

**Frequently Asked Questions #2 for BAA 07-037**  
**“Expeditionary Maneuver Warfare Applied Research and Advanced Technology**  
**Development”**  
**18 September 2007**

1. Concerning Thrust Area 2 – **Intelligence, Surveillance, & Reconnaissance (ISR)**, Area 3 (Tagging, Tracking, and Locating Technologies/Demonstrations) on page 6 of this BAA, what is the desired standoff distance and what are realistic taggant concentrations expected to be?

**A:** The minimum desired standoff distance is 1,000 meters. At this time, taggant concentrations are considered a variable that can be adjusted to achieve “readability.”

2. Concerning Thrust Area 2 – **Intelligence, Surveillance, & Reconnaissance (ISR)**, Area 3 (Tagging, Tracking, and Locating Technologies/Demonstrations) on page 6 of this BAA, what are the excitation and emission wavelengths (or spectral region) for the numerous optical tags?

**A:** Ongoing efforts are developing taggants with excitation and emission wavelengths in both the UV and IR spectrum. Requirement is that taggant emission is not visible to the unaided eye. Turnability of the detector and laser interrogator is desired. A payload need not address both UV and IR.

3. Concerning Thrust Area 2 – **Intelligence, Surveillance, & Reconnaissance (ISR)**, Area 3 (Tagging, Tracking, and Locating Technologies/Demonstrations) on page 6 of this BAA, how many taggant variants are expected, and how many emission bands per taggant, create the barcode?

**A:** Ongoing work with synthesizing optical taggants using quantum dots/ nanotechnology suggests that many (in the hundreds or possibly thousands) taggant variants are possible. The payload needs to be able to measure intensity at closely spaced emission lines.

4. Concerning Thrust Area 2 – **Intelligence, Surveillance, & Reconnaissance (ISR)**, Area 3 (Tagging, Tracking, and Locating Technologies/Demonstrations) on page 6 of this BAA, should we plan on identifying possible taggant materials or classes of materials?

**A:** Yes, recommendations on possible taggant materials or classes of materials will be welcomed.

5. Concerning Thrust Area 2 – **Intelligence, Surveillance, & Reconnaissance (ISR)**, Area 1 (Advanced Tactical Sensor Technologies) on page 5 of this BAA, Item A describes a sensor unit and Item B described Remote biometric capture. Under Item B, does ONR have more specific processing desired for Objective 1 and 2? Both request that a capability/means be provided to capture data at standoff distances and there is discussion on quick and accurate biometric data. Is there a data base that the biometric data will be compared to or should we consider sending the captured biometric data over a network for evaluation?

**A:** Topic 1A describes the requirement for an integrated sensor processor unit that is small in size, weight and power (SWAP). The desired modality of the sensor are either RF, Acoustic or EO/IR. Coupled with an advanced processor these sensors provide higher information content, that is they don't just hear or see something, they can classify, identify or possibly track an entity. This is separate from Topic 1B which describes remote biometric capture technologies which

does not necessarily need to be in a low SWAP form factor. In either case, the preference is on matching against constrained libraries at the point of collection.

6. Concerning Section III, *Eligibility Information*, Volume 2: Cost Proposal - Part 1 (page 23), states that the detailed budget requires labor hours and unburdened direct labor rates. Are these hourly rates for evaluation purposes only? Our financial systems do not allow for billing based on hourly rates. We can only report on percent effort. If awarded, will we be required to invoice with hourly rates?

**A:** Yes. The breakdown of the unburdened direct labor hourly rates are for evaluation purposes. If your financial system is based on a percentage of effort, then it will be acceptable to develop the cost proposal displaying the base salary and the percentage of effort that is proposed.

7. If there is proof that the proposal was mailed prior to the due date, but the hardcopies and CD delivery to the proper person within ONR misses the deadline due to delays from special processing of mail, will the submission be considered late?

**A:** No. Per Section III, *Eligibility Information*, Paragraph 4(b) – Submission of Late Proposals, states that if “There is acceptable evidence to establish that it was received at the Government installation designated for receipt of proposals and was under the Government’s control prior to the time set for receipt of proposals” it will not be considered late.

8. Can the hardcopies and CD be delivered via hand carried to the address shown in the BAA?

**A:** Yes. Hardcopy proposals and CDs may be hand delivered to the address listed in the BAA for submission of full proposals.

9. In Section VII, *Other Information*, Paragraph 1 – Project Meetings & Reviews (page 29), it is stated that " it should be assumed that 40% of these meetings will be near ONR, Arlington VA and 60% at other contractor or government facilities. We had assumed that some of the meetings would be held outside of the US and some in the US (6 monthly). Could you please confirm that this is an acceptable assumption and clarify what you would expect the frequency of these meetings to be per year?

**A:** Yes. The assumption above, regarding the meetings, is acceptable.

10. In Section IV, *Application and Submission of Information*, Full Proposal Content – Volume 1: Technical Proposal, the content for the Statement of Work suggests that the SOW should contain "a description (in sufficient detail to evaluate the proposal) of the scientific background, scope, and objective of the proposed effort, along with appropriate references to the scientific literature." However, there is clear direction that the SOW should not contain any proprietary information, since it may be included as an attachment to any resulting award instrument. The suggestion to include the very detailed technical description in the SOW, combined with the non-proprietary nature, has led us to believe that ONR is reserving the right to have the SOW reviewed by people outside of the government that may not be under Non-Disclosure Agreements. Does ONR intend to have the SOW reviewed by non-US government personnel? Is it acceptable to include much of the same detailed technical and scientific information in both the SOW as well as the Technical Approach section? Can you please provide some clarity to help understand the difference between the level of detail expected in the SOW vs. the Technical Approach section?

**A:** The reason ONR wants the statement of work to avoid mentioning any proprietary information, is that if an award is made, the statement of work will be extracted from the proposal and reproduced on the official award documentation. Government award documentation is considered public business, not corporate proprietary business. It should not contain any corporate proprietary information. Except for the statement of work section, the remainder of the proposal will not be distributed beyond the government employees who are involved in the evaluation process. Hence the remainder of the proposal including the technical approach section can contain clearly labeled corporate proprietary information. The statement of work should describe what will be accomplished, and the technical approach (possibly proprietary) should describe the technical details that reveal exactly how it will be accomplished.

11. In Section IV, *Application and Submission of Information*, Full Proposal Content – Volume 1: Technical Proposal, within the Statement of Work, section (b), there is a suggestion to include "A description of general and special facilities available for performing the proposed work, and the rationale for requested support of any facilities, equipment, or materials". In the section describing the Management Approach section, it states that you should "Include a description of the facilities that are required for the proposed effort with a description of any Government Furnished Equipment/Hardware /Software /Information required". This appears to be the same information, required in two separate places within the proposal. Do we need to include the facility description and request for use of government furnished equipment, materials, etc in both sections?

**A:** No. Statements of work typically don't include any mention of facilities. Describing facilities in the management approach section would be appropriate.

12. Do the sections in the proposal need to be written in the same order as that shown in Section IV, *Application and Submission of Information* - Full Proposal Content? Or, is it OK to modify the order as long as all of the individual sections are included within the technical proposal?

**A:** The sequence in which required information is addressed is up to the author.

13. How many white papers did ONR accept and how many programs does ONR plan to award?

**A:** ONR received a large number of white papers and awards will be based on the proposals yet to be received and evaluated.

14. Do contract proposals need to be submitted via grants.gov?

**A:** Submission of full proposals via Grants.gov only applies to grants not contracts.

15. Does Grants.gov have an application package available on their site for this BAA?

**A:** Yes. The application package is available and accessible through Grants.gov under this BAA 07-037. Please select "Application" to review the package.