FA8533-26-R-0007: Common Aircraft Portable Reprogrammable Equipment (CAPRE) FORP# ATSA-0003-FO-1

Questions & Comments v3

Number	RFP Section	TOPR Paragraph	Question/Comment	Responses
1	Letter FOPR - FA8533-26-R-0007	Availability of Funds	When does the Government anticipate receipt of funds for this task order?	Funds will be available before award will be made.
2	FOPR	Questions	Please confirm there is no cutoff date by which questions must be submitted?	To ensure the integrity of the proposal due date, the Government requests that all questions be received one week prior to proposal due date.
3	Attachment A- FOPR Instructions and Evaluation	1.G. Proposal Submittal via DoD SAFE	Proposals shall be submitted via DoDSAFE to Ben Wilton and Ashley Wynn. Please confirm the DoDSAFE drop-off link requested/provided will specify both Mr. Wilton and Ms. Wynn as recipients, as drop-off links normally only list the individual who issued the link as the recipient, and does not allow the Contractor to add an additional recipient. If the Government is not able to configure the drop-off link to specify both Mr. Wilton and Ms. Wynn as recipients please confirm submittal to only the DoDSAFE recipient specified in the drop-off link is acceptable.	An email should be sent to both Ben Wilton and Ashley Wynn requesting the DoDSAFE drop-off link. Ben Wilton or Ashley Wynn will provide the DoDSAFE drop-off link and the offeror will reply to that link.
4	Attachment A- FOPR Instructions and Evaluation	1.H. (2) Volume II: Factor 2: Past Performance (15-page max) and Factor 2: Past Performance, Subfactor 2.1	Offerors are required to provide a maximum of three (3) prior efforts within the past five (5) years. Specifically, "detailed narratives and supporting data". Will the Government please list examples of the type of "supporting data" they require or is this referring to the Subfactor 2.1 requirements only? Also, with a 15-page maximum limit for all past performance, will the Government clarify is they prefer greater focus on the detailed narrative or the supporting data?	Supporting data is outlined in section 2.1.2 Project Specifics and Platform Identification along with section 2.1.3 Complexity and F-16 Comparability. The greater focus should be on supporting data since the evaluation criteria primarily focuses on their historical experience. However, they should ensure that they fully cover their understanding of the challenges of integrating software and hardware
5	Attachment C - CLIN Structure with Production Ready Cable		Attachment C states cables are "a total production of 300 for the entirety of contract,". However, the CLIN Structure in Attachment F show 300/type in Basic (005 and 006) AND another 300/type in Option I (1005 and 1006). Will the Government please clarify?	A total of 300 ea cables are required for ALQ-131, Anti-Skid, CPDG/eCPDG, CSFDR, EEFCC, and FCSDR. CLIN 005 is referencing one production ready cable each for the above LRUs in which the Government will confirm its design and functionality before CLIN 006, 299 ea cables for the LRUs over the entire contract can be executed. CLIN 1005/1006 will be executed if the development and production cannot be completed during the basic year timeline. A total of 1800 cables is required for the entire contract.
6	Attachment B - SOW	Table 4.2: F-16 Technical Orders	Will the Government provide, or authorize Offerors to request via ETIMS, the Technical Orders specified in Table 4.2 of the SOW?	If the contractor meets the requirements to obtain ETIMS access, we will grant access to the specific TOs listed, once the contract is awarded
7	Attachment B - SOW	Section 4 - Requirements Page 6	The Government's SOW states: "To complete this effort, the contractor shall obtain LRU data and artifacts from the Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs) for successful development of software and hardware. If this data cannot be obtained, the United States Government (USG) will work with the contractor to provide access to LRU and/or aircraft data/artifacts located in various Software Integration Lab (SIL) locations at identified Air Force bases." Does the Government hold sufficient intellectual property rights, such as Unlimited Rights, Government Purpose Rights (GPR), or at minimum Limited/Restricted Rights in the procedures, protocols, and technical data required to perform Operational Flight Program (OFP) uploads to the LRU, or are those rights retained exclusively by the OEMs?	Those rights are retained exclusively by the OEMs. A list of OEMs has been provided as Attachment J through Amendment 1 of the FOPR.
8	Attachment B - SOW		With respect to the 10 LRUs, what data does the Government currently possess? And will you provide that data during the proposal response period as part of a bidders library of GFI?	The Government currently possesses only the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) name and CAGE code for the 10 Line Replaceable Units (LRUs). This information was added as Attachment J in Amendment 1 and posted to sam.gov. The Government does not possess further technical data or GFI for these items, and no additional data exists to provide.

9	Attachment B - SOW		Will the Government make available the CPIN and TO for the CAPRE itself? This data is needed to define required interfaces and support software development.	The Government will not release the system CPINs or Technical Orders (TOs) during the solicitation phase. This information is not required to formulate a successful proposal response. The Government has provided the necessary, high-level interface definitions within the Statement of Work, section 2, Background, to support proposal development. Full access to the relevant CPINs and TOs will be coordinated and granted to the successful awardee immediately upon contract award, subject to meeting standard security and ETIMS access requirements.
10	Attachment J - OEMs of AAGs	Government's Responses to Questions, 05 OCT 2026	In response to Offeror's request for Technical Orders specified in Table 4.2 of the SOW, the Government provided Attachment J - OEM contact information while denying access to the documents via ETIMs until "once the contract is awarded". a) To clarify, is the Government directing each Offeror to contact each OEM and obtain required LRU data and artifacts independently, rather than the Government providing such data to all Offerors? b) If each Offeror is to obtain data from the OEMs independently, please clarify why the Government cannot provide it instead? Respectfully, if the Government provides this data directly to the Offerors it ensures fair and equal dissemination of the information. Relying on each OEM to provide the same data to each Offeror and in the same response time, could potentially result in missing and/or unequal access of data to some Offerors.	a) The Government is not directing or requiring offerors to obtain proprietary OEM Technical Data Packages (TDPs) or Technical Orders (TOs) during the proposal preparation phase. Attachment J (OEM Contact Information) was provided as a courtesy to assist offerors in establishing early industry partnerships if they choose to do so. b) The Government cannot provide this data because it does not possess it. The Government's information regarding these LRUs is strictly limited to the OEM names and CAGE codes provided in the solicitation. The Government does not own, possess, or control the proprietary Technical Data Packages (TDPs) or engineering baselines for these items.
11	Attachment A - FOPR Instructions, Attachment B - SOW and Government Responses to Questions (05OCT2026)	FOPR Sub-Factor 1.2.1, SOW Section 4 - Requirements Page 6 and Government's Response to Questions, 05OCT2026	In response to Offeror questions regarding Technical Orders specified in Table 4.2 of the SOW, the Government stated access via ETIMS will only be granted "once the contract is awarded" and if the contractor "meets the requirements to obtain ETIMS access". However, Sub-Factor 1.2, 1.2.1. Possession and Access to LRU Data: of the CAPRE FOPR instructions states, "This element shall be met when the offeror acceptably demonstrates evidence of current possession of or authorized, unencumbered access to the required LRU TDPs, software baselines, and historical engineering documentation and acceptably demonstrates a data rights posture, to include any licensing agreements necessary, to utilize the data for Government purposes without delay." a) These two requirements appear to be contradictory. Will the Government please clarify how Offerors shall "demonstrate evidence of current possession" if the Government, or OEMs do not provide during the proposal phase? b) What other avenues do Offerors have if the information is not provided by an OEM in a timely manner?	a) The government does not own any information on the 10 LRUs. Examples that would serve as evidence are relevant LRU Interface Control Documents, associated software documentation, such as software requirements specifications, design documents, test plans, etc, and can also be demonstrated through formal agreements or letters of commitment with the OEM(s). b) A technical order is not required to complete the proposal process. Section 4 in the Statement of Work, Requirements, states "To complete this effort, the contractor shall obtain LRU data and artifacts from the Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs) for successful development of software and hardware. If this data cannot be obtained, the United States Government (USG) will work with the contractor to provide access to LRU and/or aircraft data/artifacts located in various Software Integration Lab (SIL) locations at identified Air Force bases." This is after award not during the proposal phase. Contractors can outline their experience and level of proficiency with software protocol capture, reverse-engineering efforts, or analyzing complex LRU software protocols.
12	Attachment J - OEMs of AAGs	Government's Responses to Questions, 05 OCT 2026	c) If Offerors are required to obtain LRU data and artifacts from each OEM independently, rather than the Government ensuring equal access and providing it to all Offerors, please provide a point of contact name, telephone number and email for each of the OEMs listed in Attachment J - Original Equipment Manufacturer of AAGs.	The Government does not have any contact information for the OEMs listed in Attachment J.
13			Software development: Can the Government confirm whether the current AAG software development requirement is intended to rehost or adapt existing F-16 software-loading functionality, or whether the contractor is expected to develop new AAG software from the ground up? Is there any existing software that will be a starting point, if so for which AAGs?	Yes new AAG software is expected to develop from the ground up. answer to second question is being worked

14			OEM LRU data rights: The SOW states that the contractor will be required to conduct investigations and liaise with OEMs to obtain the necessary LRU data. Our understanding is that the contractor may need to obtain the following information from the respective OEMs: 1. Hardware Technical Data: Engineering drawings, wiring diagrams, connector specifications, bills of materials (BOMs), and other information necessary to manufacture the required AAG hardware and cable assemblies. 2. Software and Interface Documentation: Existing software-loading procedures, communication protocols, interface specifications, and other technical information describing how the applicable LRUs receive and verify Operational Flight Programs (OFPs) and Mission Data Files (MDFs). 3. Intellectual Property and Manufacturing Rights: Any licenses or permissions necessary to use OEM-proprietary technical data, reproduce applicable hardware designs, or incorporate existing software-loading functionality into the newly developed CAPRE AAGs. Is it expected of the contractor to purchase intellectual property rights or paid licenses from the OEMs to be able to obtain the necessary LRU data to perform the software development and hardware production? Concerning the hardware, is the contractor expected to pay the OEMs for rights to build the 6 hardware articles required for production? If so, the contractor would need the drawings from the OEMs. Is the government expecting the contractor to purchase the drawings and building rights from the OEMs for the 6 articles to be produced?	The Government does not own, possess, or hold the proprietary data rights, manufacturing drawings, or intellectual property (IP) for the LRUs or the existing AAG designs. Consequently, the contractor is fully responsible for establishing the necessary commercial agreements, non-disclosure agreements (NDAs), and licensing arrangements with the respective OEMs. This responsibility includes purchasing any required intellectual property rights, manufacturing rights, engineering drawings, and paid licenses from the OEMs necessary to perform the software development and produce the six (6) hardware articles. Offerors must account for all associated OEM licensing, data acquisition, and IP fees within their cost/price proposal.
15			Software Integration Lab: The SOW states that the contractor shall obtain the necessary LRU data and artifacts from the OEMs. If this information cannot be obtained, the contractor may utilize LRU and/or aircraft data and artifacts located at various Software Integration Labs (SILs). Our understanding is that certain LRU technical data, software-loading procedures, and hardware designs may be subject to OEM proprietary rights and restrictions. If the contractor is unable to obtain the required technical data or licensing rights directly from an OEM, can the Government clarify how access to the SILs would provide an alternative means of completing the requirement? Specifically, what technical data, software, documentation, and equipment would be made available through the SILs, and would the contractor have sufficient rights and authorization to use that information for AAG software development, hardware redesign, and production? Additionally, if OEM proprietary rights or licensing restrictions still apply to information or equipment available through the SILs, how does the Government anticipate resolving those restrictions to enable the contractor to successfully perform the requirement?	The Government provides access to Software Integration Labs (SILs) to facilitate testing, interface validation, and software-loading verification on physical or simulated avionics components. SIL access is not an alternative source for obtaining proprietary OEM manufacturing drawings, technical data packages (TDPs), or intellectual property rights required for hardware production or redesign. 1. Data, Software, and Equipment Available in the SIL: The Government will make available physical test benches, operational aircraft or LRU components, and Government-owned test execution software within the SIL environment for integration testing only. The Government will grant the contractor the authorization and 'Right to Use' this equipment and software solely within the confines of the SIL facility. This access does not include the transfer of proprietary OEM source code, manufacturing drawings, or design documentation. 2. Sufficiency of Rights for Production: No. The rights and authorization granted for SIL utilization are strictly limited to testing and integration. They are not sufficient to support hardware redesign, parts manufacturing, or production of the hardware articles. 3. Resolution of OEM Proprietary Restrictions: The responsibility remains entirely with the contractor to establish the necessary commercial agreements, non-disclosure agreements (NDAs), or licensing arrangements with the respective OEMs to obtain the data and rights necessary to fulfill the hardware production requirements of the contract.
15			To develop accurate material and manufacturing cost estimates for our proposal, we would appreciate receiving any available unclassified cable drawings or bills of materials during the proposal phase for the two existing prototype cable types (CPDG/eCPDG and CSFDR), as well as the four additional cable types requiring production (ALQ-131, Anti-Skid, EEFCC, and FCSDR).	answer to question is being worked
16			In the case that a contractor holds an active Secret Facility Clearance and employees with secret clearance but does not have approved onsite classified storage capabilities. please clarify whether cable fabrication could be performed at the contractor's existing facility, with any required classified integration or testing conducted separately at an approved secure location, e.g. Hill Air Force Base.	answer to question is being worked