

AEODRS Industry Day, 6 October 2011

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

1. Contracting Officer's Comments - IHD Contracts

1.1. Can you go over the program plan/schedule again and talk to the timelines for PSI acquisition/RFP/award/start of work?

1.1.1. RFP release is anticipated in March 2012 with contract award anticipated in Feb 2013. However, all interested parties are advised to monitor FedBizOpps for the most current status.

2. AEODRS Overview - PMS-408/TECHDIV

2.1. Is the 18" culvert a round, square, or other cross-section (i.e. pipe or tunnel)?

2.1.1. Circular cross-section with an 18" diameter.

2.2. There are separate capability modules for Manipulator, End Effect and Visual Sensors - what is the required End Effect of Increment 1 if not manipulation or sensing?

2.2.1. The end-effector is the gripper. The manipulator does not include the gripper. There is a defined interface between the manipulator and end-effector.

2.3. Is the comms subsystem a subsystem in the JAUS sense of the word?

2.3.1. No. It does not have its own subsystem ID. Each end of the Comms subsystem is part of either the OCU or UGV.

2.4. Have the requirements for autonomous behaviours been defined?

2.4.1. Yes. Refer to the AEODRS Documentation Package, Version 1.1. Applicable documents are ADD-AB, MPS-AB, and ICD-AB.

2.5. Byron mentioned that the gov't-developed software and technical packages would be released to industry "at the appropriate time". Is that before or after the PSI RFP is released?

2.5.1. They will be released with the RFP.

2.6. Just to confirm: the AB-module is *not* build to print?

2.6.1. Correct.

2.7. What EOD effect is Inc 1 required to deliver? Is there a requirement to integrate or carry/drop an EOD disruptor? Will there be an integral firing circuit to enable the delivery on an EOD effect at the target?

2.7.1. See draft SOW section 1.3 for answer to question 1. There is no firing circuit required for Increment 1. The Government expects that the vehicle may transport energetic tools that fall within the load carrying capacity of the manipulator.

2.8. Does being a provider of competing robotic technologies and systems in any way affect our ability to compete for and win the contract for lead systems integration? Will our status be a consideration in the contract award decision?

2.8.1. The Government is continuing its review of this question. An answer will be posted at a later date.

2.8.2. Would the PSI for Increment 1 be allowed to compete for Capability Modules in Increments 2 and 3?

2.8.2.1. The Government is continuing its review of this question. An answer will be posted at a later date.

2.8.3. It would seem there would be some reluctance on the government's part and on the part of the companies providing CM's to have a robotics technology company that produces systems that would compete with the AEODRS produced systems run the Integration. Is this the case?

2.8.3.1. No

2.9. Whose responsibility is integration of the UGV system into the wider System of Interest, e.g. interoperability with ECM, integration of Inc 3 into vehicles, etc.?

2.9.1. Clarification to Question: ECM=CREW

2.9.2. The Government will be responsible for integration into wider system of interest. Increment 3 will be addressed when that increment is initiated.

2.10. If we were to win the Systems Integration piece of Increment 1 would there be any type of obstacle to us competing for future command modules or Systems Integration on Increments 2 and 3

2.11. The Government is continuing its review of this question. An answer will be provided at a later date.

2.12. For future Software or Firmware upgrades, will the government have to go back to the original module creator for updates, or does the government own rights to the SW and FW on the module?

2.12.1. The Government does not intend to own the rights to industry developed hardware and software.

2.13. Can you send the overview slides to the attendees?

2.13.1. Yes, all slides will be posted to FedBizOpps

2.14. Please provide details on current contracted CM vendor's contact information

2.14.1. APL POC is Michael Zeher at (443) 778-9945 and Michael.Zeher@jhuapl.edu.

2.15. Will an attendee list be provided?

2.15.1. Yes, the attendee list will be posted to FedBizOpps.

3. Review of Draft Statement of Work - TECHDIV

3.1. Quantities for Phase I and Phase II?

3.1.1. Please see section 3.2.20 for the draft SOW for Phase I quantities. The maximum number of systems to be procured in Phase II will be specified in the RFP.

3.2. Please give more details of the expected format of the training required under Section 3.3.4 of the SoW.

3.2.1. Further details will be provided in the RFP.

3.2.2. Noting the reference in 3.2.11 to a Training Simulator

3.2.2.1. SOW section 3.2.11 requires contractor to provide simulator data package for each CM.

3.3. It may have already been covered but, is it assumed that award and execution of phase I does not commit the gov't to award phase II?

3.3.1. Correct. Phase II will be an option under the PSI contract. It is the Government's unilateral right to exercise a contract option and the Government is under no obligation to exercise an option once a contract is awarded.

3.4. Can the PSI have an ongoing presence during pPRM transition period? Can the PSI maintain staff on site to facilitate transition?

3.4.1. This question was meant to ask about an ongoing presence at JHUAPL during EMD to LRIP transition.

3.4.2. Yes, assuming the PSI's onsite personnel are U.S. citizens.

3.5. Once this moves into Phase II and system delivery begins, who will be responsible should there be need for repairs upon delivery before the robots enter service. Will it be the PSI? Will it be the CM module owner?

3.5.1. It is assumed that the CM module owner will be a subcontractor to the PSI. As the Government never has a contractual relationship with subcontractors, the PSI would determine who is responsible - the prime or the sub - for making the repairs should a system be damaged upon delivery or discovered to be inoperable. The Government's contractual relationship is with the PSI, not the individual subcontractors.

3.6. Who determines the Class of the ECP?

3.6.1. The Government has the final determination of the ECP class.

3.7. Will the PSI be responsible for the safety, integrity and security of the individual capability modules that it receives for integration?

3.7.1. Yes.

3.8. Are the capability modules and subsystems GFM to the PSI?

- 3.8.1. *None of the Capability Modules will be provided GFE/GFM during the Limited Production/Production phases.*
- 3.9. How much power does the PSI have to dictate changes to the CM's should they be required to make the systems work together? All of the modules are supposed to be a "black box" so in theory the PSI would not be able to make any changes. If none, how will these changes occur?
- 3.9.1. *It is assumed the PSI and CM subcontractor have a prime – sub relationship, therefore, the PSI has the power to direct changes as necessary within the architecture boundaries.*
- 3.10. As requirements change, as they always do, how will the PSI effect changes if they have no access to the black box CM modules?
- 3.10.1. *If requirements were to change, a contract modification would be executed on the PSI contract. As it is assumed that the CM owners will be subcontractors to the PSI, it will be the PSI's responsibility to work with the CM owners to effect the changes. The Government's contractual relationship is with the PSI, not the CM owners and therefore, the PSI is responsible for managing the CM owners such that the contract requirements are met.*
- 3.11. On the CMs what do you mean by Reference Algorithms that have to be submitted as part of the Simulation Data Package?
- 3.11.1. *In most cases, the surrogate CMs in the System Test Bed will provide functionality that is representative of the hardware. This functionality will have to be approximated in a reference algorithm(s) or state machine.*
- 3.12. The TDP is expected to have detailed design documentation and is due at CDR (3 months after PSI contract award). Is it expected that the PSI will have CM vendors under contract by that time? If not, where does the data for the TDP come from?
- 3.12.1. *CDR is presently scheduled to occur 6 months after PSI award. By that time the PSI is expected to have the CM vendors under contract.*
- 3.13. Does the PSI select CM vendors before submitting a proposal or after the award?
- 3.13.1. *This is up to the PSI to decide.*
- 3.14. Re your Maintenance Concept. It would appear that there is no Intermediate level maintenance to be accomplished at the base prior to shipping problem module/subsystem back to PSI. Is this correct?
- 3.14.1. *Correct with the exception of in-theatre support.*
- 3.15. Will the PSI contract be CPFF, fixed price, or mixed?
- 3.15.1. *The Government anticipates both fixed price and cost-reimbursable CLINs. However, the RFP, when it is released, will specify CLIN type and is the authoritative document.*

- 3.15.2. *Since the government controls the configuration, does this mean every ECP will result in change orders to the fixed price CLINs?*
- 3.15.2.1. *No.*
- 3.16. You mention Safety in the SOW, however, I haven't seen any discussion on Information Assurance (IA) or System Security Eng (SSE). Will there be IA/SSE requirements for the PSI?
- 3.16.1. *IA requirements are found in SOW Section 6.*
- 3.17. What effect will being chosen as the PSI have on ability to compete for future Inc I and II modules and PSI's?
- 3.17.1. *The Government is continuing its review of this question. An answer will be posted at a later date.*
- 3.18. Will the pPRM CM developers be responsible for manufacturing the CMs during LRIP?
- 3.18.1. *That decision is made by the offeror receiving the PSI contract.*
- 3.19. Will the system integrator's proposal be evaluated based on the team and overall product being supplied or the ability to put together a team? In other words, to what extent will subcontractor capabilities be considered as part of the proposal evaluation?
- 3.19.1. *See 3.2.9 of SOW and the evaluation factors.*
- 3.20. CM vendors are under contract for Inc 1. Will the CMs be re-competed by the PSI to become subcontractors to the PSI?
- 3.20.1. *It is assumed that the CM vendors will be subcontractors to the PSI. Which CM vendors that are selected is a decision to be made by the PSI. It is the responsibility of the PSI awardee to select their team.*
- 3.20.2. *I had understood that there was currently only one vendor per CM. That seems incompatible with your statement that CM vendors will be selected by the PSI. Is that understanding incorrect?*
- 3.20.2.1. *It will be the PSI's responsibility to select the CM vendors. The PSI is not obligated to select the vendors that were selected for the pPRM development.*
- 3.20.3. *The schedule presented does not seem to support selection of alternate vendors and meet PRM dates.*
- 3.20.3.1. *It will be the PSI's responsibility to select the CM vendors. The PSI is not obligated to select the vendors that were selected for the pPRM development.*
- 3.21. Does the answer to question 18 indicate that none or all of the CM providers may be chosen to provide CM's to the PSI, completely at the discretion of the PSI?
- 3.21.1. *It will be the PSI's responsibility to select the CM vendors. The PSI is not obligated to select the vendors that were selected for the pPRM development.*

3.22. Do we understand that the "life cycle support" reference of paragraph 3.3 does not extend to ongoing maintenance support per the anticipated support contract RFP, but rather is a reference to warranty period and interim support only. Or does this imply ongoing support for technology infusion or technology refresh.

3.22.1. Clarification will be provided in the RFP.

3.23. From the responses to 18 and 19 it sounds like the PSI can also be a developer of CMs - is this correct or is the PSI OCI'ed out of developing CMs?

3.23.1. The Government is continuing its review of this question. An answer will be posted at a later date.

3.24. Are you expecting the PSI bids to include BOEs from current or candidate CM providers and if so does this OCI the CM providers from bidding as PSI or exclusive teaming with a PSI bidder; can PSI choose to make vs buy CMs if candidate providers exceed should cost estimates? Will you provide should cost estimates for CMs to level the playing field?

3.24.1. Basis of Estimates (BOEs) from current or candidate CMs are not required. Exclusive teaming agreements with CMs will be prohibited by the RFP for Increment 1. The Government will not provide should cost estimates for CMs. The Government is continuing its review of the remainder of this question. An answer will be posted at a later date.

3.25. Are there any Anti-Tamper Requirements?

3.25.1. No.

3.26. How will CMs currently being developed by APL or Government be handled in the PSI proposal activity?

3.26.1. It will be the PSI's responsibility to select the CM vendors. The PSI is not obligated to select the vendors that were selected for the pPRM development.

3.27. Can you send the overview slides to the attendees?

3.27.1. The Government's presentation will be posted on FedBizOpps within 30 days of today.

4. Review of Evaluation Information - IHD Contracts

4.1. What is the timeframe for providing written answers to the questions that were asked today?

4.1.1. All questions and answers will be posted within 30 days from today.

4.2. Is there a mechanism for submitting proprietary comments on the draft SOW, or will all communication to the government be posted publicly?

4.2.1. All questions and answers will be posted to FedBizOpps within 30 days of today.

4.2.2. *Can we still meet one-on-one with the Government outside the presence of other contractors?*

4.2.2.1. *One-on-one meetings with the Government will not be permitted.*

4.2.3. *We have comments for the government that do not necessarily require direct response. Is there a mechanism for us to submit these comments for the government's internal use that will not result in them being released to the public?*

4.2.3.1. *All questions received in response to the Industry Day and the attendant answers will be posted publicly. Once the solicitation is released, interested offerors may submit questions to the Contract Specialist. However, all questions will be answered via amendment(s) to the solicitation, which will be posted on FedBizOpps.*

4.3. One of the provisions of the Common Architecture as identified in the prior industry day was the potential for a CM to be used across multiple increments thereby resulting in economies of scale and reduced cost to the government. In the draft PSI solicitation, how is re-use of the CMs provided for?

4.3.1. *Proposals should address Increment 1 only. Potential re-use of Increment 1 CMs will be addressed during Increments 2 & 3.*

4.4. Related to Q3, how do cost considerations for projected economies of scale for CM/sub-system re-use get incorporated into the PSI cost proposal?

4.4.1. *Potential re-use of Increment 1 CMs will be addressed during Increments 2 & 3.*

4.5. Can you make the slide "Joint Service EOD Business Model" available?

4.5.1. *Yes. The slide will be included when the Government's presentation from today is posted to FedBizOpps.*

Additional question received after Industry Day:

How much time to you anticipate giving contractors to reply to the RFP once issued?

Contractors will have 60 days to reply to the RFP once issued.