

DARPA-BAA-09-24
Warfare (IASW)
Questions and Answers
20 April 2009



Interrogative Anti-Submarine

QUESTION #1: Can a proposed solution address a subset of the aspects listed (delivery, sensing or communications) or must the solution be end-to-end?

ANSWER #1: End-to-end.

QUESTION #2: Does “non-alerting” mean “do not let the target know where our ships are” or does it mean “do not tip off the target with the sensors, i.e. passive detection vs. active”?

ANSWER #2: Do not tip off the target being interrogated.

QUESTION #3: What is the definition of non-alerting?

ANSWER #3: Non-alerting to the threat submarine. Example: active sonar is alerting generally and passive sonar is not.

QUESTION #4: Does the splash have to be non-alerting?

ANSWER #4: No.

QUESTION #5: Is active sonar alerting?

ANSWER #5: Most likely, but it depends. Solutions that are alerting are acceptable, just less desirable than non-alerting solutions of equivalent capability to meet the metrics.

QUESTION #6: What platforms are assumed?

ANSWER #6: Ship. It would be nice for solutions to be extensible to other platforms.

QUESTION #7: What persistence is assumed for sensors?

ANSWER #7: That which is needed to achieve the metrics.

QUESTION #8: What target depth is assumed?

ANSWER #8: All depths.

QUESTION #9: How many interrogations/deployments are required to be performed before the system is exhausted or resupplied?

ANSWER #9: Assume a nominal 5 day underway replenishment interval. This may or may not be relevant, depending on the solution proposed.

QUESTION #10: Are shallow-water littoral techniques or periscope depth detection of concern and how much so compared to deep water detection?

ANSWER #10: The solution should not be specific to shallow or deep water environments – all target depths should be considered, not just periscope.

QUESTION #11: How significant is the ability to combine information from multiple sensors?

ANSWER #11: This is dependent upon the proposers' solution.

QUESTION #12: Are you assuming the AOU area?

ANSWER #12: The Area of Uncertainty for an initial detection and time late detection are to be defined by the performer in justifying for the approach.

QUESTION #13: Do you have a prioritization of mission?

ANSWER #13: No.

QUESTION #14: Are there assumptions for de-conflicting neutral assets in the environment?

ANSWER #14: Proposers should decide if and how this is done with their particular system concepts.

QUESTION #15: Is it assumed that a system will need to handle multiple contacts at once?

ANSWER #15: Yes.

QUESTION #16: How many hours is the system expected to operate?

ANSWER #16: Answer to number 9 may have relevance. There is no firm requirement.

QUESTION #17: Are these program metrics or Phase 1 metrics?

ANSWER #17: The performer will not build a system in Phase 1. Metrics are projected system metrics.

QUESTION #18: Are there cost guidelines for the Phase 1 proposals?

ANSWER #18: No, proposers should price their proposal based on their proposed approach.

QUESTION #19: Are there known error ellipses associated with the initial detection in terms of range and/or bearing error? We assume the detection was an active sonar as there is no target identification information provided.

ANSWER #19: No error ellipses are provided for the active sonar concepts. The proposer should provide system rationales, including assumptions used.

QUESTION #20: Are there any Target models available for use in terms of acoustic Sound Pressurization Levels or magnetic/electric signatures?

ANSWER #20: No target models are provided. The proposer should provide system rationales, including assumptions used.

QUESTION #21: Was the initial detection only a singular event or is there updated information available regarding target motion that could be provided to a search system enroute?

ANSWER #21: Target motion is not guaranteed for solving the problem.

QUESTION #22: Is the scenario presented limited to the Open Ocean environment or should we consider/extend to the Littoral environment?

ANSWER #22: The operations are not constrained to a particular water environment.

QUESTION #23: With regard to sensor persistence/duration are we to assume that the sensors need only last as long as the time limits provided or is there a preference to keep them operating for a longer duration?

ANSWER #23: Sensors should last long enough to permit subsequent interrogations. Longer holding time is better but not required.

QUESTION #24: Is the scenario limited to the transit case only or is the protection of the Sea Base scenario of interest as well?

ANSWER #24: The operations are not constrained to a particular water environment.

QUESTION #25: As phase 1 is a study, the private sector could be reasonably expected to claim the ability to develop any desired technology and thereby eliminate participation by all FFRDCs. This would exclude potentially game changing FRRDC developed TRL 1 or 2 technologies from incorporation in the proposed solution. Given the short timeline for submission of this proposal, what is an acceptable level of clear demonstration that the work is not otherwise available from the private sector?

ANSWER #25: Follow the requirements specified on page 8, Section 3.1 entitled “Eligible Applicants”.

QUESTION #26: The unclassified portion of the BAA BAA-09-24 released on March 11th states that “This solicitation (DARPA-BAA-09-24), the DARPA BAA-09-24 Classified Addendum, and the Security Classification Guide (DARPA-SCG-570) constitute the total BAA. The proposal due date is listed as 20 May 2009, 70 days after release of the unclassified portion of the BAA.” As of April 2, the Classified Addendum to the BAA has not been received. Will the proposal due date be extended based on the available/shipping date of the Classified Addendum?

ANSWER #26: Any changes to the proposal submission date will be available on FedBizOpps.

QUESTION #27: If a contractor is awarded Phase 1 will there be a conflict of interest issue that would prevent the contractor from bidding on and receiving a Phase 2 or follow-on contract award on this topic?

ANSWER #27: It is not the Governments intent to disqualify Phase I performers from proposing to any future phase.

QUESTION #28: Is it possible to change the format of the proposal? First, would it be possible to move technical section 2G to the top or front of the volume, in front of Section 2A? This change would prevent section 2G from spanning page 5 into page 6. Second, can section 3 start on a new page?

ANSWER #28: Follow the proposal submission requirements contained in the BAA.