

2. Amendment/Modification No. 0002	3. Effective Date 2004SEP30	4. Requisition/Purchase Req No. SEE SCHEDULE	5. Project No. (If applicable)
---	------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------

6. Issued By US ARMY AVIATION & MISSILE COMMAND AMSAM-AC-CM-A MICHAEL HICKS (256)313-4509 REDSTONE ARSENAL AL 35898-5280 EMAIL: MICHAEL.HICKS@PEOAVN.REDSTONE.ARMY.MIL	Code	W58RGZ	7. Administered By (If other than Item 6)	Code
---	------	--------	---	------

8. Name And Address Of Contractor (No., Street, City, County, State and Zip Code)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9A. Amendment Of Solicitation No. W58RGZ-04-R-0674			
		9B. Dated (See Item 11) 2004SEP01			
	<input type="checkbox"/>	10A. Modification Of Contract/Order No.			
		10B. Dated (See Item 13)			
Code		Facility Code			

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended, is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning 2 signed copies of the amendments; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. **FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER.** If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. Accounting And Appropriation Data (If required)

13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS
It Modifies The Contract/Order No. As Described In Item 14.

<input type="checkbox"/>	A. This Change Order is Issued Pursuant To: The Contract/Order No. In Item 10A.	The Changes Set Forth In Item 14 Are Made In
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. The Above Numbered Contract/Order Is Modified To Reflect The Administrative Changes (such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.) Set Forth In Item 14, Pursuant To The Authority of FAR 43.103(b).	
<input type="checkbox"/>	C. This Supplemental Agreement Is Entered Into Pursuant To Authority Of:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	D. Other (Specify type of modification and authority)	

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor is not, is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the Issuing Office.

14. Description Of Amendment/Modification (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

SEE SECOND PAGE FOR DESCRIPTION

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. Name And Title Of Signer (Type or print)	16A. Name And Title Of Contracting Officer (Type or print)
15B. Contractor/Offeror _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. Date Signed
	16B. United States Of America By _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)
	16C. Date Signed

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued	Page 2 of 6
	PIIN/SIIN W58RGZ-04-R-0674	MOD/AMD 0002

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

SECTION A - SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

The purpose of this amendment is to answer Industry questions and comments and AMCOM answers and to provide information as shown below:

1. Question: Will the program consider delay of the SCD fly off to Mid 2006 so as to allow currently rapidly maturing systems to compete for the ER/MP SDD phase?

Answer: No.

2. RFP Statement: Page 70 of 78, Section L-24, Paragraph 4-h, states the following: "Travel shall be identified by trip, origin, destination, airfare and per diem."

Issue: Discrete travel over a four-year time frame is very hard to estimate accurately. Our proven cost estimating system uses a Cost Estimating Relationship (CER) based on a historical program or Profit Center assign criteria. Our historical data has proven to be an accurate way to estimate travel.

Request: We request approval to use Cost Estimating Relationship (CER) based on a historical program or Profit Center assign criteria in place of identifying travel discretely as request in the RFP.

Answer: The Government has requested discrete estimates as identified in Section L-24, Paragraph 4-H so that an evaluation and subsequent comparison of offerors proposed costs can be made. Please comply with the terms of the RFP and submit discrete estimates.

3. There are two sets of missions given, those in section 3.3.1.8 described as the 'Standard Missions (missions A and B), and six missions described in Annex A. It is unclear how the two sets of missions are related.

The Annex A missions and the Standard Missions are similar but not exactly the same (e.g., cruise altitudes). This implies that they are specific missions to be analyzed. However the Annex A missions are more detailed and do not mention reserve fuel requirements, which suggests that the Standard Missions are simply examples or templates to be used for the 6 Annex A missions.

Question: Are the six missions included in Annex A the only missions to be analyzed (with the Standard missions given as examples/templates only), or are the 'Standard Missions A and B in section 3.3.1.8 specific missions to be analyzed as well (for a total of 8 missions to be analyzed)?

Answer: The purpose of the Standard Missions in section 3.3.1.8 is to provide a standardized basis for evaluation of AV Flight performance requirements. The Offerors proposed systems will be evaluated based on the Standard Mission Profiles shown in the TRD. Data will be collected during the SCD to support an evaluation to the Standard Mission Profiles only. Annex A Mission Profiles are provided as design reference material.

The Annex A missions do specify a fuel reserve under the ANNEX A Mission Profiles number 5 "A minimum, useable fuel reserve of 30 minutes at loiter condition shall be required after conclusion of the mission."

To clarify the mission profiles and conditions which the vendors should respond, the following modifications are hereby made to the TRD:

3.2.8.3 Attack Mission

It is an objective requirement that the ER/MP UAV system be capable of providing an attack mission of a minimum endurance of 6 hours. For the duration of the attack mission, the AV shall carry SEP, 150 lbs of payloads, minimum of 400 lbs weapon stores (minimum of 200 lbs under each wing (T)), the ADT/ADR and SATCOM ADT.

3.3.1.7 Time on Station (Range & Endurance)

The AV shall provide a time on station of 12-hours (T) at an operational range of 300 km (T), and 24-hours time on station (O) at a range of 500 km (O). Endurance capability refers to the time on station in each of the Standard Mission Profiles defined 3.3.1.8.

3.3.1.8.3 Standard Mission Profile C

A mix payload and fuel can be offloaded to support the weapons mission. At a minimum 150 lbs of EO/IR/LD/LRF shall be installed and operational while carrying 400 lbs of weapon stores (or simulated ordnance).

Warm-up, pre-flight checks, taxi, and automatic takeoff from sea level.
Climb to 15,000 ft DA within 15 km of the takeoff site.

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued	Page 3 of 6
	PIIN/SIIN W58RGZ-04-R-0674	MOD/AMD 0002

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

Dash at 15000 ft DA at maximum airspeed to a range of 300 km from the takeoff site (T), 500 km from the takeoff site (O).

Descend to 8,000 ft DA within range of 295 to 300 km from the takeoff site (T), 495 to 500 km (O).

Loiter on-station at a calibrated airspeed between 60 and 75 kts, at 8,000 ft DA, for 6 hours.

Climb to 15,000 ft DA within a range of 295 to 300 km (T) from takeoff site , 495 to 500 km (O) from the takeoff site.

Dash at 15,000 ft DA at maximum airspeed to within 15 km of the takeoff site.

Descend to sea level within the remaining 15 km of the takeoff site.

Perform automatic landing and taxi, maintaining a usable fuel reserve for a 30-minute loiter at 5,000 ft DA following completion of the mission.

4. Section L, paragraph 2c, page 68 states:

"The offeror shall provide RAM allocations, predictions and demonstrated values across the ER/MP system to the LRU level, with appropriate allocations for the GFE."

Offerors will need to: 1. Estimate RAM values for GFE or 2. Research individual items through Government sources. Offerors will then need to provide assumptions and data sources with our proposal. If the Government provides either individual RAM data or aggregate RAM data for GFE, this will provide a level playing field with respect to evaluation of RAM.

Question: Given that the offeror is required to provide "appropriate allocations" for GFE, will the Government provide RAM data for each item of GFE, or at least an aggregate RAM allocation for GFE? If not, what guidance can the Government provide offerors with respect to the definition of "appropriate" allocations?

Answer: The Government has provided a par value for Payload. The payload is controlled by the Government. The remaining GFE is at the discretion of the offeror. Example: number and type of vehicles. As the offeror selects the appropriate vehicles reliability/durability may be included as a rationale for the selection along with load capacity, terrain capability etc. As the offeror will research his choices of GFE, an allocation can be made for? {word appears to have been omitted}each choice by the offeror.

5. Paragraph 3.3.9.2.1 is a sub-paragraph of 3.3.9 Software Engineering. The CDRL called out in paragraph (3.3.9.1) is not a S/W design document.

Question: Should the CDRL called for in Paragraph 3.3.9.1 be part of the 3.3.9 Software Engineering SOW task and a Software deliverable?

Answer: No. The numbering is misleading, but the DID is correct. 3.3.9.2 is not a subordinate task to software.

6. SOW paragraph 3.3.9 is Software Engineering. Two software CDRLs were found in other SOW paragraphs: 3.3.15 and 3.3.17. The CDRLs called out in 3.3.15 and 3.3.17 are part of the SOW software engineering Task, Paragraph 3.3.9.

Question: Should the CDRLs called for in Paragraphs 3.3.15 and 3.3.17 be part of the 3.3.9 Software Engineering SOW task?

Answer: Yes.

7. SOW paragraph 3.3.9 is Software Engineering. Two CDRLs (A046 and A047) were not called out as part of the SOW software engineering Task, Paragraph 3.3.9. and are not referenced elsewhere in the SOW.

Question: Should the following CDRLs be identified as deliverables as part of the 3.3.9 Software Engineering SOW task?

A046	Software Version Description (SVD)
A047	Software User Manual (SUM)

Answer: The contract reference for each CDRL data item (See block 5 of DD Form 1423-1 for each) is correct. See section 3.2.3 for Software Version Description (SVD)--A046. See section 3.5.3 for the Software User Manual--A046 (associated with deliverable simulation software).

CONTINUATION SHEET**Reference No. of Document Being Continued**

Page 4 of 6

PIIN/SIIN W58RGZ-04-R-0674

MOD/AMD 0002

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

8. Reference: RFP section H-7, Government Property for the Performance of this contract (CPIF/AF - SDD), page 27, is changed by inserting a revised quantity and delivery date for the SAR/GMTI as shown below. All other equipment referenced in H-7 remains unchanged.

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>OLD</u> <u>QTY</u>	<u>OLD</u> <u>DATE</u>	<u>REVISED</u> <u>QTY</u>	<u>REVISED</u> <u>DATE</u>
SAR/GMTI	2	Aug 05	1	31 Dec 05
SAR/GMTI	2	Sep 05	1	31 Jan 06
SAR/GMTI	2	Oct 05	1	28 Feb 06
			1	31 Mar 06

All other GFP reference in H-7 remains unchanged.

9. WBS supplied in 2 formats: Attachment 5a and Attachment 5b. A comparison of the WBS element descriptions from both revealed the following inconsistencies:

WBS element 1.3.5: 5a reads "Payload Integration",
5b reads "AV integration".

WBS element 1.3.7: 5a reads "AV Integration",
5b reads "AV Software"

WBS element 1.3.8: 5a reads "AV Software",
5b reads "Payload Integration"

Inconsistency in the 2 WBS attachments affects development and evaluation of Cost, TOC and IMP/IMS.

We recommend attachment 5a be used as the master and attachment 5b be modified to agree.

Question: Which WBS attachment (a or b) should we use?

Answer: Section J - List of Attachments is changed to provide revised WBS attachments 005.a and 005.b that correct the noted inconsistencies identified in the question. The Government is also providing as Attachment 005.c Mil-HDBK-881. A copy of the revised Attachments 005.a and 005.b and new Attachment 005.c shall be posted on <http://www.tuav.redstone.army.mil/ermp2> on the date of issuance of Amendment 0002.

10. Background: Section H-5, page 27 states that the Government will notify bidders of WCP (WIN-T Payload) quantities and delivery dates by RFP Amendment.

Question: There is less than 30 days remaining to submission of ER/MP proposals. Can the Government give bidders a date when this amendment will be delivered?

Answer: Two Engineering Development Models (EDMs) that are functionally representative of LRIP models, but will have a different form/fit to be delivered 1st Quarter FY07.

Two LRIP units delivered in 3rd Quarter FY07.

It is recognized that both of these deliveries are outside of the ERMP subsystem integration window in FY06. This is due to the ongoing WIN-T program restructuring. As potential risk mitigation, WIN-T will deliver the ICDs a year early (May 05 versus May 06). Additionally, the ERMP contractor will have access to all test data from the WIN-T DT/OT (1st Quarter FY06).

11. The Extended/Range/Multi-Purpose Schedule found in the RFP Attachment 009 has the Limited User Test (LUT) occurring around month 27 ARO whereas the OPTEMPO and IOT&E tests occur around month 45.

Question: Is it the Government's intent to have the LUT occur as shown in the ER/MP Program Summary Schedule or is the contractor to schedule the LUT event?

Answer: It is the intent of the Government to conduct the LUT as shown on the ER/MP Program Summary Schedule. The LUT is a Government test intended to provide an early indication into operational issues of the ER/MP UAV. The LUT will be scheduled by the Government. The Government requires contractor's support as outlined in the SOW.

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued PIIN/SIIN W58RGZ-04-R-0674 MOD/AMD 0002	Page 5 of 6
---------------------------	---	---------------------------

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

12. Comment: The ER/MP RFP did not contain a Section C or Section G.

Question: Will the Government issue a Section C or G, and if so, when?

Answer: Section G, Contract Administrative Data, is not part of the RFP and shall be included in the contract award document.

The RFP is changed to add Section C as below:

SECTION C - DESCRIPTION/SPECIFICATIONS/WORK STATEMENT:

C-1 See Attachments 002 and 003, Statement of Works for SCD and SDD, respectively, and Attachment 001, Performance Specification (TRD).

13. Comment: The RFP states on page 51 of 78 (Section J List of Attachments) that the ERMP UAV System Security Classification Guide will be posted on the ER/MP web site after issue of the RFP, however it has yet to appear.

Question: Will the Government issue an ER/MP Security Classification Guide, and if so, when?

Answer: Reference Amendment 0001, Question/Answer #7. as below:

The Security Classification Guide will be provided upon written request to doris.dam@tuav.redstone.army.mil. Request must come from the Facility Security Officer (FSO), include FSO telephone number and U.S. mailing address; Cage Code and storage capability. SCG will be provided to Prime Contractor only. Contractor must be registered in the CVA with no restrictions. Not authorized to make copies of the SCG. Not authorized to release the SCT to Foreign Nationals, Foreign Contractors or Representatives of Foreign Contractors/Nationals. SCG must be returned not later than five (5) working days after notification that contractor was not awarded the contract to: Security Manager, SFAE-AV-UAV-SE, UAVS Project Office, Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5000.

14. Comment: Section L, paragraph 2.0, Phase I Proposal addresses the number of printed copies of all volumes except the Cost Volume.

Question: How many hard copies of the Cost Volume are required for submission as part of the ER/MP Proposal?

Answer: Reference Amendment 0001, Question/Answer #1. as below:

Section L-24, Paragraph 2.0 is hereby changed to reflect the following:

Cost Volume row should read: Max Pages "No Limit" and Printed Copies: "5"

15. Comment: The RFP schedule states an estimated start date of April 2005, but the pricing instruction states to use a start date of Feb 2005.

Question: Please confirm the use of Feb 2005 as a pricing start date or clarify which date to use.

Answer: Reference Amendment 0001, Question/Answer #4. as below:

Section L24, paragraph 4.(L), is hereby modified to read, "For pricing purposes, the expected or approximate date for initiation for SDD contract performance is April 2005".

16. Section J - List of Attachments is changed to revise Attachment 001 - TRD to add administrative changes. The revised TRD shall be posted on <http://www.tuav.redstone.army.mil/ermp2> on the issuance date of this amendment.

17. Section L-24, paragraph 8.0.a., page 73 of 78 requires the submission of DD 1494 frequency requests. Depending on number of frequencies, etc. this could amount to a substantial number of pages.

Question: Are the DD 1494s in the page count limitation?

Answer: No, completed DD 1494s are excluded from page count limitations.

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued	Page 6 of 6
	PIIN/SIIN W58RGZ-04-R-0674	MOD/AMD 0002

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

18. SDD SOW paragraph 3.4.1 Payload Integration is changed as follows*:

Delete:

3.4.1 Payload Integration

The contractor shall integrate the EO/IR/Laser Range Finder (LRF)/Laser Designator (LD), Airborne Standoff Minefield Detection System (ASTAMIDS), SAR/GMTI, and WIN-T Communications Payload (WCP) payloads and associated equipment with all ER/MP equipment to ensure compliance with the Increment I ER/MP UAV and SE TRD.

Add:

3.4.1 Payload Integration

The contractor shall integrate the EO/IR/Laser Range Finder (LRF)/Laser Designator (LD), SAR/GMTI, and WIN-T Communications Payload (WCP) Payloads and associated equipment with all ER/MP equipment to ensure compliance with the Increment I ER/MP UAV and SE TRD. The contractors integration approach shall accommodate the future integration of Airborne Standoff Minefield Detection System (ASTAMIDS).

* The revised copy of the SDD SOW shall be posted on <http://www.tuav.redstone.army.mil/ermp2> on the issuance date of this amendment.

*** END OF NARRATIVE A 003 ***