

**GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL  
FALCON SOLICITATION QUESTIONS**

165. On page 38, 4.6.1.1, 3rd para.of the draft solicitation, it states..."Cost contributions for items such as IR&D reimbursement, G&A, cost of money and fee identified separately will meet solicitation requirements". Does this mean that G&A, cost of money and fee will be counted as cost share? ***The items identified in this paragraph are provided as examples of items that could meet any requirement for cost share. It is not intended to require that these items be counted as cost share.***

166. Can we submit a compliance matrix (mapping their proposal requirements to our sections) with our proposal to aid your evaluation but not count as page count? ***A compliance matrix would count toward the page limit.***

167. Figure 2.1 Notional Program Plan depicts an SDR in Phase 1 yet the Task 1 (SLV) milestones only call for development of a System Performance Specification (SPS). An SDR seems premature based on Phase 1 funding level, maturity of development plan and stated deliverables. A streamlined System Concept Review (SCR) or System Requirements Review (SRR) based on the SPS and other deliverables and occurring as part of Milestone 4 review seems more reasonable. Is it DARPA's intent that the Milestone 3 and/or 4 serve this purpose with the content or was SDR misstated on the figure? Desire clarification. ***The Government's Reference Schedule is notional. The Offeror should propose reviews and other events that are consistent with its proposed approach and associated schedule of major accomplishments. As currently laid out, the SDR would occur near the end of Phase I and thus within the timeline of events associated with Milestone 4. The Government's expectations are that the Phase I Performers will be well beyond a Systems Requirements Review by this time.***

168. Small and Veteran owned businesses are not included in the list of types of businesses included in paragraph 1 of Attachment 1 to the PIP which provides the FAR Model Contract and Instructions. Shouldn't these type businesses be included on the list? ***Paragraph 1(3) of the Contract instructions is changed to read: "(3) Large Business, Small Disadvantaged Business, Other Small Business, Woman Owned Business, Historically Black College or University, Minority Institution, Other Educational or Other Nonprofit". More specific information regarding business type are covered under the Representations and Certifications which are set forth at the end of the model contract.***

169. Would it be possible to obtain a list of the attendees and handouts for the July 8, 2003 industry day? ***The list of attendees and handout consisting of a CD containing the briefings that were made at Industry Day are available by sending a request by electronic mail to the Contracting Officer, Mr. James Troutman at***

***"jtroutman@darpa.mil" with a copy to Ms. Sue Morris at "smorris@snap.org". The CD will only be sent to US Companies or US Universities.***

170. Would it be possible to receive the Attachment 1, FAR Model Contract and Instructions, and Attachment 2, OT Model Agreement and Instructions, in Word or other format that can be filled out electronically? ***Attachment 1 and Attachment 2 of the PIP have been posted to the DARPA/TTO website in Microsoft Word format. The documents can be located at [http://www.darpa.mil/TTO/falcon/FALCON\\_PIP\\_Attachment1.doc](http://www.darpa.mil/TTO/falcon/FALCON_PIP_Attachment1.doc) and [http://www.darpa.mil/TTO/falcon/FALCON\\_PIP\\_Attachment2.doc](http://www.darpa.mil/TTO/falcon/FALCON_PIP_Attachment2.doc).***

171. Will the government provide applicable descriptions (engineering dimensions and interface descriptions) of systems referenced in the PIP, "nominal 1,000-pound penetrator munition and dispensing of other sub-munitions such as the SDB and WAASM...", as government furnished information (GFI)? ***The government will provide this information as GFI at the onset of Phase I.***

172. The evaluation criteria contained in paragraph 5.2.1.4 under subparagraph 2 (fourth bullet) appear inconsistent with the technologies required under Task 2. Please clarify. ***The PIP paragraph 5.2.1.4, subparagraph 2, fourth bullet has been amended to read as follows:***

- ***Proposed key personnel have the technical expertise in the areas of systems engineering; design, development and flight-test of hypersonic re-entry/glide vehicles and supersonic/hypersonic aircraft; and knowledgeable of advanced air-breathing propulsion systems.***

***An amendment to the PIP has been posted to the DARPA website, [WWW.DARPA.MIL/BAA/#TTO](http://WWW.DARPA.MIL/BAA/#TTO), providing this clarification.***

173. Please clarify whether the required "Experimental Facilities" information (section 4.3.4.4) pertains to Phase 1 through Phase 3 or just Phase 1 for the immediate Phase 1 proposal (with remaining phases covered in subsequent proposals)? ***The intent of this evaluation criterion is to assess the extent to which the Offeror understands the nature and requisite capabilities of experimental test facilities necessary to develop and demonstrate its Small Launch Vehicle concept that meets program objectives. A further objective is to ascertain the extent to which the Offeror possesses and/or has access to appropriate experimental test facilities and the Offeror's experience in using these facilities. In short, the Government wishes to evaluate the Offeror's capabilities concerning conduct of an experimentally focused system development program. As a consequence as Section 4.3.4.4 indicates, requested information regarding experimental facilities pertains to the program as a whole, i.e., Phases I through III.***