

Question #18

Research Announcement, 9. Proposal Content, pg 10:

After the demonstration phase is completed, will the public, any nongovernmental entity, any ACTD competitor or future FTTS competitor have access to any competitor's ACTD Demonstration Vehicle? If the answer is yes, please indicate how a competitor can prevent the reverse engineering of proprietary design or unique configuration features of its demonstration vehicle.

Answer: Note that the research announcement is for the M&S Phase, not for the Demonstration Phase.

The Government currently intends to control the vehicles in a manner similar to a competitive production runoff test. Once the vehicle has completed demonstration, the Government has purchased the vehicle and the title resides in the Government; access would be unrestricted. The Military Utility Assessment Plan, which addresses these issues, will be finalized during the M&S Phase.

Question #19

FTTS Research Announcement, 9. Proposal Content Question:

After the demonstration phase is completed, will the public, any nongovernmental entity, any ACTD competitor or future FTTS competitor have access to the proprietary data or any modeling and simulation conclusions submitted by the competitors in this program? If the answer is yes, please indicate how a competitor can protect its proprietary information from disclosure to, and use by, the public, a nongovernmental entity, or a competitor.

Answer: Note that the research announcement is for the M&S Phase, not for the Demonstration Phase.

No. Reference Section 9.1.3(d) of the RA for identification of IP rights. Data developed at private expense and properly marked will not be available to third parties. Data or software developed with Government funding may be made available to third parties under the relevant regulations and statutes.

Question #20

Reference: Exhibit C, Page: 2, Paragraph: Block 13, Title: Security Guidance

Statement: On the DD Form 254 for W56HZV-04-Q-RA01, page 2, block 13, states "see attachments titled, "Security Classification Guide for Armor Materials (1-APR 2002) and Technology" and "Security Classification Guide for Low/Counter Low Observable (LO/CLO) Programs". (1 OCT 02) These documents are not found on the website.

Answer: The documents will be made available to proposers who are selected for the M&S phase.

Question #21

Reference: SOW, Page: 22-23, Paragraph: C.8, Title: Environmental Assessment

Statement: In Government responses released on May 27, 2004, reference ID # 285, the Government indicated that the language in SOW paragraph C.8 would be revised to read as follows:

"The Contractor shall not use cadmium (electroplating processes), hexavalent chromium (electroplating, and coating processes), asbestos, Class I or Class II Ozone-Depleting Substances, or other highly toxic or carcinogenic materials as defined in 29 CFR1910.1200 without Government approval."

The final Research Announcement released on July 9, 2004 did not contain this revision and still includes the original language contained in the draft announcement.

Question: When does the Government intend to revise paragraph C.8 as was indicated in their response on May 27, 2004?

Answer: The revised language was inadvertently not included in the research announcement's SOW. At the time of award, Paragraph C.8 will state, "The Contractor shall not use cadmium (electroplating processes), hexavalent chromium (electroplating, and coatings processes), asbestos, Class I or Class II Ozone-Depleting Substances, or other highly toxic or carcinogenic materials as defined in 29 CFR1910.1200 without Governmental approval."

Question #22

Reference: Research Announcement, Page: 11, Paragraph: 9.1.1; Element 1,

Title: Vehicle System Capabilities - Technical Proposal (Volume I)

Statement: We understand that the M & S and Design Work on the contract will include the development of both an MSV Truck and an MSV Trailer. Also, it appears that in the proposal the three Technology Solutions for Vehicle Capabilities in Element 1 for Mobility, Distribution and Force Sustainment must include the Trailer with the Truck.

Question:

a) Is it the Government's intention that three Technology Concepts for the Trailer capabilities also be addressed under Mobility, Distribution and Force Sustainment?

Answer: Trailer capabilities should not be addressed separately. The offeror shall provide no more than three candidate technologies in total for each capability listed in Element 1. Each of the three candidate technologies apply to the truck and trailer where applicable.

b) If the answer is yes, must the Trailer discussion fit within the 3 page limitation or will an additional 3 pages be allowed for the trailer?

Answer: See the response to 22 a).

Question #23

Para 9.1 of the RA requires that offeror's proposal be printable on 8 ½ x 11 paper. Can the program Schedule be formatted to 11 x 17?

Answer: No.

Question #24

Paragraph 3.9.1 of Attachment 2 indicates that the "UV CT will be employed throughout the UA/UE." There appears to be no other reference to FTTS use in the UE. Does this imply that the UV CT is required to interface with any other platform other than the UV? Please clarify UV CT use.

Answer: Yes. The UV CT may be required to be towed by current force vehicles in its weight class. Since the Unit of Employment has not been defined, therefore, a firm answer cannot be provided at this time. UV CT issues will be addressed during the M&S Phase.

Question #25

In Attachment 3A, the CT Maintenance Capability required on the Demonstrator indicates that the "CT shall utilize the FTTS UV to automatically collect maintenance and cargo (payload) data. In Attachment 3, there appears to be no requirement for the UV Demonstrator to have any system that must receive any such maintenance and cargo data. Please clarify. If such a capability is required please identify the specific maintenance and cargo data which is required.

Answer: See Q&A #8 in the 26 July 2004 update to the web site.

Question #26

In Paragraph 3.7.2.7 of Attachment 2, it requires vehicle cab interior foam thickness of 2 in. minimum. This was deleted in the final MSV spec and is now covered as a performance based requirement under 3.7.1. This was not changed in the UV spec. We recommend that the UV spec be revised accordingly.

Answer: Prior to award the Government will update the UV specification deleting the requirement for the vehicle cab interior foam thickness of 2 ins. minimum.

Question #27

Para 3.9.5.1.3.1 of Attachment 2 indicates that, if equipped with a combustion engine, the trailer must have a range of 93 miles. What is the range requirement if it does not have a combustion engine? The paragraph also indicates that this range is to be achieved over the OMS-MP. At what speeds is the trailer required to navigate the OMS-MP when used in this autonomous mode? If the trailer is being controlled from on board the UV, from what maximum distance must the trailer be controlled?

Answer: The range requirement is the same for the trailer with or without a combustion engine. The ride limiting speeds for the trailer are defined in specification Para 3.2.1.7.1 of Attachment 2. Currently, there is no requirement for the maximum distance.

Note that Para 3.9.5.1.3.1 Range is changed to only an objective performance requirement. The updated specification will be included in the award document.

Question #28

In Attachment 5A, Autonomous Operations is identified as a unique capability. Should this actually be defined as a Mobility Capability and be a sub-element under the same since it falls under 3.9.5.1.

Answer: In Attachment 5A, Autonomous Operation is identified as a performance parameter not a unique capability.

Question #29

Attachment 5 identifies the weighting of Objective Performance Parameters. How will the government treat those specification items that are not included in Attachment 5? Will a contractor receive a maximum evaluation score if it successfully addresses all objective performance requirements and identifies technology solutions for all those items?

Answer: All evaluation criteria are set forth in sections 9 & 10 of the RA.

Question #30

In response to a question on the draft, the government indicated that engine off driving and silent watch, as well as power generation, were a requirement on all vehicles. In spite of this, Tactical Security has a 0 weighting in Attachment 5, Objective Priorities. Does this mean that Tactical Security capability is not a priority objective capability and that a contractor's score for an objective capability solution will not be reduced if Tactical Security is not addressed?

Answer: All evaluation criteria are set forth in sections 9 & 10 of the RA. Tactical Security is not identified in Attachment 5.

Question #31

Under Distribution in Attachment 3, the demonstrator UV is to provide "Command and Control" for Distribution. Please further define this "Command and Control" capability to be demonstrated.

Also, this "Command and Control" capability is not identified as a weighted Objective capability. If it not an Objective capability why is it required on the demonstrator?

Answer: Command and Control capability is defined in Section C.4.4.2.2 – C.4.4.2.2.1.5 of the Scope of Work.

Not all demonstrator requirements are identified as objective performance capabilities. Attachment 3 defines the most important capabilities that should be demonstrated during the MUA.

Note in Attachment 3, "Command and Control" was improperly included under Distribution. It belongs under Network Centricity. The corrected Attachment 3 will be included in the award document.