

Amendment 0004  
Solicitation Number ONRBAA 12-019  
“Research and Development/Technology Maturation of Solid State High Power Laser Weapon  
Systems, Subsystems, and/or Components for Surface Navy, USN”  
Date 31 August 2012

The purpose of Amendment 0004 is to respond to questions submitted at the 16 May 2012 Industry Day. Questions received after BAA 12-019 was posted on 14 August 2012 will be addressed in a separate amendment.

Preface: The following questions were received from attendees during the Solid State Laser Industry Day held on 16 MAY 2012 at the Washington Navy Yard, Washington DC. The resultant answers provided by the Government relate to a distributed draft BAA which was made available to the attendees, as well as the released BAA 12-019 for the Navy’s SSL-TM program. The final released BAA 12-019 shall, in all cases, be the sole determining document used in determining the contract awards made.

1. Industry Day Questions and Answers are provided as follows:

**Q1) Has the government assessed the cost realism of \$1.5 million FFP award to produce a weapon combat prototype CDR?**

A1) Yes, the government reassessed the cost realism and concurred that CDR was not appropriate within a short time frame after award with a FFP contract as shown in the Draft BAA provided at the SSL-TM Industry Day. The government recognized that a CDR (Critical Design Review) was not appropriate, and revised the structure of the phases and included a concept design phase. Based on the discussion points made at Industry Day, a separate a CoDR (Concept Design Review) was established at the end of Phase I in order to refine the designs and government roles in each awardee. A new Phase II was developed in order to provide time and necessary support for more detailed design studies to be conducted, and to carry those from the completed CoDR through to PDR and CDR, to now be held in the revised Phase II. Phase III was added to support the build and testing of the SSL-TM prototype system. Both the figure and text shown in the BAA now reflect inputs received from the Industry Day.

**Q2) Please clarify if Phase I award for \$1.5M FFP is expected to lead to preliminary design review or critical design review. Is this for full systems or components?**

A2) The Phase I effort will end with a Concept Design Review (CoDR) for full systems proposals only. Phase II includes both a PDR and CDR as part of a detailed design phase. We are confident that during Phase I that there will be sufficient time for the contractors to work with the government teams to better understand the requirements (mission, performance, and programmatic) and refine their concepts prior to entry into a more detailed design and testing phase. Specifics on the conduct of CoDR, PDR and CDR are provided in the document “*General Guidance for Technical Reviews including Concept Design Reviews (CoDR), Preliminary Design Reviews (PDR) and Critical Design Reviews (CDR) for first article Naval S&T Prototypes.*”

Subsystems and Component proposals shall have separate development schedules, and shall have PDR and CDR as necessary to integrate into one of the prototype developed and manufactured.

Q3) Full system proposals as described in the draft solicitation are restricted to \$1.5M and 9 months to achieve CDR. There are instances where the draft BAA indicates that final guidance in the form of requirements, and/or deliverable definition will be provided at or following award. In order to be confident in bidding to a fixed price requirement, all requirements and constraints for design, as well as deliverables would need to be fully defined in the final solicitation.

A3) This was identified as a significant issue with the draft BAA, and has been carefully readdressed in the final BAA provided. The CDR was replaced with a CoDR at the end of Phase I, and Phase II includes both a PDR and CDR as part of a detailed design phase. We are confident that during Phase I that there will be sufficient time for the contractors to work with the government teams to better understand the requirements (mission, performance, and programmatic) and refine their concepts prior to entry into a more detailed design and testing phase. Specifics on the conduct of CoDR, PDR and CDR are provided in the document “*General Guidance for Technical Reviews including Concept Design Reviews (CoDR), Preliminary Design Reviews (PDR) and Critical Design Reviews (CDR) for first article Naval S&T Prototypes.*”

Q4) In (draft BAA 6.1.2 third paragraph), it is stated that at the end of Phase 1, there will be a CDR. This needs further clarification. Is this a traditional CDR meaning all of the subsystem PDRs and CDRs have taken place leading up the system level CDR? Also a CDR does not support a Level III TDP which is also requested at this time. Please clarify the level of detail required at the end of Phase 1 and what level of TDP is required.

A4) This was identified as a significant issue with the draft BAA, and has been carefully readdressed in the final BAA released. The CDR in the draft BAA was replaced with a CoDR at the end of Phase I, and Phase II includes both a PDR and CDR as part of a detailed design phase. Detailed Technical Design Package related to the concept and deliverable at CoDR is still required. We are confident that during Phase I that there will be sufficient time for the contractors to work with the government teams to better understand the requirements (mission, performance, and programmatic) and refine their concepts prior to entry into a more detailed design and testing phase, where the technical design package will go into additional depth for each subsystem, interface and component. Specifics on the conduct of CoDR, PDR and CDR are provided in the document “*General Guidance for Technical Reviews including Concept Design Reviews (CoDR), Preliminary Design Reviews (PDR) and Critical Design Reviews (CDR) for first article Naval S&T Prototypes.*”

Q5) There are three proposal options and four phase one winners. Have you considered the scenario where someone wins a singular subsystem and how that fits with the four winners?

A5) Yes, consideration for subsystems and components are of high interest to the government under this BAA. Components or subsystems development early and in parallel to a specific design strategy has potentially high value to the government in order to reduce technical risks in

critical subsystems for any proposal, and has the potential to be implemented through the Modular Open System Architecture (MOSA) construct. In these cases, the Phase I full system integrators (government or industry led) may want to consider these as parallel efforts and the government shall separately select and fund efforts based on their ability to reduce high technical risks and speed the technical maturation or testing of the SSL-TM prototype. Of particular consideration in such an offered scenario shall be the development of an open interface standard and interface control document (ICD) that shall enable the component installation and function with minimal to no need for rework or system modification.

**Q6) What are the criteria to be used in down selecting the proposals following Phase I for a full system effort?**

A6) Please refer to Section V, part 1, entitled “Evaluation Criteria”, of the BAA.

**Q7) If a company plans on proposing multiple subsystem and components should each be submitted as a separated proposal?**

A7) Yes. Multiple subsystem and components should each be submitted as a separated proposal. Grouped proposals are discouraged but shall be reviewed with respect to components making up subsystems and their proposed ability to reduce technical and programmatic risks.

**Q8) How many subsystem awards are expected or what is the dollar total allocated for subsystem awards?**

A8) Until proposals have been reviewed and evaluated, no specific dollar value can be identified at present. No more than a dozen subsystem or component awards are anticipated, but the government shall reserve the right to award few, some, none, or alter this anticipated value based on the quantity and quality of the proposals received. Regardless, subsystems and components shall only be evaluated after full system proposals have been reviewed and recommendations for awards made by the source selection team.

**Q9) Under 6.1.2 third paragraph, it is stated that Phase I awardees will be provided with the additional documents (HPA ICD, Detailed Weapon Specification, and Results of NAVSEA 05D ship integration study). Can this information be provided at the time of BAA release so that the design implications can be fully addressed prior to submittal of the proposal? If the information is provided, as currently planned, after award, will ONR fund any cost impact as a result of this new information and allow for the additional time required to incorporate the impacts into the design?**

A9)The Hybrid Predictive Avoidance (HPA) ICD is still under development at time of the BAA release, and not anticipated to be releasable until contract awards are made. For this reason, as well as other reasons related to concept refinement, ONR has adjusted the timeline, performance expectations and funding reflected in the drafts provided at industry day, based on the feedback received. The new Phase I and Phase II segments related to the concept development and the detailed design phase, respectfully shall allow for this adjustment. Costs resulting from the information provided at initial phase I award shall allow for the time required to incorporate any

resulting impacts caused by the HPA ICD into the design before Phase I is complete and before Phase II detailed design efforts start.

**Q10) Is the SSL-TM Program intending to fund the laser subsystem as well as the beam director subsystem?**

A10)The potential exists to fund laser subsystems, or to utilize laser subsystems already owned or under development by the federal government in order to reduce cost. The government recognizes the need for a laser subsystem in order to test and evaluate a weapon system prototype. However, the technical maturity of a laser subsystem acceptable for testing in the SSL-TM system may be significantly less robust than the beam director needs to be. For example, the laser subsystem may not be suitable for actual grade A shock testing, and the designs offered may require significantly more time and cost than what is available for test and evaluation of the prototypical system. Therefore, text in the release BAA has been significantly revised and should be reviewed carefully.

Also, in some cases, risks in a laser subsystem may be reduced through already available, federally funded high power laser subsystems – and may be available as GFE and provide a significant reduction of both technical risk and cost. For example, laser subsystems developed under the Robust Electric Laser Initiative (RELI) funded by the OSD HEL Joint Technology Office could provide initial testing and design capabilities with a laser subsystem at little to no cost to the SSL-TM program through cooperative development. The Navy has been involved in the development of the HEL JTO RELI concepts, and in some cases has funded development efforts related to RELI designs. Where possible, the government seeks to leverage those investments, but also recognizes that the designs developed for RELI occurred well prior to the development of the draft weapons specifications included with this SSL-TM BAA.

In contrast, the risks for a beam director are unique in the environment common to a Navy surface combatant and no significant maritime beam director efforts of a similar maturity are known to be underway. The technical risks of damage and possible reduced laser performance are significantly raised in the maritime environment with risks associated and evaluated by the government as having both a significantly higher likelihood of occurrence and a significantly higher level of consequence.

**Q11) Is the FY 15/16 Demonstration (shipboard and con-based) to be conducted with the 25KW+ laser subsystem installed in the prototype ADM?**

A11) 25KW is considered the absolute lowest power level considered acceptable by the ADM level prototype, and constitutes a minimum threshold performance objective based on laser subsystem aperture power, sans any distinction on beam quality or spot size. Prototypes offering 25KW will have significant performance issues when evaluated against the draft weapon specification objectives and thresholds provided with the BAA. The potential exists to test the prototype ADM beam director at sea in FY16 with a laser at 100 kilowatts. However, solid state laser subsystems with suitable maturity for a prototype navy laser weapon system above 150KW are not expected to be available by 2016.

**Q12) Will cost share be allowed/encouraged? What are current thought related to cost share on this phase?**

A12) Without additional information on what costs would be shared, or to what effort these would be shared on, no determination can be made by the government at this time. Therefore, the government anticipates little opportunity for cost share, and expresses a concern that cost share may result in reduced government rights in any cost sharing agreements. However, any cost sharing arrangements should be clearly identified and offered within the proposal submission, and shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Any resulting reduction to government rights from “government purpose rights “resulting from an industry proposed cost sharing agreements shall be clearly identified prior to contract award.

**Q13) Is there an identified budget line item/program element identified for this acquisition?**

A13)The identified program elements are within budget activities BA.2 (PE 602114N) and BA.3 (PE 603114N) The specific budget line items are not available at the time of the release of this BAA.

**Q14) What is the planned total budget over the period of the program?**

A14) As stated in the BAA in Section 6.1.1, SSL-TM Program Prototype Maturation Phases, “Initially, the funding identified for this prototype effort in Phases I, II and III will be from the ONR in budget activities two and three (BA.2 and BA.3) on the order of the \$110 Million from FY13-FY16, and shall include government costs. ONR Program funding allocations are initially guided on a historical split with 30% of funding going to government activities, and the remaining 70% going to industry. No value of IRAD funding was considered in the determination of these values, as this is hard to correlate based on varied reporting methods used.”

**Q15) With two clearly defined make/buy decision points and Dahlgren’s clear desire to be the system integrator, how real is the opportunity to have a contractor be the system integrator?**

A15) The opportunity exists and will be evaluated based on the proposals received from Industry on their concept, design effort, and ability to manufacture a prototype.

**Q16) Will ONR define the criteria for making these Make/Buy determinations? Will ONR consider making this Make/Buy determination before releasing the BAA?**

A16) Any “Make Buy” determination will be made by the government, largely based on the ability of the proposals received to meet mission objectives as stated in the BAA and will ultimately be done by determination of “Best Value.” The government is under no obligation to share the specifics of the decision making process on any “Make Buy” decisions. However, highest priority will be to achieve the goals as stated in the BAA and to transition a prototype system into a future Navy Program of Record. Industry has the option to either team with government on the development of the prototype, and thereby share risks through mutual development; or Industry may accept the risks in the integration and subsequent testing of the

prototype and in either case value shall be determined by the government program manager based on reduction of technical risk, transitionability, affordability, and the prototype system's ability to meet mission objectives.

Q17) The program plan graphic also included a Government internal team and its unclear if the intent is to make a decision between industry and Government, or if the possibility exists that both may be carried forward.

A17) Government functions that are intrinsically necessary, such as Test and Evaluation, will be carried in parallel. Formation of a "Government internal team" therefore is necessary and required in order to perform required performance tests indicated in the overall plan. Similarly, issues related to ship integration and safety are required government functions due to Navy, DoD and Federal requirements. In the SSL-TM program, the option exists for a government led prototype to be developed, which could act in any one of a number of traditional or non-traditional paths toward an acquisition process. In particular, the Laser Weapon System (or LaWS) has been identified as a potential test bed that could offer significant advantages toward system, subsystem and components rapidly maturing through testing and evaluation – whether developed by a contractor or through the government. However, the LaWS system as it exists today is not seen as technically mature enough to reach above technical readiness levels required for long term use indicative of a prototype installed on either at Navy test facility, in a Navy Test Ship, or a Naval Combatant. Based on the proposals received, and an assessment of the utility of the LaWS system, a determination shall be made by the ONR program officer on assignment of use, availability and/or continued development of the LaWS system, including prototype evolution and potential funding necessary. Currently, the LaWS system is designated as a "Test Bed" for testing components and functions of a future laser weapon, such as the functions related to the Hybrid Predictive Avoidance subsystem, which will be provided as GFE/GFP to all contractors as specified in the BAA.

Q18) Do subsystems technology maturation proposals need to be fully substantiated with classified performance predictions? For example charts marked as "unclassified" that showed performance contours. Are such performance contours deemed classified?

A18) Performance predictions against specific classes of targets for specific laser weapons concepts are considered classified under OPNAVINST 5133.8C, Navy Security Classification Guidance for High Energy Lasers and were appropriately marked with classification levels. Other performance metrics, e.g. laser fluence within a given spot area at range, not specifically tied to a specific laser system were properly labeled as unclassified, but are still considered for limited distribution. When developing responses to the BAA, offerors are strongly encouraged to review carefully OPNAVINST 5133.8C, Navy Security Classification Guidance for High Energy Lasers.

Q19) Please clarify the definition of the phrase "integration designs" (page 3 in the draft) as related to industry designs.

A19) This section was heavily rewritten for clarity, based on feedback from Industry day. However, integration designs referred to integration of the proposed laser prototype with ship systems (power and cooling).

Q20) How does the scope and depth of an “integration design” differ from a traditional CDR that would encompass system/subsystem/component level specifications?

A20) In particular, the laser prototype being proposed must be compatible with Navy combatant ship systems and design for available cooling, power, size, weight, volume, center of gravity, etc. While ship modifications are possible, the costs of these potential modifications can make a transition and acquisition plan costly or unaffordable by the government. Therefore the CDR for the prototype will closely examine effects on ship installation as well as performance testing.

Q21) With regard to the proposal instructions for inclusion of a bidder defined Operational Utility Assessment Plan, is this plan for testing beyond the scope of Phase II?

A21) Based on revised BAA, yes. All testing including any Operational Utility Assessment Plan discussions shall be formally conducted as part of Phase III. Informal discussions on any Operational Utility Assessment Plan shall be part of the Test and Evaluation Master Plan developed by the government in Phase I.

Q22) Or is it expected (in the draft BAA) that the Phase II schedule and cost reflect the testing contained in this attachment?

A22) Testing was moved from Phase II to Phase III. It is recognized that testing in Phase III may require adjustment based on the proposals received, and information exchanged between the government and industry in Phase I, the concept development phase. As such, the government is offering ample opportunity to refine, and sufficient initial guidance on how to best estimate Phase III costs based on the information and budgets available at the time of the release of this BAA.

Q23) With regard to proposals for “subsystems/components” and support to a Government lead effort: Are the proposal instructions contained in section 2a “Full Proposals” applicable to these as well?

A23) Information on the proposal of subsystems/components were reviewed and revised prior to the release of the BAA, and are applicable in either government led, or industry led system integration roles.

Q24) Can proposals for support of a Government lead activity provide costs based on an estimated level of effort and durations? Will the final solicitation contain estimated durations for milestone activities to establish a common schedule for costing?

A24) Additional guidance on expected levels of effort required to achieve success on required activities and test durations are provided to the best of the government’s ability to do so at the time of the release of the BAA.

Q25) Is government participation in the IPT structure limited to those organizations not participating in the government led design team?

A25) No, no requirement exists to limit the access to government SMEs or HQEs in any IPT structure or design team. Should concerns exist where SMEs or HQEs are exposed to proprietary information, their efforts shall be suitably firewalled from other industry partnerships.

Q26) What is the definition of the government led design team? The government is already providing system engineering guidance to the contractors. How is that different from the government led design team?

A26) Please refer to revised BAA text in Section 6.1.2, Solid State Laser Technology Maturation Program Approach for a comparison of Industry led design vice Government directed design.

Q27) During the industry day presentation it was stated several times that it would be desirable for offers to “exceed stated requirements”, however, the evaluation factors do not indicate how scoring will credit performance above stated requirements. Which requirements are “worth” more than others and what is considered significant (5% in excess, or 10% in excess)?

A27) Please refer to Section V, part 1, entitled “Evaluation Criteria”, of the BAA. The Evaluation Criteria in the BAA are listed in relative order of importance. The Government will make its selection based on which proposal delivers the “best value” to the Government.

Q28) The draft solicitation states on page 6 that the “Government owns the final design.” Please clarify the intent of this statement as it relates to Government rights to the design (ie: Government purpose rights, unlimited rights, etc). [Note: there is a similar statement on page 9]

A28) “Government owns the final design” was a typographical error in the draft, and has since been revised in the released BAA to accurately reflect the strong desire for the government for “Government Purpose Rights” to any prototype system, subsystem, component, or design information related to the system, subsystem or components in a prototype.

Q29) Under 6.1.2 the statement is made that “the Government owns the final design”. Please specify to what type of license this refers (e.g. Unlimited, Government Purposes, etc.)

A29) The draft BAA was revised and now accurately reflects the emphasis on “Government Purpose Rights.”

Q30) How soon can we obtain a copy of the classified (industry day) presentation/reference documents?

A30) Classified information packages will be made available under separate cover in the same manner as the classified draft weapon specifications.

Q31) Will the Industry Day presentation slides available? Is it possible to obtain a copy of the classified requirements slides with proper verification of facility clearances?

A31) Yes, Both the Unclassified Industry Day Slides and the Classified Weapons Specification shown are being made available. The classified Weapon Specification will only be provided after receiving a request and verification of facility clearances and US Citizenship of the receiver. Similarly, other unclassified documents provided at Industry Day or referenced in the BAA (Section 6.1.4 Additional Information) are being made available on request.

Q32) Can a suitably redacted version of the classified briefing be made available?

A32) Due to limitations of available personnel to conduct such a redaction and release, no such version shall be made available.

Q33) Under 6.1.2 fourth paragraph, it is stated that the selectees are required to submit design changes based on panel and IPT recommendations. Who will be responsible for the cost and schedule impact of these design changes?

A33) The government shall be responsible for any resulting impact on cost based on government direction or additional government requirements which emerge, and will conduct contract negotiations as required on a case-by-case basis when cost or design changes are submitted as engineering change proposals.

Q34) Under 6.1.2 fifth paragraph, in the official BAA when released, will it provide guidance on how to cost this section regarding the location and duration of the performance tests?

A34) Based on this question received at the SSL-TM Industry Day, additional information is included in section 6.1, "Introduction", related to performance testing and required reviews including the most likely locations and length of testing periods, based on available historical data when the BAA was released.

Q35) Under 6.2.1 Partnering: If the Government directs a "preferred partnering relationship" will that result in a new request for proposal?

A35) The potential for development of a new cost proposal for manufacture of a prototype (Phase III) is included in Phases I and II. Alternately, the government shall reserve the right to decide that preferred partnering provides "best value" to the government and as a result may invite a revised proposal from any resulting directed partnership arrangement. The government may act as partnership broker for the purposes of obtaining best value for the SSL-TM program prototype development,

Q36) Section 6.3 states that a Level III TDP is to be delivered at the end of Phase I. The traditional definition of this level of TDP is associated with production-ready systems. Is this really ONR's intent or is ONR looking for a TDP of a demonstration system?

A36) A TDP for a typical Technical Readiness Level six (TRL 6) demonstrator as has been conducted in the past is evaluated by the ONR program officer as not being a sufficient enabler for transition to a Program of Record and entry into a future acquisition program. The TDP level of a one-time demonstrator, with inability to replace results over the number of target-weapon encounters is seen as insufficient. Similarly a TDP associated with a multiple unit production-ready system is not seen as appropriate for the type of new weapon system to be manufactured. However, the prototype expected to be manufactured and delivered shall meet the necessary standards of a future Navy acquisition system and show a readiness to support limited series of military utility assessments, and enable an incremental development into a future program of record. Therefore, the TDP expected to be reviewed at CoDR, PDR and CDR in Phases I and II, shall be consistent with the tailored technical reviews and check off sheets provided in the document provided, “*General Guidance for Technical Reviews including Concept Design Reviews (CoDR), Preliminary Design Reviews (PDR) and Critical Design Reviews (CDR) for first article Naval S&T Prototypes*”

Q37) In the same section (Section 6.3), Phase II is for the development, integration tests and at-sea demonstration. If a Level III data package is delivered in Phase I, what “development” does this refer to?

A37) This section and the phases from the draft version provided have changed significantly based on comments received from Industry Day. Phases I, II, III and IV have now been revamped and revised to accurately reflect a concept development phase, a detailed design phase, a manufacturing, test and evaluation phase, and a transition to a program of record phase. A level III technical data package at the concept design level is required at CoDR, consistent with the checklist provided in the document “*General Guidance for Technical Reviews including Concept Design Reviews (CoDR), Preliminary Design Reviews (PDR) and Critical Design Reviews (CDR) for first article Naval S&T Prototypes.*” Similarly, Level III data packages for the detailed designs are required in Phase II at PDR and CDR, as similarly outlined in the check off listings provided.

Q38) 6.3.1 (from the draft BAA at Industry Day) states that the WS Requirements will evolve and mature with final WS Requirements provided DURING Phase I. If we’re asked to deliver a Level III TDP in 9 months, the requirements are needed at the beginning of Phase I. Changes to requirements could result in cost and schedule impacts. Will ONR provide additional funding and schedule relief to address these requirement changes?

A38) Based on the comments received at Industry Day, the phase I was revised to a concept development phase, and Phase II to a detailed design phase. Also Phase III was revised to a manufacture and test phase. Sufficient time and opportunity are provided in Phase I, and prior to Phase III starting to accommodate changes caused by the requirements and permits the submission for a revision to Phase III anticipated costs based on a revised concept design. As stated in the BAA released, any changes after Phase I completion shall be handled through a formal engineering change proposal process, and handled on a case-by-case basis.

Q39) Section 6.3.2 states that the required irradiances will be provided upon Phase 1 award. Will ONR make this information available upon release of the BAA so the proposal can reflect the desired performance?

A39) A draft of the classified weapons specification is being provided at time of release of the BAA. Additional refinement of the final classified weapons specification will be provided at Phase I award, and throughout the contracting period as required.

Q40) Section 6.3.3 talks to Stand-Alone and Partially Integrated configurations, however section 6.3.6 states software must be compatible with AEGIS CPS/CDS, which is correct?

A40) Both are correct. Stand alone configurations shall be required for any land based testing, and may be required if the "at sea" test platform does not support the provided connectivity to AEGIS CPS/CDS to the prototype laser weapon provided. It is accepted that such a stand alone configuration shall potentially not be compatible with the AEGIS CPS/CDS. However, the intent of the prototype is to connect the fire control systems to the Navy's surface combatant ships, with the AEGIS CPS/CDS system being preferred for a DDG-51 surface combatant.

Q41) Must the cost of test (e.g. as stated in 6.3.6) be priced out in the response to the BAA?

A41) Yes, the contractors cost of testing shall be included in Phase III. However, the cost of the government test facilities, government or military personnel and test platforms (e.g. test ship) shall be borne by the government.

Q42) At the Industry Day one of the charts presented included an exit aperture size of 50cm. Please confirm this quantity (50cm) and whether or not it is a hard requirement.

A42) Any aperture size for the beam director exit aperture shown at Industry Day was provided as an illustrative example. 50cm is currently NOT seen as a "hard requirement," however it is a design option which may be viable, but also have implications of cost to manufacture. The draft weapon specification shall be the guiding technical document, and proposals reviewed against the draft weapon specification carefully to determine the proposed concepts ability to support mission functions related to target location, identification, and battle damage assessments. Therefore caution is recommended in the development of proposals and the selection of beam director exit aperture offered, and how the beam director provides weapons specification level functionality in the maritime environment while at sea, especially if the beam director optic is used for these targeting functions.

Q43) Draft BAA encourages industries to propose System & Engineering Integration Support Services for support of integration effort. Would that cause an organizational conflict of interest (OCI) for the industry to bid for EMD and production phase of the program?

A43) The related section on System & Engineering Integration Support Services included in the draft BAA was removed based on inputs received from Industry Day. The government values such feedback, and recognizes the potential for an organizational conflict of interests (OCI,) and shall seek to avoid these occurrences and perceptions wherever possible.

Q44) The Phase II cost proposal done prior to Phase I execution cannot possibly be accurate. Is an updated Phase II cost proposal to be considered post Phase I, but presumably before down-select?

A44) Based on the comments received at Industry Day, the Phase I was revised to a concept development phase, and Phase II to a detailed design phase. Also Phase III was revised to a manufacture and test phase. Sufficient time and opportunity are provided in Phase I, and prior to Phase III starting to accommodate changes caused by the requirements and permits the submission for a revision to Phase III anticipated costs based on a revised concept design. As stated in the BAA released, any changes after Phase I completion shall be handled through a formal engineering change proposal process, and handled on a case-by-case basis.

Furthermore, testing was moved from Phase II to Phase III. It is recognized that testing in Phase III may require adjustment based on the proposals received, and information exchanged between the government and industry in Phase I, the concept development phase. As such, the government is offering ample opportunity to refine, and sufficient initial guidance on how to best estimate Phase III costs based on the information and budgets available at the time of the release of this BAA.

Please refer to sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 in the BAA for more information regarding requirements for full system cost proposals.

Q45) Describe known OCI (Organizational Conflict of Interests) issues within the community. Besides obvious SETA/A&AS relationships, what sort of existing programs are known to conflict with performing on this contract?

A45) No Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) are currently known to exist on the SSL-TM program. A particular concern noted at the Industry Day was that a potential OCI might occur in the development cycle of an awarded subsystem or component which would become a piece of government furnished equipment or government furnished property (GFE/GFP) to multiple competing contractors to integrate into prototypes.

The government shall seek to avoid OCIs in these cases by having a suitable, uniformly enforceable, interface control document (ICD) and by allowing alternative options for the same component or subsystem functionality. Since specific concepts on the SSL-TM Prototype configuration have yet to be proposed or evolve through the Phase I conceptual development phase, no specific guidance is yet available as regards OCIs, other than the direction available in the FAR or DFARS.

However, offerors should be aware that ONR has adopted and adheres to a detailed policy regarding potential OCIs. ONR's OCI policy is available on line at

<http://www.onr.navy.mil/Media-Center/Press-Releases/2011/~media/Files/About%20ONR/Organization-Conflict-Interest.ashx>.

See also <http://www.onr.navy.mil/Media-Center/Press-Releases/2011/Conflict-Interest-Business-ONR.aspx>.