCA, the TDP shall meet the modeling standards listed in Attachments 0023 and 0024.
11	Section C, SOWC-4602 2.6, page 92	Is there a difference between the TDP Options Worksheet for the Purchase Option and the required TDP defined in 2.1.1.6.1? To what level of supplier does this option apply?	No, there is no difference in requirements except for the level of rights given to the government if the TDP option is exercised. The intent of this language is to reinforce that regardless of TDP ownership the contractor is expected to maintain a TDP to the maturity level specified in Attachments 0023 and 0024.  The requirement in Section 2.6 applies to the prime contractor. However, subcontractors must provide the necessary data for the offeror to comply with these requirements.
12	Section C, 2.6.2.2, page 92	No CREO software version is defined in this statement. Is CREO Parametric 2.0 acceptable?	In accordance with C.2.6.5, the Government intends to upgrade to newer software versions as they become available and are approved for use. While CREO Parametric 2.0 may be the current version of the software, CREO Parametric 3.0 is due to be released later this year and will likely be the version in use at the time of contract award.
13	M.4.2.4.1.3	1. How will the four possible multipliers (0.00, 0.33, 0.67 and 1.00) be applied? Is there rounding – i.e., if one proposed TDP offers 40% of full competitive utility and another offers 20%, will they both be rounded to the 0.33 multiplier? What if one proposal offers 45% of full competitive utility and another offers 55%? Will the former be rounded to 0.33 and the latter rounded to 0.67?  2. To receive a 1.00 multiplier, the TDP has to have “full competitive utility” and have no source-controlled components. Does that mean that a TDP that offers 99% of what the government seeks (e.g., only one source controlled component) will receive a multiplier of only 0.67?  3. Will the government consider a multiplier that accurately reflects the extent to which the proposed TDP rights provide the government full competitive utility – i.e., a proposal that would give the government a TDP that provides half of what the government considers full competitive utility would receive a multiplier of 0.50?	1. One multiplier will be selected after evaluation of the competitive utility of the offeror’s proposed TDP. There is no calculation based on percentages, nor is there rounding to determine the multiplier to be applied.  2. In order to receive a 1.00 multiplier, there cannot be any proposed OEM source controlled components. This does not mean that there cannot be any source controlled components. For example, a TDP which proposes a source controlled transmission from a commercial supplier (e.g. Allison Transmission, Caterpillar, Ford Motor Company, General Motors, etc) would still be eligible for a 1.00 multiplier. If the proposed TDP features one OEM source controlled component, the highest multiplier possible for that TDP would be 0.67.  3. No, the evaluation will be conducted IAW the requirements specified in Section M of the RFP.
14	Section C, Para 2.4.2.1, Page 87 Section H, Para 2.1, Page 173	The Draft RFP states that contractor performance in government testing will be written into the contract for Tier 2-5 requirements for which non-compliance was claimed in the RFP response. How will this be handled for items which were traded away?	Section H.2 contained in the second Draft RFP has been updated to clarify how tier 2-5 traded requirements will be reinstated. Section H.2.1 states: The PQT results will be utilized to establish a production baseline. In addition to the requirements set forth in Attachment 0001, all other threshold requirements set forth in Attachment 0087 will also be assessed during PQT. For those requirements set forth in Attachment 0087, the level of performance that is demonstrated at PQT will become part of the production baseline and added into Attachment 0001 via a contract modification at no additional cost to the government.
15	Transparent Armor ATPD Compliance / ENG sPD-MB VO.AB.00 PDFOV-3190 Section 4	Please confirm the government’s intent is to require the non-ballistic certifications for TA as described in Tier 4 PDFOV-3190 Section 4 and that the reference to ATPD 2352 Table III requirements in Annex E Section 4 of Tier 1 PDE-56, PDE-58 and PDE-115 are applicable only after contract award. This approach is consistent with previous proposals and contract awards.	The certifications is not necessary until after contract award as part of the system compliance as a part of contract performance. However, the contractor should adhere to the guidance in L & M for RFP submission and evaluation.
16	C4ISR Data Bus / ENG sPD-MB VO.AB.00 PDFOV-2346	This is not the connection interface between GFE JCR/JBC-P software and the GFE JCR/JBC-P hardware that was tested during the EMD phase.  Is the traffic between the GFE JCR/JBC-P software and the GFE JCR/JBC-P hardware intended to be routed across the C4ISR databus?	The JCR/JBC-P integration shall maximize to the extent possible the use of the C4ISR databus without redesign of GFE interfaces.  There is a requirement in C.2.1.4.7.1 that states the vendors can’t modify GFE. Therefore, it is required unless all possible interface design implementation methods that would enable its use are restricted due to the GFE hardware.
17	Fuel Efficiency Testing - Fan / ENG sPD-MB VO.AB.00 PDFOV-3338 Section 4	Per section 3.2 (9) of TOP 2-2-603A, “Temperature controlled fan drives locked in same operating mode (on/off) throughout the test.”  Will temperature controlled fan drives be locked in the on or off position for test?	Temperature controlled fans will be locked in the on-position. No changes to TOP 2-2-603A from EMD testing are anticipated.

18	Intercom System Kits / ENG sPD-MB V0.AB.00 Annex K, Table 2.1 and Table 2.2	Table 2.1 and Table 2.2 of Annex K identify the CFE Intercom System Kit as part of Baseline Equipment for only the HGC. Is it correct that the CFE Intercom System Kit is not Baseline Equipment for the GP, CCWC, or UTL?	Yes, the CFE Intercom System Kit is not baseline equipment for the GP, CCWC, or UTL
19	CCWC Hatch Storage / ENG sPD-MB V0.AB.00 PDFOV-8302	This PDFOV has been modified from the EMD Phase to include the requirement to store the GPK/TO-GPK hatch. To meet this requirement, is it permissible to utilize existing GPK hardware locations that do not irreversibly modify the GPK or interfere with operation?	No, is it not permissible to utilize existing GPK hardware locations that do not irreversibly modify the GPK or interfere with operation.
20	TOW Missile / ENG sPD-MB V0.AB.00 PDFOV-8801	When will complete model/ICD information be provided on the TOW BB RF missile for offeror evaluation of compliance?	The Government intends to provide ICDs or points of contact, for the complex systems added to the Annex K that were not part of the EMD contract, through a PCO letter after the release of the Final RFP for proposal purposes.
21	PMCS Time / ENG sPD-MB V0.AB.00 PDFOV-2989	Does the total time allowable regarding the requirement within PDFOV-2989 equate to the before interval crew level PMCS tasks?	The PMCS, in total, shall require no more than PD time requirement to complete, which includes the before interval crew level PMCS task.
22	Government Furnished Information	Annex K: Does the Government plan on providing the Government Furnished Information (GFI) for the new items (not seen in EMD) in Annex K in advance of the contract release? Alternatively, will the Government consider "sponsoring" a vendor when needed to allow the vendor to obtain the information directly from GFE manufacture prior to award?	The Government intends to provide ICDs or points of contact, for the complex systems added to the Annex K that were not part of the EMD contract, for proposal purposes.
23	Specification Sheet / Draft Solicitation Section L.4.1.3 & Attachment 65	Section L.4.1.3 specifies "For each test event used as substantiating data, the Offeror shall submit an as-tested specification sheet to detail the vehicle configuration for each test event used as substantiating data. The as-tested specification sheet shall be submitted in accordance with Attachment 0065 (Spec Sheet)." Attachment 0065 requests under "Preceding Specification Sheet #" the following: Identify the specification sheet documenting the previous configuration of the same vehicle (if applicable). Please clarify what the "previous configuration of the same vehicle" refers to. Also, does "as-tested" refer to the offeror's EMD configuration only? For example, if an offeror is submitting substantiating data that was developed using its technology development phase vehicle, would this be considered as the "previous configuration" to the "as-tested configuration" during EMD? For all areas a specification sheet is called out, such as for attachment 65 and additional specification sheets called out within attachment 65, is the format to be the same as provided in attachment 64?	Q1: "Please clarify what the "previous configuration of the same vehicle" refers to." A1: The "previous configuration of the same vehicle" refers to the configuration described by the previous as-tested specification sheet provided for a given vehicle. Q2: "Also, does "as-tested" refer to the offeror's EMD configuration only?" A2: No. A specification sheet is required for any test event supplied as substantiating data, including but not limited to: tests performed by the Government, a third party tester, or the Offeror, and in any timeframe before, during, or after the EMD phase. Q3: "For example, if an offeror is submitting substantiating data that was developed using its technology development phase vehicle, would this be considered as the "previous configuration" to the "as-tested configuration" during EMD?" A3: The example is answered by Q1 and Q2 directly above. Q4: "For all areas a specification sheet is called out, such as for attachment 65 and additional specification sheets called out within attachment 65, is the format to be the same as provided in attachment 64?" A4: Offerors may provide several As-Tested Specification Sheets (Att 0065) with their proposal. The "Preceding Specification Sheet" mentioned in Att 0065 would be the As-Tested Specification Sheet (Att 0065) documenting the previous configuration of the same vehicle (if applicable). The "Next Specification Sheet" mentioned in Att 0065 would be the As-Tested Specification Sheet (Att 0065) documenting the next configuration of the same vehicle (if applicable). The format for as-tested specification sheets is Attachment 0065. The format for the Proposed Specification Sheet is Attachment 0064.
24	MaxTTR / ENG sPD-MB V0.AB.00 PDFOV-3956	Can an offeror assume this requirement is with a 2 person crew, thus the requirement would equate to 5.0 maintenance man hours?	No, Field Level Max TTR requirement is not changed regardless of number of people. MaxTTR requirement at the field level is measured in clock-hours and is not limited by number of mechanics. Whereas, MaxTTR requirement for crew level is limited to two crew maximum.
25	MTTR / ENG sPD-MB V0.AB.00 PDFOV-2975	Can an offeror assume that MTTR is calculated for Field Level maintenance actions only?	Yes, MTTR is calculated for Field Level maintenance actions only.

26	Automated Reporting / ENG sPD-MB V0.AB.00 PDFOV-9508	Please clarify the intent of an "automated reporting system" as it may affect Information Assurance requirements. Installing additional software beyond what was tested through EMD will add IA risk. Is the government requiring an additional piece of software to be installed on smart displays to manage all applications on each unit or does the automated reporting system functionality that is core to most COTS operating systems meet this intent?	PDFOV-9508 is a valid requirement. Contractor's may need to add software to meet this requirement depending on design. OS COTS solutions most likely will not meet this requirement.
27	Audit Logging / ENG sPD-MB V0.AB.00 PDFOV-9482	Where is the audit logging capability required to be hosted and are the audit logs required to be stored for the network switch?	1. The host location of the audit logging capability is design specific and not mandated by requirements. 2. Yes. Audit logs are required to be stored for the network switch.
28	NMWR / Draft Solicitation Section SOWC-4237	Per Para 2.3.4.13 - The Contractor shall develop Preliminary National Maintenance Work Requirement (NMWR) procedures...  Are the required NMWR's limited to stand-a-lone publications in support of secondary reparables, or will a reset/system NMWR be required as well to support a complete sustainment level overhaul of the vehicle?	Section C.2.3.4.12 states: The Contractor shall develop Preliminary National Maintenance Work Requirement (NMWR) procedures including Repair Parts and SpecialTools List (RPSTL), containing all procedures and tasks required to perform Sustainment level maintenance tasks as identified in the Maintenance Task Analysis (MTA) and associated support item's Logistics Product Data (LPD) contained within PowerLOG-J. NMWR content shall be mirrored in PowerLOG-J, within the appropriate associated record fields, to support and allow for quick updates to NMWRs based upon changes to LPD. NMWRs shall be developed IAW MIL-STD 40051-2B and NMWR Content Selection Matrix - TABLE A-VII NMWR Requirements Matrix (Attachment 0042, DMWR_NMWR Requirements Matrix) and be compatible with the EMS-NG software provided to the Contractor as GFE. The Contractor shall deliver the Sustainment Level Preliminary NMWRs within 60 days after validation.  Yes, the required NMWR's are limited to stand-a-lone publications in support of secondary reparables, and there are no requirements for NMWR for reset/system NMWR in the scope of work.
29	L.4.1.4 and M.4.1 / Primary Technical Factor	Draft RFP Section L.4.1.4 Substantiating Data and M.4.1 Primary Technical Factor: Will Final government test reports from the EMD phase be provided to offerors prior to Final RFP release?	As Government test reports are received from the test sites, they will be reviewed internally, after which they may be shared with the EMD contractors.
30	L.4.1.4 and M.4.1 / Primary Technical Factor	Draft RFP Section L.4.1.4 Substantiating Data and M.4.1 Primary Technical Factor: How will test reports that indicate a "fail" but which the JPO has identified as being a "pass," be updated; or will corrective documentation be provided to support government review?	JPO-JLTV will not update or provide corrective documentation to any Government test reports.
			<p>1. The following is an example of a proposed highest TDP price of \$1 with a 0.67 Competitive Utility Multiplier, where X= the Highest Proposed TDP price.</p> <p>Per M.4.2, <math>TEC/P = \text{Evaluated Contract Cost/Price} * (M.4.2.2) - LCC \text{ Adjustment} ** (M.4.2.3) - TDP \text{ Adjustment} (M.4.2.4) - \text{Tier 1 Objective Adjustment} **</math></p> <p>*For purposes of this example, assume the Evaluated Contract Cost/Price is \$1,000,000,001, which includes a \$1 Highest Proposed TDP Price from Attachment 0070 in accordance with M.4.2.2.4</p> <p>**For purposes of this example, assume the LCC Adjustment and Tier 1 Objective Adjustment are \$0.</p> <p>Therefore:</p> <p><math>TEC/P = \\$1,000,000,001 (\text{Evaluated Contract Cost/Price}) - \\$0 (LCC \text{ Adjustment}) - \\$? (TDP \text{ Adjustment to be determined below}) - \\$0 (\text{Tier 1 Objective Adjustment})</math></p> <p>Since the TDP Price &lt;\$511M, the applicable TDP Adjustment formula per M.4.2.4.1 is: <math>TDP \text{ Adjustment} = X + ((Z - X) * Y)</math>.</p> <p>X = Offeror's Highest Proposed TDP Price Y = Competitive Utility Multiplier (See M.4.2.4.2.3) Z = Government Baseline Savings (See M.4.2.4.1.2)</p>

M.4.2.4.1: Can the government please provide numerical examples of how the TDP Adjustment will be calculated and applied to the TEC/P?

- One example where the TDP price is below the \$511M  
 One example where the TDP price is over the \$511M

The RFP does not indicate the period in which the Government would exercise the TDP option if they chose to do so. Can the Government clarify the timing of this?

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TDP Adjustment} &= X + ((Z - X) * Y) \\ \text{TDP Adjustment} &= \$1 + ((\$511,000,000 - \$1) * 0.67) \\ \text{TDP Adjustment} &= \$1 + ((\$510,999,999) * 0.67) \\ \text{TDP Adjustment} &= \$1 + (\$342,369,999) \\ \text{TDP Adjustment} &= \$342,370,000 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore:

$$\text{TEC/P} = \$1,000,000,001 \text{ (Evaluated Contract Cost/Price)} - \$0 \text{ (LCC Adjustment)} - \$342,370,000 \text{ (TDP Adjustment)} - \$0 \text{ (Tier 1 Objective Adjustment)}$$

$$\text{TEC/P} = \$657,630,001$$

2. The following is an example of a highest proposed highest TDP price of \$512M with a 0.67 Competitive Utility Multiplier, where X= the Highest Proposed TDP price.

$$\text{Per M.4.2, TEC/P} = \text{Evaluated Contract Cost/Price} * (\text{M.4.2.2}) - \text{LCC Adjustment} ** (\text{M.4.2.3}) - \text{TDP Adjustment (M.4.2.4)} - \text{Tier 1 Objective Adjustment} **$$

\*For purposes of this example, assume the Evaluated Contract Cost/Price is \$1,512,000,000, which includes a \$512,000,000 Highest Proposed TDP Price from Attachment 0070 in accordance with M.4.2.2.4

\*\*For purposes of this example, assume the LCC Adjustment and Tier 1 Objective Adjustment are \$0.

Therefore:

$$\text{TEC/P} = \$1,512,000,000 \text{ (Evaluated Contract Cost/Price)} - \$0 \text{ (LCC Adjustment)} - \$? \text{ (TDP Adjustment to be determined below)} - \$0 \text{ (Tier 1 Objective Adjustment)}$$

Since the TDP Price > \$511M, the TDP Adjustment per M.4.2.4.1 equals the Offeror's Highest Proposed TDP Price.

Therefore:

$$\text{TDP Adjustment} = \$512,000,000$$

Therefore:

$$\text{TEC/P} = \$1,512,000,000 \text{ (Evaluated Contract Cost/Price)} - \$0 \text{ (LCC Adjustment)} - \$512,000,000 \text{ (TDP Adjustment)} - \$0 \text{ (Tier 1 Objective Adjustment)}$$

$$\text{TEC/P} = \$1,000,000,000$$

3. The TDP may be purchased at any time IAW Attachment 0070 and M.4.2.2.4

32	E-6, E.3.1.7, E.9.2.1	E-6, E.3.1.7, E.9.2.1: Can the government confirm the exterior welds exposed to under body blast, direct fire, and fragmentation are critical as defined by the Ground Combat Vehicle Weld Code – Steel?	<p>A Contractors interpretation of the Ground Combat Vehicle Weld Code should be based on the Contractor's vehicle design.</p> <p>Critical Weld is defined as following (per Attachment 0059, Table 1, Armor Steel, Ground Combat Vehicle Welding Code -Steel TACOM Drawing Number 12479550, paragraph 6.6.2.2):</p> <p>This class of welds applies to highly stressed joints in readily weldable steel alloys, and to joints in steel alloys requiring special welding procedure controls. Readily weldable alloys are defined in 6.6.1.2.</p> <p>This class of weld is applicable to all weld joints where failure of the joint would likely result in personnel injury, loss of life, or a mission-critical failure. This class of welds is not applicable to ballistic joints.</p> <p>Examples of weldments in this category include highly stressed carriage and vehicle components and assemblies, leakproof containers, and pressure tight vessels.</p> <p>NOTE: There is a typo (error) in the Ground Combat Vehicle Welding Code -Steel TACOM Drawing Number 12479550, paragraph 6.6.2.2. The paragraph 6.6.2.2 references paragraph 6.7.1.2, which does not exist. It is actually referencing 6.6.1.2.</p>
----	-----------------------	--	--

Distribution Statement A – Approved for Public Release; distribution unlimited

UNCLASSIFIED