

## **Next Generation Squad Weapons: Industry's Questions & Comments**

---

(Start as of November 7, 2018)

**152. Question:** Why did the Government decrease Lethality?

**Response:** The capability matrix (to include muzzle velocity) developed by the Government reflects the introduction of the NGSW-R, NGSW-AR, and common cartridge and provides industry trade-space to optimize the NGSW program desired goals. The Government is considering all input from Industry Day and One-on-Ones to improve the PON and other required documents.

**153. Question:** Are all the capabilities within the tiers of equal value?

**Response:** Yes, all the capabilities within the tiers are of equal value?

**154. Question:** Can you explain further the transition from the contractor to Lake City?

**Response:** The Awardees will be responsible to load Government Furnished Material (GFM) projectiles into Company designed cartridges (to include case, propellant, and primer) for testing in the Prototype Test series. The follow-on production contract or other transaction agreement will utilize this Awardee (still utilizing GFM projectiles) to manufacture the ammunition as outlined in the NGSW PPON. The intent would be that the Government obtains Special License Rights at award of production contract to initiate the transition to Lake City Army Ammunition Plant (LCAAP). Once the Special License Rights terms and conditions have been met, the Government will initiate production at LCAAP.

**155. Question:** If you only selected one gun from one vendor, how would you compete the second gun? Would you ever do ammunition separate from the weapons?

**Response:** The ammunition from the first weapon would be required ammunition for competition of the second gun. We would not pursue a competition just for ammunition. We are looking for a systems approach for the NGSW.

**156. Question:** Is the USG interested in vendor-supplied Surrogate and/or GP projectile production efforts to supply PON participants?

**Response:** No, the Government is planning to provide the surrogate and GP projectiles to the PON participants.

**157. Question:** Does the prohibition against disclosing "ANY information associated with this project to ANY Government or private individual, firm, or business is prohibited without the express written approval of the Agreement Officer" exclude subcontractors of the Offeror?

**Response:** Any partners, subcontractors, foreign, and other vendors shall submit the required documentation to the following individuals:

Corey Woodson  
Agreements Specialist  
Email: corey.w.woodson.civ@mail.mil  
Phone: 973-724-2712

Travis James  
Agreements Officer  
Email: travis.t.james2.civ@mail.mil  
Phone: 973-724-4591

**158. Question:** What projectile type(s) will be required for the 1200 rounds (600+600) of bid sample ammunition?

**Response:** The Offeror must supply the projectiles for the bid sample ammunition. Bid samples that are representative of the final designs are considered more credible.

**159. Question:** Is feasibility and effort level of a vendor's ammunition solution implementation within LCAAP an evaluation factor within the NGSW PON?

**Response:** No, an Offeror's ammunition solution implementation within LCAAP is not an evaluation factor. However the Ammunition Special License Agreement will be used as part of the evaluation factor (Factor 3) in the NGSW PPON.

**160. Question:** In Attachment 3, can USG modify the GP projectile design to share a common ogive length with the Surrogate and SP Envelope projectiles?

**Response:** No, the Government does not intend to modify the surrogate projectile since it is designed to mimic the behavior of existing and future combat projectiles.

**161. Question:** In Attachment 3, is USG interested in other 6.8mm projectile technology that becomes available during the estimated 27 month PON effort?

**Response:** No, the Government intends to provide the 6.8mm projectile. In the future, the Government may explore other projectile technology.

**162. Question:** In Attachment 14, if a vendor requires additional GP or Surrogate projectiles for testing, is there currently or will there be a way for a vendor to acquire them other than through receipt of GFP? If so, can the Government provide guidance to a vendor on how to acquire additional GP or Surrogate projectiles?

**Response:** The Offeror will not be supplied with any projectiles for Bid Sample testing. The vendor can fabricate surrogate projectiles from the supplied drawing in Attachment 3 for internal testing.

**163. Question:** In Attachment 14, will the USG require the use of MIC primers in the 6.8mm solution? If so, will USG supply them to vendors for use in testing and/or bid samples?

**Response:** No, the Government will not require the use of MIC primers. No, the Government will not supply primers.

**164. Question:** In Attachment 13, muzzle Velocity: Are the listed muzzle velocities desired at muzzle or SCATP standard average distance of 78' from muzzle?

**Response:** Muzzle velocities are measured at the muzzle.

**165. Question:** Why were USG SMEs not present for either the General Session or 1-1s? Engaging with SMEs at NGSAR Industry Day #2 was a very positive experience and greatly helped with the understanding of the program. Please include Government SMEs in future Industry Day efforts.

**Response:** The Government NGSW Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) were present and participated in both the General Sessions and one-on-ones.

**166. Question:** Scoring tradeoffs: A robust scoring metric is necessary in order to determine acceptable trade-offs between Tier 1, 2, and 3 evaluation factors; ie, is the improvement in a Tier 1 factor from 'green' to 'blue' worth two Tier 2 factors going from 'green' to 'yellow'. Will the Government mandate a way to quantify tradeoffs, especially from tier-to-tier? Does USG anticipate coming up with a more refined scoring system how these tradeoffs tier-to-tier will be distinguishable?

**Response:** The individual desired goals and tiers will not receive a score or rating, but collectively form the basis of the Sub-Factor rating.

**167. Question:** Regarding the Safety Assessment Report (SAR) each vendor needs for the Bid Sample Evaluation, USG needs to mandate either all or none of the offerings be evaluated via live fire during Soldier Touch Point evaluation. For example, vendors may submit very lightweight systems strategically without a SAR such that soldiers would appreciate the maneuverability of the system but not experience unpleasant recoil. This would present a very biased and unbalanced evaluation of potential down-select NGSW submissions.

**Response:** All candidate systems will undergo live fire as detailed in Attachment 14 –Bid Sample Test Overview which will be updated in the final PON.

**168. Question:** Recommend adding a cartridge extraction test under different test scenarios.

**Response:** Thank you for your comment. This will be considered for the final PON.

**169. Question:** Is there an Environmental test for ammunition?

**Response:** The Prototype Testing (including environmental tests) will be conducted on a system level including the ammunition as detailed in Attachment 9 – Prototype Test Outline.

**170. Question:** How will the total system weight (including links, belts, magazines, etc) be evaluated?

**Response:** The Soldier Touch Points will include a Mobility evaluation to capture the impact to lethality relevant mobility that NGSW candidates have relative to current baseline systems. The test will comprise a series of activities and task considered to be essential components of dismounted combat mobility. The participants will wear an Army Combat Helmet, Army issued gloves, slick body armor, and carry the assigned weapon with a sling and a full combat load. Weight of the links/belts/mags are considered in the Solider Mobility evaluation.

**171. Question:** Will the Government require the use of lead free primers?

**Response:** No, the use of lead free primers is not required. However the Government is looking into providing more favorable consideration for increased capabilities of military utility that are not included in the capability matrix.

**172. Question:** How should Offerors price out qualifying a new propellant/explosive?

**Response:** The Government is reviewing the requirements for energetic material qualification. The vendors will not be required to qualify the materials but will be required to supply samples of any unqualified materials for the Government to conduct testing. The change will be reflected in the final PON.

**173. Question:** What purpose does the surrogate provide?

**Response:** The surrogate projectile is designed to mimic the behavior of existing and future combat projectiles.

**174. Question:** How does the Government plan to ensure consistency among vendors for the Government Furnished Property projectiles?

**Response:** The Government will maintain lot formation per MIL-STD-1168 and sampling inspection per MIL STD-1916. Lot sizes will be kept at a Government approved quantity, and subject to lot acceptance testing. The lots will be accepted through an ammunition data card, which includes the pedigree of each lot (Raw material lots, inspection and ballistics results). Each lot will be split equally across each vendor, so that each vendor will receive parts from the same lot(s).

**175. Question:** Is velocity less important now since it is tier 2?

**Response:** The capability matrix (to include muzzle velocity) developed by the Government reflects the introduction of the NGSW-R, NGSW-AR, and common cartridge and provides industry trade-space to optimize the NGSW program desired goals.

**176. Question:** Is the suppressor length measured independently or with the weapon?

**Response:** The suppressor length is measured independently of the weapon.

**177. Question:** Is there a locking requirement for suppressor?

**Response:** There is no locking requirement for the suppressor. The Government may provide additional consideration for design attributes not specifically requested that provide military utility, enhance the usability of the weapon system and/or increase User Acceptance.

**178. Question:** Does the NGSW have a recoil requirement?

**Response:** The Controllability Soldier Touch Point will elicit shooter performance distinctions driven by weapon system candidate design for the Next-Generation Squad Weapons - Automatic Rifle (NGSW-AR) and Next-Generation Squad Weapons - Rifle (NGSW-R) programs, specifically with respect to controllability during target engagement at various distances.

**179. Question:** What type of testing is needed for SAR?

**Response:** The SAR shall be developed per MIL-STD-882E and in accordance with DI-SAFT-80102C and submitted electronically with the written proposal. The Safety Assessment Report (SAR) is a comprehensive evaluation of the safety risks being assumed prior to test or operation of the system. The Government reserves the right to stop testing and evaluation of the Bid Samples if they are found unsafe to operate.

**180. Question:** How is the weight of a belt/links or a magazine accounted for?

**Response:** The Soldier Touch Points will include a Mobility evaluation to capture the impact to lethality relevant mobility that NGSW candidates have relative to current baseline systems. The test will comprise a series of activities and task considered to be essential components of dismounted combat mobility. The participants will wear a combat helmet, gloves, body armor, and carry the assigned weapon with a sling and a full combat load.

**181. Question:** Is the suppression in User Acceptance suppressive fire or flash/sound suppression?

**Response:** The Soldier Touch Points will include a User Assessment with a suppress/assess exercise to evaluate the ability of the NGSW-AR to provide suppressive fire. There is not a specific test for User perception of flash/sound but it could impact User Acceptance rating.

**182. Question:** How do the requirements like IMS IMP play into the follow-on production proposal?

**Response:** New proposals for the follow-on production award will be requested and will be separate from proposals for this PON.

**183. Question:** How long is Bid Sample testing scheduled for?

**Response:** The technical portion of the bid sample testing is anticipated to last 30 days with the user acceptance portion following and lasting approximately 1 week.

**184. Question:** How are the lifecycle costs of the system evaluated?

**Response:** Life cycle costs are currently estimated by PM Soldier Weapons and will be evaluated in the follow on production proposal.

**185. Question:** Can the Government provide more details on the barrel life metric?

**Response:** Thank you. The Barrel life goal will be clarified in the final PON.

**186. Question:** When does the barrel life metric start? Before or after the barrels are broken in?

**Response:** The barrel life would encompass the entire life of barrel to include break in period.

**187. Question:** Why is the lethality requirement in the same tier as the powered rail?

**Response:** The capability matrix (to include muzzle velocity) developed by the Government reflects the introduction of the NGSW-R, NGSW-AR, and common cartridge and provides industry trade-space to optimize the NGSW program desired goals.

**188. Question:** Has the Government performed a dispersion study?

**Response:** Dispersion studies are still ongoing and may be releasable upon request.

**189. Question:** Can the Government provide a copy of the STANAG 4740 for the powered rail?

**Response:** Information in the STANAG 4740 will be replaced by the Picatinny Smart Rail Interface Control Document.

**190. Question:** How can small business gain an advantage again for Other Transaction Agreements?

**Response:** Businesses may contact the Small Business Representative below:

Gherin Fracasso  
Director  
Office of Small Business  
JM&L LCMC  
Bldg # 1610  
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806-5000  
P# 973-724-2775  
gherin.fracasso.civ@mail.mil

**191. Question:** Is there a chance to delay the program based on a disruptive bid sample?

**Response:** It is not likely the program will be delayed based on a disruptive bid sample.

**192. Question:** What is the Government looking for in a shot counter?

**Response:** A shot counter is a desired goal in Attachment 13 – Capability Matrix.

**193. Question:** Will there be a PON 3?

**Response:** A third prototype opportunity notice for NGSW is not planned at this time.

**194. Question:** Can Offerors watch bid sample testing?

**Response:** No, Offerors will not be able to witness Bid Sample Testing because multiple candidate systems will be tested simultaneously.

**195. Question:** Can the Government provide a General Purpose round before bid sample?

**Response:** No, the Government will only provide General Purpose rounds in accordance with Attachment 4 – Government Furnished Property to the Offerors who are selected for award.

**196. Comment:** The system accuracy should be separated from the projectile accuracy.

**Response:** The Government is looking for a system level solution with the goals identified in Attachment 13 – Capability Matrix.

**197. Question:** Do we have expiring funds for this effort?

**Response:** No, funds are not expiring.

**198. Question:** Is the sustained rate of firing expected beyond the rounds identified in the Capability Matrix?

**Response:** No, firing is not expected to go beyond the rounds identified in the Attachment 13 - Capability Matrix.

**199. Question:** Is there a requirement for touch Temperature?

**Response:** No, there is not a requirement for a touch temperature in the Capability Matrix but could impact User Acceptance rating.

**200. Question:** Is there a maximum time allowed to reload? Is there a requirement for a Rapid loader?

**Response:** No, there is not a requirement for maximum time allowed to reload but could impact User Acceptance rating. A rapid reload tool is desired for the NGSW-R in Attachment 13 – Capability Matrix.

**201. Question:** Is there a maximum time to change a magazine?

**Response:** No, there is not a requirement for maximum time to change a magazine but could impact User Acceptance rating

**202. Question:** Is there a requirement for ambidextrous controls?

**Response:** The NGSW-R and the NGSW-AR prototypes shall allow for ambidextrous operation and controls.

**203. Question:** Is there a minimum magazine size?

**Response:** No, there is not a minimum magazine size but the Government will assess magazine size during the User Acceptance Soldier Touch Points.

**204. Question:** Are there mounting requirements?

**Response:** There are no mounting requirements. At this time, the NGSW-AR is intended for dismounted soldier use.

**205. Question:** Can classified rounds be manufactured oversea?

**Response:** This is dependent on the applicable ITAR and export controls.

**206. Question:** Are there classified test ranges at Lake City?

**Response:** Yes, there is a classified range at Lake City.

**207. Question:** Can Offerors gain access to Soldier gear?

**Response:** The Government does not plan to provide gear as GFP but may provide access to gear at a specified time and location to awardess. Information on what the Soldier kit is comprised of may be provided upon request.

**208. Question:** Are weapons that are able to be configured ambidextrous considered ambidextrous?

**Response:** Yes.

**209. Question:** Will the Government assist on technical agreements with foreign vendors?

**Response:** It depends on the foreign vendor. While not guaranteed, the Government is willing to assist on a case-by-case basis as necessary.

**210. Question:** What optics/fire control are being used for PT1 and PT2.

**Response:** The Government intends to use the M68 optic or a fire control from a separate effort.

**211. Question:** Do batteries count in the weight or weapon weight?

**Response:** Batteries do not count in the weight or weapon weight.

**212. Question:** Is funding available?

**Response:** Yes. Funding is available. Efforts will be incrementally funded. Incremental funds are subject to congressional approval.

**213. Question:** Can the time between PT1 and PT2 be extended to allow more time to make changes?

**Response:** It is unlikely the time between PT1 and PT2 will be extended. The program is on a very aggressive timeline in order to meet a First Unit Equipped date of 4QFY22.

**214. Question:** Will Offerors receive any credit for exceeding capabilities?

**Response:** The Government is looking into providing more favorable consideration for increased capabilities of military utility that are not included in the capability matrix as long as it is within the timeline and funding availability.

**215. Question:** Is the Government evaluating the potential growth of a weapon system?

**Response:** Attachment 13 – Capability Matrix presents the Governments desired goals for this effort. Offerors are encouraged to submit the weapon design which best addresses the Government’s goals considering the tiered capabilities, the timeline, and funding availability. However, the Government is looking into providing more favorable consideration for increased capabilities of military utility that are not included in the capability matrix as long as it is within the timeline and funding availability.

**216. Question:** Is there a point system for capabilities?

**Response:** There is not a point system for capabilities. The individual desired goals and tiers will not receive a score or rating, but collectively form the basis of the Sub-Factor rating.

**217. Question:** Are the testers (in User Acceptance) the same throughout testing? Experience has shown different evaluators dislike changes from one test to another.

**Response:** The User Acceptance testers will be the same throughout PT1; however, they will most likely be different for PT2.

**218. Question:** Are there chances of requirements changing?

**Response:** The Government does not intend to change the requirements.

**219. Question:** Will Offerors receive credit for additional capability?

**Response:** The Government is looking into providing more favorable consideration for increased capabilities of military utility that are not included in the capability matrix as long as it is within the timeline and funding availability.

**220. Question:** What can be discussed with subcontractors.

**Response:** All information posted on FBO may be shared with anybody. In regards to Limited Distribution Data, any partners, subcontractors, foreign, and other vendors shall submit the required documentation to the following individuals:

Corey Woodson  
Agreements Specialist  
Email: corey.w.woodson.civ@mail.mil  
Phone: 973-724-2712

Travis James  
Agreements Officer  
Email: travis.t.james2.civ@mail.mil  
Phone: 973-724-4591

**221. Question:** Is there a definition of the firing fixture?

**Response:** Additional details on firing fixtures will be provided in the Final PON.

**222. Question:** What's the funding line called? Does it get its own line?

**Response:** NGSW funding is on PE 0604601A Infantry Support Weapons. In FY19, the NGSW funding is included as a portion of Crew Served Weapons Development (FM4) and Individual Weapons Development (S63). In FY20, a new project will be established to fund NGSW in PE 0604601A.

**223. Question:** Would we ever not go with Lake City and just stick with the contractor?

**Response:** It is the Government's desire to transition to Lake City for ammunition production as it is critical for both National Security purposes and to ensure that the organic manufacturing capability remains available with the potential for a surge capacity.

**224. Question:** Will the Government facilitate the Technical Assistance Agreements?

**Response:** Yes, the Government will facilitate TAAs.

**225. Question:** Will Contractors be allowed onsite at Lake City to provide support for ammunition production?

**Response:** If an Offeror chooses to utilize LCAAP they will have to make arrangements with LCAAP directly. For the follow-on production award, the selected Awardee(s) will likely have access to LCAAP to assist in the transition.

**226. Question:** Are the weapon lengths, for desired capabilities, measured without the suppressor?

**Response:** Weapon Lengths are measured without the suppressor.

**227. Question:** Is the suppressor intended to be used on the weapon as the rule or as the exception? Which, if either, will be more common, suppressor on or suppressor off?

**Response:** The weapons are intended to be used primarily with the suppressor on.

**228. Question:** Is the flash signature base of comparison the M249/M4A1 as they are now, with the current muzzle attachments/compensators?

**Response:** Yes, the flash signature is based on the M249 short barrel and the M4A1 short barrel firing M855A1.

**229. Question:** Can an Offeror propose a different ammunition?

**Response:** No, the Government will provide the projectiles and the vendors will be responsible for cartridge design. In the Bid Sample, Offerors are required to provide the ammunition, including projectile. The Bid Sample is not required to fire 6.8mm ammunition but it preferred.

**230. Question:** Can Offerors use commercial items?

**Response:** Yes

**231. Question:** Does the Army have a preferred adjustable sling?

**Response:** No, vendors are encouraged to propose a materiel solution that best meets the desired goals of the Government including user acceptance.

**232. Question:** Can the Government provide definitions of failures i.e. Class 1, Class 2, Class 3?

**Response:** Definitions of failures are provided in the Attachment 13 - Capability Matrix. Failures are classified by the corrective action required to address the stoppage. Additional information on failure classification will be provided in the Failure Definition and Scoring Criteria to be provided in the final PON.

**233. Question:** Can the Government provide calculation on reliability?

**Response:** The calculation of reliability is the number of failures of each class will be divided by the total number of rounds fired (as a point estimate).

**234. Question:** Can the Government further define the maintenance levels?

**Response:** No, this should be defined by the Offerors as it may be specific to each proposed design.

**235. Question:** Can the Government provide a better definition of mean time to repair? (repair, clean, maintenance)

**Response:** Mean Time to Repair is defined as the total elapsed time (clock hours) for corrective maintenance divided by the total number of corrective maintenance actions during a given period.

**236. Question:** Are there any benefits of using Lake City?

**Response:** The current contractor running LCAAP would be seen as a subcontractor and would be considered and treated the same as all other subcontractors in the evaluation criteria.

**237. Question:** Is the Government requiring a separate cost for ammo setup?

**Response:** No, the current PON does require Offerors to provide a cost for ammo setup.

**238. Question:** Will the projectile design change during rapid prototyping?

**Response:** There are no planned changes to the projectile designs.

**239. Question:** When is the Government delivery the GFP projectiles?

**Response:** Delivery of projectiles will be in accordance with Attachment 4 – Government Furnished Property.

**240. Question:** How does the Government plan to ensure consistency among vendors for the Government Furnished Property projectiles?

**Response:** Each lot will be split equally across each vendor, so that each vendor will receive parts from the same lot(s).

**241. Question:** Will Lot Acceptance Test report and barrel info provided to vendors?

**Response:** Yes, Lot Acceptance Test and barrel info will be provided with each projectile delivery.

**242. Question:** Each vendor will receive 1.75M projectiles from the Government, so will the Vendor have to build more for their internal testing?

**Response:** Attachment 4 – Government Furnished Property includes a quantity of projectiles for Company testing. If additional surrogate projectiles are required, the Awardee(s) can fabricate them as needed using the provided drawing in Attachment 3 – Ammunition Data.

**243. Question:** Is there a tracer flash versus muzzle flash.

**Response:** No, the Government will provide details on flash measurement in the Final PON.

**244. Question:** Do small guys have a chance or is the PON slated to the bigger guys?

**Response:** This PON will be conducted as a full and open competition and award(s) will be made to the Offeror(s) of the best value to the Government based on an integrated assessment of the evaluation results.

**245. Question:** Any suggestions for improving proposals?

**Response:** Each Offerors should ensure they address all evaluation criteria with through and complete responses. If you are teaming with partners or vendors, include information to substantiate the teaming agreement.

**246. Question:** Does the Buy American Act apply?

**Response:** It depends. Funding restrictions may determine if the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a-d) and the Berry Amendment (10 U.S.C. 2241) apply to this PON. However, the follow-on production award is anticipated to be a Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) based contract award. In FAR based contracts, the Buy America Act and Berry Amendment would be applicable; however, for the DoD the Buy America Act includes DoD Qualifying countries (reference DFARS 225.872 Contracting with qualifying country sources).

**247. Question:** Does the Government have a preferred types of cleaning kit?

**Response:** No, vendors are encouraged to propose a materiel solution that best meets the desired goals of the Government including user acceptance.

**248. Question:** Is the Suppressor Removal Tool included in the cleaning kit?

**Response:** Offerors are encouraged to propose a materiel solution that best meets the desired goals of the Government including user acceptance.

**249. Question:** What are the power requirements for the rail and attachments?

**Response:** Details of the power requirements will be included in the Final PON.

**250. Question:** Is a 1 in 7 twist rate barrel required to make the bullet stable?

**Response:** Offerors are encouraged to propose a materiel solution that best meets the desired goals of the Government.

**251. Question:** Can the Government provide the material used for the projectiles?

**Response:** Attachment 3 – Ammunition Data provides the material information for the surrogate and general purpose projectiles.

**252. Question:** Can the Government provide Interior ballistic information?

**Response:** No, the Government does not plan to release interior ballistic information.

**253. Question:** Does the Government have a preferred cartridge case?

**Response:** No vendors are encouraged to propose a materiel solution that best meets the desired goals of the Government.

**254. Question:** Can the Government provide information on the transition to Lake City?

**Response:** The Government will begin planning the transition of ammunition from the Awardee to LCAAP upon selection of a final cartridge design based on the agreement in the Special License Agreement (SLA). Aside from the SLA terms and conditions, the Government anticipates it will take up to five years to fully transition from the Awardee production to LCAAP.

**255. Question:** Does the follow-on production contract include development of new ammunition types?

**Response:** Details for development of new ammunition types will be identified in the Final PON.

**256. Question:** Is there, or will there be, a firing schedule beyond the 300 rounds for the AR?

**Response:** No.

**257. Question:** Is there, or will there be, temperature limits for either the R or AR?

**Response:** There is no requirement for a temperature limit in the Capability Matrix but could impact User Acceptance rating. The environmental tests described in Attachment 9- Prototype Test Outline provide the operating and storage temperature limits.

**258. Question:** Do you consider the M249 ambidextrous?

**Response:** Yes, the current M249 is considered ambidextrous.

**259. Question:** Would you consider it acceptable to lose the semi-automatic functionality when firing in the cook-off range? (i.e. gun would only fire in full-auto in cook-off range)

**Response:** Offerors are encouraged to propose a materiel solution that best meets the desired goals of the Government.

**260. Question:** Is there a need for mount interfaces on the AR or is it intended for dismounted Soldier use only?

**Response:** At this time, the NGSW-AR is intended for dismounted Soldier use only.

**261. Question:** Besides the magazine, is there a compatibility/commonality of parts requirement between the R and the AR?

**Response:** No, there is not a compatibility/commonality of parts requirement. However, the Government is looking into providing more favorable consideration for increased capabilities of

military utility that are not included in the capability matrix as long as it's within the timeline and funding availability.

**262. Question:** There appears to be a very large “tolerance” in the MRBEFF Class I and Class II reliability requirements. How will the Army evaluate a Class II reliability of, let's say, 2,900 rounds versus one of 38,000 rounds?

**Response:** Desired capabilities that are presented as a range, reflect a lower and higher capability in that order. Offerors can propose within and outside the range. Within the range, more favorable consideration will be assessed for great capability. Outside the range, significantly less favorable consideration will be provided for proposed requirements below the lower range, and some additional favorable consideration will be assessed for proposed requirements above the higher range, but only to the extent it provides additional military utility

**263. Question:** Will the Army provide Combat Gear samples for integration verification or supply a list of comparable COTS items available for Industry to purchase?

**Response:** The Army will provide opportunities for Awardees to see Combat Gear configurations at specified times/locations during the course of the Other Transaction Agreement.

**264. Question:** Can a weapon that can be configured with a “reversible” control (button, lever, etc.) be considered “ambidextrous”?

**Response:** Yes, a weapon with a reversible control will be considered ambidextrous.

**265. Question:** Will the Army provide any assistance with the approval of Technical Assistance Agreements (TAAs) between partner companies?

**Response:** Yes, the Government will facilitate TAAs.

**266. Question:** Can the Army consider supporting the export of the bullets to NATO countries?

**Response:** This is dependent on the applicable ITAR and export controls.

**267. Question:** Will the future potential transition to a FAR based contract require a new competition and/or contract?

**Response:** Only the vendors who receive an OTA award from the NGSW PON are eligible to compete in the follow-on production award, which will come after PT 1 and PT2. The follow-on production award is planned to be a new contract without further competition.

**268. Question:** How will potential teaming agreements be evaluated by the Army?

**Response:** Solutions presented by Industry will be evaluated based on the criteria in Section 4.

**269. Question:** The proposed “aggressive” schedule presented at the NGSW Industry Day provides very little time for product development, teaming agreements, design collaboration

between partner companies, innovation, import/export of samples, etc. We would suggest a less aggressive schedule to encourage all of these activities and the submission of better samples for the Army's consideration.

**Response:** Thank you for your comment. The final schedule will be announced in the final PON.

**270. Question:** Attachment 9- Prototype Test Outline ( PT#1, PT#2) calls out an Operational Low Temp of -50°F. This temperature is different than the -65°F called out in MIL-C-63989C for 5.56mm, MIL-C-46931F for 7.62mm ammunition and -60°F called out in TOP 3-2-045 for Low Temperature testing. Why is -50°F the lowest temperature test for these weapon and ammunition systems?

**Response:** Updated temperature ranges will be included in the Final PON.

**271. Question:** Is the contractor allowed to, within the envelope, propose changes to the projectile that would allow for increased accuracy, reliability, and/or lethality?

**Response:** No, the 6.8mm projectiles must be utilized as provided by the Government.

**272. Question:** Does the gov't have a desired capability for a quick change barrel on the AR to support a firing schedule beyond the Sustained Rate of Fire assessment of 300rds?

**Response:** No, however, the Government is looking into providing more favorable consideration for increased capabilities of military utility that are not included in the capability matrix.

**273. Question:** Blank ammunition is required. What are the desired capabilities for a Blank Firing Adapter (BFA)?

**Response:** Blank ammunition and/or a blank firing adapter (BFA) are not required in this effort.

**274. Question:** How will the weapon signature desired capability be measured and/or evaluated? Is there also a desired capability for or for flash-hider only shooting? If so, how would this be measured and/or evaluated?

**Response:** Attachment 9 – Prototype Test Outline includes a ground disturbance test.

**275. Question:** What is the "end of life" criteria for flash suppressors and sound suppressors?

**Response:** Thank you. The Government will clarify the suppressor life in the final PON.

**276. Question:** Will a MIL-STD-31000A TDP Option Selection Worksheet be included in the Final PON to clarify the requirements for the TDP?

**Response:** No. The requirements for the TDP are included in the FINAL PON Statement of Work.

**277. Question:** The Capability Matrix includes desired capabilities for empty weapon weight and bare bulk cartridge weight but does not include a measure for ammunition packaging (i.e., magazine or belt). Recommend that a system weight (weapon + packaged ammunition) be added as a quantitative measure of the actual load that will be carried by the soldier.

**Response:** The Soldier Touch Points will include a Mobility evaluation to capture the impact to lethality relevant mobility that NGSW candidates have relative to current baseline systems.

**278. Question:** In relation to Attachment 13- Capability Matrix, Tier I Accuracy and Dispersion requirements, in that the non-surrogate GP and AP aren't currently available to industry, would the Government consider an "ammunition error budget" allowing for dispersion to be correlation with Mann barrel accuracy results of the surrogate, GP and AP rounds.

**Response:** Thank you for your comment. The Government will take this into consideration in the final PON.

**279. Question:** In relation to Attachment 13- Capability Matrix, Tier 2 Reliability requirements, could the Government please define barrel life for the NGSW-AR and NGSW-R? Would the Government consider decreasing barrel life from the stated quantity of rounds?

**Response:** Barrel life for the NGSW-R and NGSW-AR is defined in Capability Matrix.

**280. Question:** In relation to Attachment 13 - Capability Matrix, Tier I, Weapon Signature, the NGSW-R is required to have an acoustic signature (measured at the shooter's ear), which is less than the NGSW-AR acoustic signature (measured at the shooter's ear) requirement. Based on length and weight requirements, the NGSW-R system, including barrel length, should be a smaller, shorter, lighter, more compact weapon as compared to the NGSW-AR, which is further supported by the muzzle velocity requirements of the NSGW-R as compared to the NSGW-AR. As a smaller platform, it is likely impossible that the NGSW-R will have less acoustic signature than the NGSW-AR. Would the Government consider increasing the acoustic signature of the NGSW-R to that of the NGSW-AR or greater?

**Response:** Thank you for the comment; however, these are the desired capabilities by the User.

**281. Question:** There is a discrepancy between the surrogate projectile dimensions, the selected material, and the specified weight.

**Response:** Thank you. Updated information regarding the surrogate projectile will be provided in the final PON.

(End of Part 2 of 2 as of December 7, 2018)

---