

**Joint Non-Lethal Weapons Program
Fiscal Year 2015 Non-Lethal Weapon Technologies
ONRBAA14-008
Amendment 0001**

The purpose of amendment 0001 to ONRBAA14-008 is to answer questions received in response to the BAA as follows:

Q#1: Reference: ONR BAA-14-008, p. 56, Section IV. ("Applications & Submission Information), subsection a. ("White Papers")

Question: Since the programmatic quad chart, referenced on page 56 of the BAA, will contain information that is duplicative with the written technical content, may we exclude it from the white paper page count?

A#1: No, you cannot exclude information from the technical content of the white paper because it is duplicated in the programmatic quad chart.

Q#2: Part I.F.8. Compact Non-Lethal Non-Pyrotechnic Flash-Bang Technologies

Paragraph A: The description ends with a statement that the desired form factor be equivalent to existing chemical-based flash-bang grenades, then presents a baseball bat as an unacceptably large form factor.

Is there a size and weight threshold measure for acceptable technology proposals?

Does the JNLWD have an objective to obtain form factors equal to or smaller than current flash-bangs, i.e., just under 6" tall x 1.5" diameter?

A#2: No, there are not specific size and weight thresholds for acceptable proposals, but our objective is to achieve form factors equal to or smaller than current off-the-shelf flash-bang grenades, which again are small enough to be easily hand-tossable.

Q#3: I have a question regarding the format of the white paper response for ONRBAA14-008

Page 56 of the BAA refers to a "Standard programmatic QUAD Chart". Do you have any specific requirements for the format or content of this portion of the white paper?

A#3: No, there are no specific QUAD chart requirements. Our standard programmatic QUAD charts typically include: (1) a representative picture, illustration or diagram; (2) objective and operational relevance; (3) technical or scientific approach; and (4) top level cost and schedule. QUAD charts should be clear and concise.

Q#4: When a contractor is awarded funds under this BAA does the Government own the final product?

Would that contractor be able to later offer this non-lethal weapon commercially to law enforcement, security firms, etc?

A#4: Please reference ONR BAA-14-008, p. 56-58, Section IV.B.b.i, Full Proposals - Instructions for Contracts:

(Required as Applicable) Intellectual Property: Offerors responding to this BAA must submit a separate list of all technical data or computer software that will be furnished to the Government with other than unlimited rights. The Government will assume unlimited rights if offerors fail to identify any intellectual property restrictions in their proposals. Include in this section all proprietary claims to results, prototypes, and/or deliverables. If no restrictions are intended, then the offeror should state "NONE."

The contractor will be able to offer resultant products commercially.

Q#5: I have a question for you regarding the submission of a white paper. I am planning to propose a topic that will address two separate topics. Am I allowed to do that- propose one development for two topics?

A#5: Yes, offerors may propose one development effort to address multiple topic areas.

Q#5a: Should I then mention both Topics (and their Items) in the header of the white paper?

A#5a: It would be helpful to mention the associated topics in the header, but it is not a requirement.

Q#6: Regarding ONRBAA14-008, is ONR interested in whitepapers that discuss using cyber attacks and capabilities to accomplish the objectives of Topic Area 6 - Directed Energy and Non-Directed Energy-based Vehicle/Vessel Stopping Technologies? Or are cyber solutions out of scope for this BAA?

A#6: Cyber solutions are out of the intended scope of this BAA.

Q#7: The directions for the submission of the white paper state that it must be signed by an "authorized officer".

Our business office has interpreted this to mean that it must be signed by the head of the business office, which means that it will be treated just like a proposal submission (additional forms, reviews, red tape, etc.).

We will do that if that was your intent. If that was not your intent, would you consider my signature to be that of an “authorized officer”?

A#7: It is not up to the Government to determine who is an authorized officer. An authorized officer should have the authority to submit on behalf of the offeror.
