**Caisson Wagons - Question & Answer Log**

AO: Jennifer Hastedt Email at: usarmy.jbsa.acc-micc.mbx.tsc-div1@army.mil

| Q # | Subject | Attachment or # RPP Section | Document Paragraph # | Question/Comment | A # | Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Executive Summary | RPP | #1 | To what extent is the Government willing to accept visible deviations from the 1917 caisson design in order to incorporate modern engineering solutions such as suspension and braking systems)? | 1 | The Government's primary goal is to retain the historical and ceremonial aesthetic of the 1917 caisson wagon to the greatest extent possible. However, we recognize that integrating modern, humane solutions may require some visible modifications. Offerors have the flexibility to propose such deviations, but their proposals must provide a clear and compelling justification explaining how the functional benefits of the modern engineering solution (e.g., improved horse welfare, safety, or sustainability) outweigh any impact to the traditional aesthetic. |
| 2 | Executive Summary | RPP | #1 | Does the Government have defined quantitative metrics or testing criteria for evaluating reduced physical strain on horses, or will this be assessed qualitatively? | 2 | The Salient Characteristics document provides specific performance requirements, such as "When stationary on flat ground: There shall be no load from wagon components on horses." For other aspects, the Government has not prescribed specific quantitative metrics. Offerors should describe in their proposal their own methodology, engineering rationale, and any analysis or modeling that demonstrates how their proposed solution will reduce physical strain on the horses. This will be evaluated as part of the Technical Approach. |
| 3 | Executive Summary | RPP | #1 | Are there any restricted or preferred technologies/materials (e.g., composites, advanced alloys) that should or should not be considered in modernization efforts? | 3 | The Government has not identified any restricted or preferred technologies or materials, beyond what is stated in the Salient Characteristics document (e.g., powder-coated high-grade metal for the frame). Offerors are encouraged to propose innovative solutions using modern materials and technologies. All material selections should be justified based on durability, ease of maintenance, sustainability, and their contribution to solving the core problem statements outlined in the RPP. |
| 4 | Executive Summary | RPP | #1 | Can the Government provide more detail on the typical duty cycle, terrain, and operational frequency of the caisson wagons to better inform design tradeoffs? | 4 | The Salient Characteristics document provides the key operational parameters required for design. As stated in Attachment 001, the wagon must be able to "sustain daily use and mileage of a minimum 10 miles per day @ 10 mph on 10% grade hills." Furthermore, it notes that Caisson teams are in Arlington National Cemetery for approximately 4 hours at a time, and the terrain includes steep grades. Offerors should design their prototypes to meet these specified requirements. |
| 5 | Acquisition Approach | RPP | #2.4 | Will the Government consider multiple prototype awards, or is a single award anticipated? | 5 | The Government intends to award at least one (1) prototype agreement. |
| 6 | Prototype Proposal Submission | RPP | #4 | For proposals requiring large technical drawings or models, is DoD SAFE the preferred submission method, or should it only be used when email limits are exceeded? | 6 | As stated in RPP Section 4.2, offerors may use DoD SAFE as an alternative to email for submitting large files. Offerors who anticipate their proposal files will exceed the 25 MB email size limit should contact the AO 72 hours prior to the submission deadline to coordinate the use of DoD SAFE. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | Technical Documentation | RPP | #5.2.1 | Are there available blueprints from the current design tha can be shared? | 7 | The Government does not have blueprints of the current design available for distribution. Offerors should base their proposals on the requirements and dimensions provided in the RPP and its attachments. |
| 8 | Technical Documentation | RPP | #5.2.1 | Should the proposal include CAD models (2D and 3D) as deliverables? If so, is there a preferred model format? | 8 | RPP Section 5.2.1 requests "detailed renderings, drawings, and descriptions." Offerors have the flexibility to determine the best format to convey their technical approach. The Government does not have a preferred CAD format for the proposal submission. Note that if awarded a prototype agreement, the contractor will be required to provide a complete Technical Data Package, which would include schematics and detailed drawings. |
| 9 | Technical Documentation | RPP | #5.2.2 | Apart from a service manual, are spare parts tobe delivered at the end of the project or to be contracted on demand and sourced directly by the ARMY? | 9 | Per the Salient Characteristics document, Attachment 001, the prototype delivery shall include "one spare wheel for each wagon. If the limber and caisson wheels differ, provide one spare of each size wheel per wagon." The RPP emphasizes a logistics strategy where other repair parts are easily resourced commercially by the Government. |
| 10 | Technical Documentation | RPP | #5.2.2 | Warranty: does the ARMY have equipment warranty requirements that are applicable to this proposal? | 10 | The Government does not have a pre-defined warranty requirement. As stated in RPP Section 5.2.2.d, the Offeror shall propose the details of any warranty they intend to provide, including the length of time and the services or parts included. The proposed warranty will be evaluated as part of the Integrated Logistics and Sustainability Plan. |
| 11 | Technical Documentation | RPP | #5.2.2 | Can the ARMY clarify expectations around the level of detail required for the Comprehensive Service Manual at the prototype stage? | 11 | As stated in RPP Section 5.2.2.c, the Comprehensive Service Manual delivered with the prototype must be complete enough to allow Government personnel to perform all operator-level and field-level maintenance, identify parts that need servicing, and understand the frequency of such services for future organic support. |
| 12 | General | RPP | #6 | Will the Government provide opportunities for site visits or engagement with The Old Guard Caisson Unit to better understand operational needs? | 12 | A virtual industry day was held 18 February 2026, and an in-person industry day was held 24-25 March 2026. The Government will not be holding any additional site visits or one-on-one engagements during the proposal period. All necessary operational information has been provided in the RPP and its attachments. |
| 13 | Caisson Wagon Design and Functionality | Attachment #001 | Wheel Design | The original design used wooden wagon wheels. Is there a requirement for keeping wooden wheel or are other materials allowed? | 13 | Per the Salient Characteristics document, the requirement is that wheels shall be "spoked" and "maintain the historic aesthetic of the original 1917 Caisson model." Offerors may propose alternative materials if they can demonstrate that the proposed material meets the durability, sound-dampening, and aesthetic requirements outlined in the document. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | Caisson Wagon Design and Functionality | Attachment #001 | Wheel Design | The requirement mentions "wheels shall be durable", is there a specific target for tread life? | 14 | The Government has not specified a target tread life in terms of years or miles. The requirement in the Salient Characteristics document states the "tread shall have minimum vertical thickness of 1" that will aid in durability of function, so that the need for replacement is decreased." Offerors should propose a durable solution that supports the lifecycle and maintenance goals of the program. |
| 15 | Caisson Wagon Design and Functionality | Attachment #001 | Reducing Strain on Horses | Attachment requires an automatic solution. Are there any requirements/limitations regarding adding battery powered functionalities/features to the wagon? | 15 | The Government has not placed specific limitations on the use of battery-powered features. Offerors are encouraged to propose innovative solutions. Any proposed solution, whether battery-powered or purely mechanical, must be consistent with the overall program goals, including sustainability, ease of maintenance by Army personnel, and safety. The proposal should fully justify the choice and detail the maintenance and logistical considerations of any such system. |