

Question #1

Para C.1 of SOW indicates that the "SOW is broken down into two work efforts." It also indicates that "At the conclusion of the CDR, contractors will be required to submit a proposal for the Hardware Demonstration effort." It appears that, based on C.9.0, the post CDR Analysis effort is part of the Hardware Demonstration phase and that this analysis and all other items identified under the Hardware Demonstration phase will neither be costed under the Modeling and Simulation phase, nor part of the Cost Proposal (Volume II) for Phase 1. Please confirm.

Answer: True

Question #2

There is currently no requirement in the RA for either an Executive Summary or an introduction to the Technical Proposal. We would like TACOM to consider allowing bidders to include or provide the following:

- a. An Executive Summary of no more than 5 pages to provide an overview of the total proposal being offered to the US Government.
- b. An Introduction to the Technical Proposal volume of no more than 2 pages to provide an overview of the proposed concept.

Answer: All page limitations identified in the RA are Government recommendations only. It is up to the proposer to determine the value of additional pages if needed for an executive summary or introduction.

Question #3

a) In Attachment 5, under the "Distribution" Performance Parameter, the major weighting is identified as 0.1, with minor weighting of 0.4 for payload, 0.3 for transload, and 0.3 for material handling. However, there is no transload performance specification for the UV referenced. Attachment 5A appropriately separates the minor weighting for a similar situation. Please advise how the minor weighting will be handled. Please advise as to the impact on the minor weighting.

Answer: The transload requirement does not apply to the UV and will remain prioritized only in terms of payload and material handling. The major weight provides the overall weight of the war fighter capability; the minor weight provides weight to each specific requirement.

b) Also, the Attachment identifies Performance Parameters for Reliability, Availability and Training which are not considered in Attachment 3 or in Para 9 of the RA. How are these performance parameters to be considered in the technical proposal?

Answer: Reliability, Availability and Training are not identified in Attachment 3, Capabilities and Priorities. The proposer may choose to address them in their technical proposal under Element 2, in Section 9 of the Research Announcement.

Question #4

Under the "Deployability" Performance Parameter, its major weighting is only .05, 50% of the weighting of the "Training" parameter. Further, the C-130 requirement minor weighting is only .5 of the major weighting, and is less of a priority than water generation. Please clarify the apparent lack of importance/priority on C-130 transportability given the CSA's emphasis on C-130 transportability. Can/would the government accept a solution with an achieved priority weighting of .975 if it did not meet the C-130 transportability requirement? Should this specification actually be a pass/fail criterion?

Answer: The weighting has been provided to industry as a tool to formulate strategies for design trade-offs in the M&S phase if awarded. The weighting factors were based on current guidance as defined in the Warfighter Capabilities/Priorities. These priorities are under continuous review and are subject to change as the program matures.

Question #5

In Attachment 3, the UV Deployability capability describes preparation time requirements for transport but does not specify the types of transport requirements which must be met. Will the UV demonstrator have to meet C-130 transportation requirements?

Answer: Yes. See Attachment 2.

Question #6

Paragraph 9.1.1 of the Research Announcement indicates that the offeror must identify 3 technologies for achieving the performance specification for Survivability. However, the classified annexes containing the specifications are not provided. Further, para 10.1.i of the RA appears to indicate that contractors will be provided classified and FOUO information when "any resultant OT or contract involves access to information classified ..." If this is the case, how is the offeror to identify technologies to meet a specification when it does not know what the requirements are and therefore cannot determine the technology tasks associated with meeting the requirement?

Answer: See Amendment 0001 for revisions to Sections 9.1.1 Element 1 and 10.3.1 Element 1.

Question #7

In Attachment 3a, the Mobility capability item indicates that the trailer shall cause a mobility degradation of "not less than 20%". A) We assume this should be "not more than 20%." B) Please identify how this degradation percentage must be calculated.

Answer: Correct. It should state a degradation of not more than 20%. The degradation will be measured in terms of speed, comparing the prime mover over a specified course to the prime mover and trailer over a specified course. The Mobility capability item references in Attachments 1, 2, and 3a are changed from "not less than 20%" to "not more than 20%".

Question #8

In Attachment 3a, the maintenance capability indicates that the CT shall utilize the UV to automatically collect maintenance and cargo sustainment data. Please define what "Maintenance" and "Cargo sustainment" data must be collected, and what must be demonstrated.

Answer: Attachment 2 Section 3.6 defines the types of maintenance data that will need to be collected and reported. Cargo sustainment data is providing a system or method for identifying the cargo onboard the trailer or truck (i.e. RFID, scanning).

Question #9

Para 9.1.1, Element 2, of the RA requires the offeror to provide a detailed schedule for a Demonstrator build. However, in the case of survivability, it appears that the offeror cannot determine what technologies are required to meet the survivability specifications since they have not been provided. How can the offeror reasonably provide a detailed schedule if it does not know what technologies and, therefore, what hardware and associated prototype lead times must be built into such schedules?

Answer: This information is not necessary to complete the schedule.

Question #10

In Attachment 3a, under the UV Trailer Distribution capability, both threshold and objective requirements are identified. This is not the case on the vehicle. Why is there an objective requirement indicated? We understand that the purpose of the demonstrator is to meet mandatory threshold requirements?

Also, it indicates the CT shall be capable of transporting mission modules such as radars, UAV launchers, etc. Please indicate what systems must be

demonstrated during the MUA. Will the government provide technical information on such systems to insure the contractor can consider this in the M&S and design phase?

Answer: The Government recognizes that there is one objective contained in Attachment 3a. The Government expects to demonstrate the capabilities in 3a, and for some capabilities, greater than threshold is expected. The CDR down-select criteria will be provided as early as possible, but no later than at the M&S start of work meeting.

Question #11

Both paragraphs C.1.2.2.1.5 and C.1.2.2.2.6 of the SOW require Unit Production Costs based on volumes in Attachment 15. However, C.1.2.2.1.5 provides none of the detailed direction as to how this Unit Production Cost will be determined. In what "year" dollars are these costs to be calculated and in what year is production to commence? Please clarify.

Answer: The information requested is not needed for M&S proposal preparation.

Question #12

Paragraph C.1.2.2.2.6 of the SOW requires Unit Production Costs based on volumes in Attachment 15. It also provides guidelines for making the cost estimate which includes an assumption on production rates, and identification of the sensitivity of these costs to fluctuations in production rates. This appears to be a less than optimal means of directly comparing Unit Production Costs between offerors. Also the paragraph does not indicate the "year" dollars in which the cost is to be provided. The government knows the planned activation rate of the FCS UAs identified in Attachment 15. To insure fairness in evaluation, to minimize the effort in analyzing the cost data, and to insure accuracy, we recommend that the baseline Unit Production Cost estimate be based on quantities needed to support the Army's planned activation rate of these UAs, rather than a Contractor assumed rate which may have no relationship to the government's production requirements.

Answer: The information requested is not needed for M&S proposal preparation.

Question #13

Paragraph 2.1 of the UV specification references MIL-STD-462D. This was canceled and superceded by MIL-STD-461. There never was a MIL-STD-462E. References to MIL-STD-462 should be omitted.

Answer: Noted. All references to MIL-STD-462 will be replaced with MIL-STD-461E. This change is applicable for the MSV specification (Attachment 1) and UV specification (Attachment 2).

Question #14

Paragraph 3.3.5.9 of the UV specification would imply that all vehicle surfaces must be CARC.

Please clarify that CARC shall not be used in areas that will heat to temperatures at or above 400 degrees F. Also, please confirm that CARC is not required for off-the-shelf-parts.

Answer: CARC paint specifications provide application procedures for CARC paint. Surfaces that heat to temperatures above 400 degrees F should not be CARC painted. All parts on the exterior of the vehicle shall be CARC painted.

Question #15

In Exhibit A, CDRL A011 as written conflicts with SOW, paragraph C.3.4.1. CDRL requirement is believed to be in error. Delivery per C.3.4.1 is programmatically correct, i.e., delivery required 90 days prior to Acceptance Testing (AT).

Answer: Noted. The SOW is correct, the CDRL should read "90 days prior to AT".

Question #16

Paragraph 9.1.1 of the RA indicates that candidate technology solutions will be analyzed based on both the Hardware Demo timing and 2010. Given the recent announcement by DA of at least a 2 year slip in the fielding of FCS, will the government be adjusting the ACTD to recognize the reality of the change in the Army's FCS schedule and therefore the fielding of FTTS?

Answer: There will be no changes to the RA at this time.

Question #17

Statement: Element 1 of the solicitation instructions require that 3 technology solutions for Survivability be provided in the proposal. The specification paragraphs for "Survivability" and "Ballistic Protection" only reference Annex F and G. Reasonable technology solutions cannot be provided in the proposals without knowing the levels of the threats in each of these sections.

a) Will the Government provide Annexes F and G before the proposals are due to be submitted?

Answer: No

b) If these documents will not be provided in a timely manner to support proposal development, will the Government delete the requirement to address "Survivability" in the proposal?

Answer: No

c) If the answer is no to both questions, what guidance will the Government provide so meaningful technology solutions can be addressed in the proposal?

Answer: See Amendment 0001 for revised Sections 9.1.1 Element 1 and 10.3.1 Element 1 of the RA.