



S²MARTS Project: Hypersonics Advanced Manufacturing Test Capability (HAMTC)
Request For Solutions (RFS) Question & Answer | Date: August 3, 2021

1. Question: Is a solution required to address both aspects of the prototyping project (advanced materials manufacturing and 3D C/C) or may they be treated individually?

Answer: The tasks may be treated individually, or solutions can address subtasks within Task 1 or Task 2.

2. Question: Are there limitations on materials or structures for part one of the prototyping project (advanced materials manufacturing proof-of-concept), ie. C-C, Ox-Ox, CMC, monolithic materials and leading edge, structure, skin, window, elements?

Answer: No limitations on type of material or structure.

3. Question: Would you consider a proposal that only focuses on the Hypersonic simulations portions of the eco-system If gaps could be addressed and the procedures/software/mathematical models could be made available to all DoD contractors, and/or to one or two large prime contractors to start with until de-risking has been validated to improve pre-fabrication and wind-tunnel testing efficiencies by reducing the gap between simulation and wind-tunnel testing results? Short note and rationale for this approach: In theory if the simulation process are de-risked over time to provides near real-world simulation results with different material builds and configuration, it would create an increased opportunity to more efficiently centralize manufacturing processes closer to wind tunnels by a variety of Hypersonic industry partners.

Answer: Yes, we will consider proposals that address specific gaps in simulation vs testing in the "Test" subtask under Task 1.

4. Question: Is this the total available budget for Task 1, allocated for one consortium proposal which addresses all of the tasks' outlined in the RFS to be awarded to a single awardee/consortium winner? Or, is the Task 1 \$18.674M budget to be awarded to several capable consortium awardees hedge-off risks?

Answer: It is possible to award to multiple awardees if there are multiple proposals that address various aspects of the requirements/ tasks.

5. Question: Is this only interested in C/C or C-SiC materials? Is there an interest in refractory metals?

Answer: The interest is in materials that will support testing in a high temperature Hypersonic environment.

6. Question: Can we propose to build a team focused ONLY on cyber security related topics - requirements, plans, design and implementation.

Answer: No, we are looking for proposals that will address technical and programmatic solutions rather than just cybersecurity.

7. Question: (2) Under (9) on page 11 of the RFS, there is a requirement to allow "government rights to use, modify, reproduce, release, perform, display, or disclose technical data within the Government without restriction." However, under "Technical Response" (ii)(8) on page 14, the RFS indicates there are means for justifying limited government rights to data. (2)(a) Is a technical response eligible for award if it entails developing a prototype manufacturing device derived in part from technology developed from a contractor's independent resources? (2)(b) Will the government accept precedent enabling an assertion of limited rights to the government for data regarding such technology developed independently (non-governmentally)? (2)(c) Will these considerations be acceptable to the proposal reviewers if such assertions (and justification) are included as an addendum to the Technical Proposal and not included within the 20-page technical proposal write-up?



Answer: (2)(a/b) Yes, we will consider a proposal that includes use of a contractor-developed technology with limited governmental use of data rights. (2)(c) No, we will not accept an addendum, and would require the assertion within the 20 page write up.

8. Question: 1) Under (8) on page 11 of the RFS, there is a requirement for a Security Classification of "Secret, At Award." The initial concept for several of our potential statements of work entails developing non-classified manufacturing processes and materials. In addition, the DD 254 included with the RFS package allows for more flexibility and indicates clear recognition of non-classified work being performed. In light of the foregoing, we respectfully submit the following questions: (1)(a) Could the Government please clarify whether it interprets "Secret, At Award" language to require the prime awardee to have an independent "Secret" clearance itself at the time of the award, as opposed to being able to use the receipt of this award as the basis for obtaining such a clearance? (1)(b) If the answer to the foregoing question is that the prime awardee must have its own independent "Secret" clearance at the time of the award, would the Government reconsider this position, recognizing that some respondents are no doubt still in the process of standing up facilities and capabilities for delivering the objectives outlined in the RFS and thus have not yet had the opportunity to obtain such a standalone clearance at the time of award? (1)(c) Is a proposal acceptable if it reflects the fact that the Prime contractor and several subcontractors will perform unclassified work for the first 15 months of the proposed period of performance before shifting to classified applications to be performed by Prime contractors and subcontractors with requisite clearances?

Answer: (1)(a) Yes, we accept the use of the contract award to obtain clearance. (1)(b) N/A. (1)(c) No, we expect to begin performing Classified work with requirements definition, so an Interim clearance would be required to perform this work.