

**STRATEGIC & SPECTRUM MISSIONS ADVANCED RESILIENT TRUSTED SYSTEMS
(S²MARTS)
REQUEST FOR SOLUTIONS (RFS)**

in support of the
Prototype Simulator Subcomponent Development

Project No. 20-10c

All prospective respondents must be members of the NSTXL consortium.

- 1. Project Title:** Prototype Hardware-in-the-Loop (HITL) Simulator Development
- 2. Prototype Project Sponsor/Requiring Activity:** Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC Crane), Code WXRQ
- 3. Contracting Activity:** NSWC Crane, Code 024
- 4. Project Background & Current Capability:**

The Naval Surface Warfare Center Crane Division, Infrared (IR) /Radar Frequency (RF) Systems Technologies Division is seeking prototype support to address Modeling & Simulation (M&S) issues in the area of countermeasures and countermeasure techniques to protect U.S. aircraft from threat missile systems. The threat environment is changing at an ever-increasing rate. This reality requires the capability to respond rapidly to new threat missile systems. This cannot be done without an efficient means of developing prototype models, simulators, countermeasures, and countermeasure techniques. The advent of each new threat missile system triggers the requirement for the development of multiple new prototype systems. These requirements cannot be met without an efficient, flexible acquisition strategy.

M&S is an essential component of all current Department of Defense (DoD) efforts to protect our platforms from threat weapon systems as well as ensure the effectiveness of our own weapon systems. M&S tools used for these types of applications are quite varied and take many forms such as live-fire engagements, captive seeker field tests, hardware-in-the-loop (HITL) simulations, software-in-the-loop simulations, and all-digital simulations. Model development is primarily driven by the availability of resources and information on the system to be modeled. If the actual hardware of the system is available, given the necessary time, resources, and expertise, a highly accurate model of the system can be developed. Otherwise, information gaps will have to be filled with engineering and intelligence estimates resulting in a tool that may be of significant value, but which must be viewed with appropriate caution due to its inherent uncertainties. In some cases, surrogate simulations are developed to explore the realm of the possible rather than emulate a known system.

As the number and complexity of threat weapon systems grow at an ever-increasing rate, it is critical to have the capability to develop prototype models of the new systems quickly and efficiently. Each new threat requires the building of a new prototype model which may in turn require upgrades to other existing M&S tools that are part of an overall simulation. The development of new prototype system models involves considerable R&D efforts and, by its very nature, is not formulaic. Consequently, it is impossible to predict precise expertise and material requirements far enough in advance to accommodate traditional acquisition timelines.

If prototype threat simulators are to be developed quickly and efficiently as required, there must be a means of quickly designing, configuring, acquiring, and testing prototype threat simulator subcomponents, assembling them into full-up HITL simulators, and performing the required verification, validation, and accreditation (VV&A) processes. The development and testing aspects may involve acquisition of multiple alternative subcomponents or a series of iterative acquisitions as part of a spiral development process.

Summary: The Government requires assistance in the development of prototype HITL simulators. This will include the development of many simulators over a 10 year period. This will help solve current problems with quick reaction to quickly changing threats. These prototype HITL simulators are unique and must be developed from the ground up, there are no commercially available solutions.

5. Desired End-State Objective(s) & Success Criteria:

The Government requires a suite of Test & Evaluation (T&E) ready simulators for threat exploitation and countermeasure development that have been fully documented, verified, validated, and accredited. Prototype simulators will be sufficiently documented to allow routine replication of the prototypes in response to run capacity requirements. Given the increasing rate of threat development, in order to maintain robust protection of our aircraft and aircrews, the Government requires support for prototype HITL simulator development. The desired end-state objective of this RFS is to have one or more Performers fully integrated in all aspects of HITL simulator development with the Government. Below, the various phases of HITL simulator development are outlined.

The Government projects that up to 25 simulators may be required in the next 10 years. These 25 simulators will each be distinct and represent different threat missiles. Both the Government and the Performer will collaborate on the development of all future simulators; however, individual phases may be performed by either entity or both together. For each prototype simulator development, Performer assistance may be needed for some phases and not others, itemized Performer cost estimates are requested for each of the seven phases described below. The cost for a Performer doing all the development for a given prototype simulator will be the total of the itemized costs for the seven phases. The Government may award contracts to one or more Performers.

With the posting of this RFS and upon request from the vendor, the Government will provide a classified annex that contains a list of threat missiles that are candidates for prototype HITL simulators to be developed during performance of this action. This list will be comprehensive but not all-inclusive. Development of prototype HITL simulators may be requested for threats that are not on this list. This list will be classified and will only be provided to vendors that possess

the appropriate facility and personnel security clearances (details are provided below under Section 8). The Government will be requesting firm-fixed pricing for each phase (as identified below) for three (3) of the threats on the list. The three threats to be used for pricing will be clearly identified on the classified list. Although the Government is requesting firm-fixed pricing for each of the seven phases for three threats, proposals without pricing for all seven phases will also be accepted. For example, respondents who do not have the capability to perform all seven phases may submit pricing for the phases they are able to complete.

Project award(s) may be for any number of prototype HITL simulator development phases, from one (1) to all seven (7). The Government is interested in potentially awarding individual projects for individual phases and groups consisting of multiple phases. For example, a missile threat could be provided to a vendor and that vendor requested to perform Phases 4-7. In that scenario, Government Furnished Information would be provided to that vendor relative to work and data gathered by the Government during Phases 1-3.

It is requested that each vendor specifically identify the length of validity of their firm-fixed pricing for the three (3) threats identified.

Phase 1 – Design

All prototype HITL simulators developed under this RFS will utilize the Reconfigurable Signal-Injection Missile Simulation (RSIMS) architecture. Depending on the specific requirements for each threat, modifications or enhancements to RSIMS may be required and are included as part of this phase (where needed). System design includes (but is not limited to) the following activities: configuration of RSIMS threads, development of subsystem models (e.g. gyroscope, reticle processor, missile airframe model, etc.), configuration of RSIMS input/output (both digital and analog), and seeker interface and power requirements. Design documentation will be provided at the end of this phase and will include the items discussed above.

Phase 2 – Subcomponent Development

Prototype HITL simulator subcomponents must be developed. This includes development of all-digital models for the gyroscope and missile flyout, as well as hardware subcomponents like the seeker interface circuitry and computer boards.

An essential component of the development of these prototype simulators is a capability to acquire and test multiple alternative prototype simulator subcomponents. This project will require timely response by the Performer to satisfy prototype simulator subcomponent requirements. These requirements typically include, but are not limited to:

- Custom printed circuit boards (PCBs)
- Circuit Design, Fabrication, and Testing Services and Equipment
- Analog-to-Digital, Digital-to-Analog, and Digital Input/Output (IO) Cards
- GPU Cards
- FPGA Cards
- High Performance multicore computer systems and the necessary support equipment including but not limited to desktop workstations, digital simulation network servers, peripherals, and stand-alone HITL simulator systems

- Software Development Tools
- 3D printing and/or additive manufacturing of prototype designs

The development of each subcomponent will be documented in sufficient detail to produce additional copies or make design changes.

Phase 3 – Subcomponent Integration & Testing

Once the prototype simulator subcomponents have been developed, they must be integrated together and tested. This testing will be performed at the contractor's facility. Typically this is done in an incremental process where baseline RSIMS operation (stand-alone) is demonstrated first, then each all-digital subcomponent model is added one at a time, culminating in integration of the missile hardware. Incremental system testing then proceeds until the full capabilities have been demonstrated (e.g. missile flyout with image based aircraft scenes and both expendable and laser-based countermeasures).

An integration/testing report will document the results of this phase.

Phase 4 – Integration with MOSAIC GUI

In order to make the prototype simulators ready for countermeasure technique development production runs, each simulator must be integrated with the MOSAIC graphical user interface (GUI). MOSAIC (MODular System for the Advanced Investigation of Countermeasures) is a comprehensive threat engagement modeling system developed by the Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL). NSWC Crane uses the MOSAIC GUI to set up countermeasure effectiveness simulation runs for the threat models native to MOSAIC and our RSIMS HITL simulators. MOSAIC can be provided to the Performer as GFE.

A report will be provided by the Performer detailing modifications made to MOSAIC and the prototype HITL simulator during this phase. Digital copies of all supporting computer files will be provided by the Performer.

Phase 5 – Verification & Validation (V&V)

Verification is the process of assuring that model implementation is consistent with the intended model design. Validation is the process of assuring that a given model accurately responds the same as the real-world system that it represents. Prototype simulator V&V will be patterned after existing threat missile simulator V&V documents from other DoD facilities. Standard V&V documents from the Defense Modeling and Simulation Organization (DMSO) may also be used as templates. Certain V&V tests will be common to all threat missile simulators, but each simulator will also have unique V&V requirements identified during the process of system exploitation.

At the end of this phase, a formal V&V report will be provided.

Phase 6 – Delivery of Final Prototype HITL Simulator and Technical Data Package

Final delivery of the prototype HITL simulator will involve acceptance testing to insure proper functionality in all system modes. The technical data package will contain all design information

necessary to support and/or duplicate the simulator, as well as the V&V documentation. Acceptance testing will include (but is not limited to):

- Flyout simulation runs against benign targets
- Flyout simulation runs against targets employing expendable countermeasures
- Flyout simulation runs against targets employing directed infrared countermeasures (DIRCM)
- Simulation runs in lab-bench mode
- Simulation runs in captive flight test mode (seeker test van)
- Demonstration of MOSAIC GUI integration including run set-up, execution, scoring, and post-processing (detailed performance/signal analysis), and batch run capability
- Recreation of selected parameter tests from the V&V documentation

Phase 7 – Accreditation

Each prototype simulator must be accredited for use by one or more programs. Major accreditation agencies include NAVAIR PMA-272 for developmental testing and Commander Operational Test and Evaluation Force (COMOPTEVFOR) for operational testing. Simulators may also be accredited by individual program offices, or other DoD services.

This process includes development by the Performer of an accreditation support package which includes the V&V reports as well as other documentation including configuration management, system maintenance and development.

This phase includes all activities leading to a successful accreditation, including development of the accreditation support package and reviews by various subject matter experts.

The project is expected to have a duration of 10 years. Multiple prototype HITL simulators will be developed over this period of performance.

The success criteria is delivery of a fully functional prototype HITL simulator with complete documentation and V&V report that has been accredited for use by at least one project office.

6. Project Deliverables

| # | Deliverable(s) | Description | Frequency | Delivery Method |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|
| 1 | Monthly Status Report | Provide summary of events/actions completed during the previous month | 1/Month | Electronic submission |
| 2 | Prototype Simulator Acknowledgement | Upon receipt of a new government furnished prototype HITL simulator requirement, the Performer shall acknowledge receipt and provide an estimated period of performance | Upon Government Identification of a New Simulator Requirement | Electronic submission |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 3 | Phase 1 Prototype Simulator Design Review | The Performer shall provide all design documents and specifications for review/approval | As Needed | Electronic Submission |
| 4 | Phase 2 Prototype Simulator Subcomponent Development | Government review and approval for each simulator subcomponent | Upon Completion of Each Prototype Simulator Subcomponent | Crane, IN; or Government review at Performer facility |
| 5 | Phase 3 Prototype Simulator Subcomponent Integration and Testing | Government review and approval of test results from each stage of simulator subcomponent integration/testing | Upon Successful Integration of Each Subcomponent | Crane, IN; or Government review at Performer facility |
| 6 | Phase 4 Integration of Prototype Simulator with MOSAIC GUI | Documentation of all modifications needed for integration of the prototype simulator with the MOSAIC GUI, and demonstration of all system functionality within the GUI | Upon Successful Integration of the Simulator with the MOSAIC GUI | Electronic submission, and demonstration at Crane, IN; or Government review at Performer facility |
| 7 | Phase 5 Verification and Validation | Government review and approval of Verification and Validation report | Upon Completion | Electronic submission |
| 8 | Phase 6 Final Prototype HITL Simulator Delivery | Successful completion of all acceptance testing, and Government review and approval of simulator technical data package (TDP) | Upon Completion of the Simulator Development | Electronic submission of TDP, simulator delivery to Crane, IN |
| 9 | Phase 7 Accreditation | Simulator is accredited for use by Government project office, includes development of accreditation support package and participation in the SME review process | As Needed | Electronic submission, with in-person meetings as needed |

7. Current Project Budget: \$500,000

This value is subject to change depending on the number of simulators being developed and which development phases are being requested for each simulator. Respondents should propose a cost that reflects the respondent’s approach and not use the budgetary estimate only. The Government estimates that up to 25 HITL simulators will be required in the next 10 years (see Section 5 above for additional details). Total funding will be up to \$10,000,000 per year for a maximum of \$100,000,000 over 10 years. Capabilities or project phases that will require additional funding beyond the project budget must be identified as such. As described above, firm-fixed pricing is requested for each of the seven phases for each of three different threats (identified in the classified annex).

8. Security Classification, Respondent Restrictions, and other required compliances:

This RFS has been released under Distribution Statement A. *Approved for public release.*

This project encompasses the following restrictions:

- a. Security Classification: Respondents will be required to possess at least SECRET level personnel and facilities clearance at the time of award. Respondents should verify this in their proposal.

Anticipated Classification

| | Unclassified | CUI | Classified |
|----------------|--------------|-----|------------|
| RFS | x | | |
| RFS Annex | | | x |
| Proposal | | x | |
| Interim Report | | x | x |
| Final Report | | x | x |
| Hardware | x | x | x |

- The annex is classified SECRET//NOFORN. Personnel who are handling the classified annex must hold an active SECRET or higher level security clearance.
- Depending on which phases are included, interim and final reports may be Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI), or classified.
- The prototype hardware submissions may be unclassified, CUI, or classified, depending on the type of hardware.

Classified Annex: The Classified Annex with information at the SECRET/NOFORN level can be requested via email to s2marts@nstxl.org. Requests for the classified annex

should include at a minimum; Company name, the technical point of contact (POC) name and phone number, Facility Security Officer (FSO) name and phone number, CAGE code, statement of facility clearance and safeguarding capability, a valid address for receiving classified material at the SECRET level, and a statement certifying the company's intent to participate through a submission of a solution. Provide inner and outer envelope addresses.

Classified Annexes will be mailed out weekly. Requests received no later than 12:00 PM EST on Tuesday will be mailed out on Wednesday. Requests for Classified Annex will be accepted for 14 calendar days after the release date of this RFS.

b. ITAR Compliance is required at the time of award

c. Respondent Restrictions: Respondents and subcontractor / teaming partners are limited to U.S. companies

d. Any additional restrictions applicable to this project: Simulator and subcomponent designs must be compatible with NSWCC Crane RSIMS real-time simulation architecture. The RSIMS software and documentation will be provided as GFI.

e. Respondents must be compliant with DODI 8582.01. "Security of Unclassified DoD Information and Non-DoD Information Systems" and DoDM 5200.01 Volume 4, "DoD Information Security Program; Controlled Unclassified Information". Respondents must implement the security requirements in NIST SP 800-171, "Protecting Controlled Unclassified Information in Non-Federal Information Systems and Organizations"

f. Respondents shall complete the Section 889(a)(1)(B) Prohibition on Contracting with Entities Using Certain Telecommunications and Video Surveillance Services or Equipment representation attached to this RFS (Attachment #1), and return the signed representation with the submitted proposal.

All work must be done in accordance with the appropriate Security Classification Guides (SCGs). Copies of the SCGs relevant to the threats in the classified annex may be requested via email to s2marts@nstxl.org

9. Level of Data Rights Requested by the Government:

Unlimited rights: The right to use, modify, reproduce, perform, display, release, or disclose technical data in whole or in part, in any manner, and for any purpose whatsoever, and to have or authorize others to do so.

10. RFS and Response Process:

a. The following is requested from all respondents:

| Proposal Volumes | Page Limitation |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Technical Report | 20 pages (max) |
| Price Response | 5 pages (max) |

For written submissions, the following formatting guidelines shall be followed by respondents:

- 10-point font (or larger) for all response narratives; smaller type may be used in figures and tables but must be clearly legible.
- Single-spaced, single-sided (8.5 by 11 inches).
- Margins on all sides (top, bottom, left, and right) should be at least 1 inch.
- Page limitations shall not be circumvented by including inserted text boxes/pop-ups or internet links to additional information. Such inclusions are not acceptable and will not be considered as part of the response.
- Files must be submitted in PDF and/or Microsoft Word formats only. Price volumes may be submitted in an editable, unlocked Excel file.

b. Each submittal **must include** (i) a Cover Page, (ii) a Technical Response, and (iii) a Price Response that each align to the instructions below:

i. Cover Page: (Not included within page count) The cover page shall include the company's name, Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) Code (if available), level of facility clearance (if available), address, primary point of contact, business size, and status of U.S. ownership.

Respondents shall also identify the applicable 10 U.S.C. § 2371b eligibility criteria related to the response (*please identify only one*):

- There is at least one nontraditional defense contractor (*defined below*) or nonprofit research institution participating to a significant extent in the project; **OR**
- All significant participants in the transaction other than the Federal Government are small businesses (including small businesses participating in a program described under section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. § 638)) or nontraditional defense contractors; **OR**
- At least one third of the total cost of the project is to be provided by sources other than the Federal Government.

Note: A *Nontraditional Defense Contractor* is defined as an entity that is not currently performing and has not performed, for at least the one-year period preceding the solicitation of sources by the Department of Defense (DOD) for the

procurement of transaction, any contract or subcontract for the DOD that is subject to full coverage under the cost accounting standards prescribed pursuant to 41 U.S. Code § 1502 and the regulations implementing such section.

ii. Technical Response:

Responses should be constructed to align with the order of the instructions below (1 - 8).

1. Solution Narrative: Respondents shall describe the approach used to design/deliver a unique prototype solution for the prototype technology objectives defined in RFS Section 5, Desired End-State Objective(s), to include any attachments. While these focus areas are of significant importance, responses will be considered as a whole. No pricing shall be included in the technical response.

The Solution Narrative must also include a discussion on schedule and the timing of all deliverable(s) to include those outlined within RFS Section 6, Project Deliverables.

2. Explanation Supporting Eligibility for Award of a Prototype OTA:

Respondents shall provide rationale to support the specific condition that permits award of an OTA to the proposed prime contractor/performer. The onus of proof to support *nontraditional participation to a significant extent; small business or nontraditional defense contractor status; or any cost sharing arrangement* lies with the respondent and has a direct correlation to award eligibility.

3. Foreign Owned, Controlled, or Influenced (FOCI) Documentation (if applicable): Documentation may include, but is not limited to: Standard Form 328 (Certificate Pertaining to Foreign Interest); Listing of Key Management Personnel; an Organizational Chart; Security Control Agreements; Special Security Agreements; and Proxy Agreements or Voting Trust Agreements. It is recommended companies who fall within the FOCI category visit <https://www.dss.mil> for additional guidance and instruction.
4. Government Furnished Property or Information: Respondents must clearly identify if its proposed solution depends on Government Furnished Information (GFI) / Government Furnished Property (GFP) or other forms of Government support (i.e. laboratory or facility access), etc.

If so, the response must specify the GFI/GFP required. Respondents must clearly identify if its proposed solution depends on GFI/GFP or other forms of Government support be provided, the impact to the solution if the requested information/property/asset is not available, and will confirm the details with the respondent prior to any proposal revisions or selection, if applicable.

5. Mandatory Compliance with Restrictions: Respondents must address the restrictions identified within RFS Section 8, Security Classification, Respondent Restrictions, and other Required Compliance, and explain how each regulation or standard is currently, or will be met.
6. Task Description Document (Not Included Within Page Count): Respondents must provide a Task Description Document (TDD) outlining the project tasks to be performed along with schedule milestones and delivery dates required for successful completion. It is anticipated that, if selected, the proposed TDD will be incorporated into the resultant OTA. Respondents are encouraged to be concise but thorough when outlining their work statements. The TDD may be submitted as an appendix or a separate file as part of the proposal.
7. Summary of Subcontractor Participation (if applicable): Respondents must identify all subcontractors involved and their role within the performance of the proposed concept. The information must include the following:
 - a. Subcontractor company name, Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) Code (if available), level of facility clearance (if available), address, primary point of contact, business size, and status of U.S. ownership.
 - b. If the subcontracted company's involvement is considered significant, rationale supporting the significance must be present within the narrative. The onus of proof to support participation to a significant extent or any cost sharing arrangement lies with the respondent and has a direct correlation to award eligibility.
 - c. If applicable, Foreign Owned, Controlled, or Influenced (FOCI) Mitigation Documentation shall be provided for subcontractors and will not count towards the page count.
8. Data Rights Assertions and Level of Rights Proposed:
 - a. The rights offered should be displayed in a manner that allows for ease of discussion in determining trade-offs and potential options for long-term sustainability of the deliverables of this effort.
 - b. If rights are being asserted at a level less than the Government's desired level of allocation (see RFS Section 9, Level of Data Rights Requested by the Government), respondents must provide detail explaining the specific rationale for the assertion. Please also review 10(b)(iii)(5) below for additional requirements related to data rights pricing.

- c. Any items previously developed with federal funding (and used for the proposed solution) should clearly identify all individual components funded by the Government and the recipient of the deliverables.
- d. If commercial software is proposed as part of the prototype solution, all applicable software licenses must be identified and included with the response. Note that any software license term or condition inconsistent with federal law will be negotiated out of the license.

iii. Price Response:

The price response shall be submitted as a separate file from the technical response. No pricing details shall be included in the technical response. This project will employ the following pricing structure:

- Fixed Price with Payable Milestones
- Expenditure Basis (cost reimbursable)

1. Itemized prices will be provided for each of the seven phases of HITL simulator development (described in Section 5 above), for each of the three threats identified in the classified annex. Awards for development of individual prototype HITL simulators can be made for one to seven phases of development as described in Section 5 above.
2. The overall total price should be divided among severable increments that align to the seven phases of HITL simulator development described in Section 5 above. Milestones are not required to match actual expenditures but should realistically align to the effort expended or products delivered.
3. In order to support the Government's evaluation of fair and reasonable pricing, the respondent shall delineate the key pricing components, and show clear traceability to the phases and/or milestones of the Technical Response. At a minimum, key pricing components include Labor Total(s), Other Direct Costs/Material Total(s), License prices and Subcontractor price(s). Data should be segregated by each key objective, milestone, and/or phase proposed.
4. Include a brief narrative that explains your pricing structure and maps the proposed prices to the solution's technical approach.
5. Including a Basis of Estimate to support your pricing may substantially expedite evaluation of your response.
6. If limited or restricted rights are being asserted within the response, a table that includes prices for both Government Purpose Rights and Unlimited Rights for any limited or restricted item must be included.

7. Any additional features or capabilities that extend beyond the currently requested core technical objectives shall be separately priced for the Government's consideration. Pending funding availability and need, the Government may fund these advanced features at a later date.

11. Evaluation Process and Methodology:

- a. Individual responses will be evaluated with consideration given to:
 - i. Demonstrated expertise and overall technical merit of the response;
 - ii. Feasibility of implementation; and
 - iii. Total project risk as it relates to the technical focus areas, price and schedule
- b. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the proposed solution provides a thorough, flexible, and sound approach in response to the prototype technical objectives as stated in RFS Section 5, Desired End-State Objectives, as well as the ability to fulfill the objectives in this RFS.
- c. The Government will award this project, via S²MARTS (Agreement No. N00164-19-9-0001), to the respondent(s) whose solution is assessed to be the most advantageous to the Government, when price, schedule, technical risks, the level of data rights, and other factors are considered. The Government reserves the right to award to a respondent that does not meet all the requirements of the RFS.
- d. The proposed project price, schedule, and intellectual property/data rights assertions will be considered as aspects of the entire response when weighing risk and reward. The assessment of risks is subjective and will consider all aspects of the proposed solution. Respondents are responsible for identifying risks within their submissions, as well as providing specific mitigating solutions.
- e. The Government reserves the right to reject a submission and deem it ineligible for consideration if the response is incomplete and/or does not clearly provide the requested information. Debriefings will not be provided.

12. Follow-On Activity:

- a. Upon successful completion of this prototype effort, the Government anticipates that a follow-on production effort may be awarded via either contract or transaction, without the use of competitive procedures if the participants in this transaction successfully complete the prototype project as competitively awarded from this document. The prototype effort will be considered successfully complete upon demonstration of the aforementioned technology objectives.

b. Successful completion for a specific capability may occur prior to the conclusion of the project to allow the Government to transition that aspect of the prototype project into production while other aspects of the prototype project have yet to be completed.

c. Requirements of other potential follow-on activities could involve, though not limited to, continued development and baseline management, fielding, sustainment, training, further scaling of the solution, integration of future capabilities, or integration of the solution with other capabilities.

13. Attachments

1. FY 2019 NDAA Section 889 Verification - Representation
2. FY 2019 NDAA Section 889 Clause
3. DD254 Security Classification

14. Important Dates

- a. Questions related to this RFS shall be submitted no later than 10 February 2021.

To submit any questions, visit the opportunities page at www.nstxl.org/opportunities, select the “Current” tab, locate the respective project, and select “Submit a Question”.

- b. Proposals submitted in response to this RFS are due no later than Friday, February 26, 2021.
- c. To submit your proposal, visit the opportunities page at www.nstxl.org/opportunities, select the “Current” tab, locate the respective project, and select the “Submit Proposal” link. You must have an active account and be logged-in to submit your response.
- d. RFS Respondents must be active members of the consortium at the time of proposal submission.

15. Additional Project Information

a. The Government intends to award one Other Transaction Agreement as a result of this RFS; however, more than one award may be made if determined to be in the Government’s best interest. The Government also reserves the right to not select any of the solutions proposed.

b. Acceptable responses not selected for the immediate award will be retained by NSTXL & the Government for possible future execution and funding. The non-

selected proposals will be considered as viable alternatives for up to 36 months. If a proposal (that was not previously selected) is determined to be a suitable alternative, the company will be contacted to discuss any proposal updates and details of a subsequent project award.

Respondents whose proposals are not selected for the initial award shall not contact the Government or NSTXL to inquire about the status of any ongoing effort as it relates to the likelihood of their company being selected as a future alternative.

- c. The United States Navy, specifically Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division, has release authority on any publications related to this prototype project.
- d. Unsuccessful respondents will be notified, however, debriefings for this project are not required nor planned at this time.
- e. If resource-sharing is proposed in accordance with 10 U.S. Code § 2371b(d)(1)(C), then the non-Federal amounts counted as provided, or to be provided, by parties other than the Federal Government may not include costs that were incurred before the date on which the OT agreement becomes effective. Costs offered as a resource-share that were incurred for a project after the beginning of negotiations, but prior to the date the OT agreement becomes effective, may be counted as non-Federal amounts if and to the extent that the Agreements Officer determines in writing that: (1) the party other than the Federal Government incurred the costs in anticipation of the OT agreement; and (2) it was appropriate for the entity to incur the costs before the OT agreement became effective in order to ensure the successful implementation of the OT agreement.
- f. Certain types of information submitted to the Department during the RFS and award process of an OT are exempt from disclosure requirements of 5 U.S.C. §552 (the Freedom of Information Act or FOIA) for a period of five years from the date the Department receives the information. It is recommended that respondents mark business plans and technical information that are to be protected for five years from FOIA disclosure with a legend identifying the documents as being submitted on a business confidential basis.
- g. No classified data shall be submitted within the proposal. To the extent that the project involves DoD controlled unclassified information, respondents must comply with DoDI 8582.01 and DoDM 5200.01 Volume 4. Respondents must implement the security requirements in NIST SP 800-171 for safeguarding the unclassified internal information system; and must report any cyber incidents that affect the controlled unclassified information directly to DoD at <https://dibnet.dod.mil>.
- h. Export controls (if applicable): Research findings and technology developments arising from the resulting proposed solution may constitute a significant enhancement to the national defense and to the economic vitality of the United States. As such, in the conduct of all work related to this effort, the selected performer must comply

strictly with the International Traffic in Arms Regulation (22 C.F.R. §§ 120-130), the National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual (DoD 5220.22-M) and the Department of Commerce Export Regulation (15 C.F.R. §§ 730-774).