Question #	Question/Comment	Answer
1	Sec. C.d lists 4 specific topics to address for sustainment. However, there is one paragraph after #(4) that is not numbered. Should the paragraph that starts with "Document supply, support, and logistics including …" be #5? Or is this part of #4?	See Attachment 14 Sec L, Section C.d(5), Numbering has been updated to provide clarity.
2	Please confirm if the Government is requesting a twenty-four (24) month warranty. Previous standard warranty was twelve (12) months.	*UPDATED 08/05/26* The warranty period requested by the Government is outlined in the PWS (RFP Attachment 16 Performance Work Statement) 4.13.12.
3	This section states: "The offeror shall send out and track the completion of the Present and Past Performance Questionnaires (RFP Attachment 6) to each of the offeror's, joint venture members and/or critical subcontractors' (i.e., each entity's) Points of Contact identified in each RFP Attachment 4 (FACTS Sheet)." Pleaes confirm that the offeror sends the PPQs to the POC for each past performance submission included in a FACTS Sheet.	Per Attachment 14 Sec L, Sec E.8, Yes the offeror is responsible for sending the Present and Past Performance Questionnaires (RFP Attachment 6) to the Point of Contact (POC) for each past performance reference included in the FACTS Sheet (RFP Attachment 4). Additionally, the offeror must track the completion of these questionnaires.
4	The transmittal letter template states: "The offeror shall send out – and track the -- Present/Past Performance Questionnaire to each of the offeror's, critical subcontractors', teaming contractors, and/or joint venture members' Points of Contact (POCs)." Please confirm that the offeror sends a transmittal letter and PPQ to the POC for each past performance submission included in a FACTS Sheet.	Per Attachment 7, #1, The offeror is required to send a transmittal letter and the Present/Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) to the designated Point of Contact (POC) for each past performance submission that is included in the FACTS Sheet.
5	This section states: "The Cross Reference Matrix will be utilized as a tool to show critical interrelationships and dependencies among the technical requirements documents (System Requirements Document (SRD), Performance-Based Work Statement (PWS), the Contract Line Item Number (CLIN), the Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL), Section L (Proposal Requirements), and Section M (Evaluation Basis for Award)." The Section L instructions and the provided Cross-Reference Matrix describe the content to be delivered and reviewed in the Vol. II. However, several PWS sections and SRD requirements not mapped to the Vol. II content to be reviewed. a) Is it your intent that Vol. II address only the specific content requested for evaluation? b) Are offerors expected to provide additional sections/subsections in our proposal outline, outside of the 4 evaluation factor areas prescribed by Section L, to address the additional requirements? c) Or should the offeror map any requirements not listed in the Cross Reference Matrix into the 4 subfactors? *NOTE:* We ask this question because Section L states "Note: To assist with streamlining the evaluation, offerors shall address only one subfactor per section in the technical proposal, avoid including subfactor discussions in multiple sections, and use the same headings, subfactor numbers, and paragraph numbers as used in this paragraph." This could be interpreted as "The Technical Volume should only have these 4 sections."	Per Attachment 14, Sec. L, Sec. B.3 Cross Reference Matrix and Attachment 5 Cross Reference Matrix a) Yes. Offerors are to structure their proposals to directly address the specific content of the four technical subfactors as outlined. b) No, Offerors should not provide additional sections or subsections outside of the four prescribed subfactors in Volume II. Anything submitted outside of the items listed will not be evaluated. c) The proposal narrative itself must be contained within the structure of the four subfactors. Offerors should integrate their responses to all relevant PWS and SRD requirements within the most appropriate of the four subfactors. If there appear to be requirements that do not map directly, they should be addressed under the subfactor to which they are most logically related. Only requested information will be evaluated. Per Section L Technical Proposal (Volume II) All required information and responses to PWS and SRD requirements must be incorporated within the four technical subfactors The critical requirement is the diligent and accurate completion of the Cross-Reference Matrix. Note: It is the offeror's responsibility to ensure the cross-reference matrix is clear and accurate. For each requirement, the offeror shall provide a single, specific citation pointing to the exact location within the proposal where the response is located. Multiple or vague references are not acceptable, as the Government will not search for information that is not clearly and accurately mapped in the matrix.

6	This section states: "...use the same headings, subfactor numbers, and paragraph numbers as used in this paragraph." Does this mean we are required to use the letters a, b, c, and d as the paragraph numbers for the four subfactors?	Attachment 14 Sec L, II.C.2, Yes. ensure proposals align with the evaluation criteria, respondents must use the exact headings and numbering system as presented in Section L for the four technical subfactors. You are required to use "Subfactor One," "Subfactor Two," etc., as the headings for the corresponding sections in your technical proposal. The instruction is to mirror the format provided, which uses words ("One," "Two") rather than letters ("a," "b").
7	The information in the Gate 5 section appears to actually be for Gate 6 because it references Gate 6 but not Gate 5. May we please obtain the correct Gate 5 information?	RFP Amend 02, Attachment 15 Section M, e. has been updated to reflect the correct gates within the paragraph.
8	This section states: "g. All offerors within Gate 4 will receive a Final Proposal Revision (FPR) Request in accordance with RFO 15.204-2(d)." Is Gate 4 correct in the above statement? Or should it be Gate 6?	RFP Amend 02, Attachment 15 Section M, f. has been updated to reflect the correct gates within the paragraph.
9	Will the Government please allow offerors to use a smaller font (e.g., Times New Roman 8 or 9) in graphics, tables, and pictures?	RFP Amend 02, Attachment 14 Section L amended for Page 3, Number 1, bullet 2.
10	Will the Government please provide offerors the following TOs to support estimating? These TOs require us to insert our data and understanding the expected number of change pages will help us refine the scope and level of effort for A013. 1H-60(H)W-1 1H-60(H)W-1CL-1 1H-60(H)W-1CL-2 1H-60(H)W-2 1H-60(H)W-5-1 1H-60(H)W-5-2 1H-60(H)W-6CF-1 1H-60(H)W-6CL-1	Bidders library is being set up to provide TOs to offerors. This should be available in the next couple weeks due to updates to the TOs.
11	The SF 33 and PWS Section 4.1.1 reference a PoP of "...One (1) base period of two (2) years with One (1) Ordering Period and One (1) Option to turn on Ordering Periods 2-6. A total period of performance of eight (8) years." The Attachment 11 Cost Model and Attachment 23 Delivery Schedule reference one base period of two years and eighteen-month ordering periods for periods 1-4 and one-year ordering periods for 5-6 for a total PoP of 10 years. Will you please clarify the discrepancy between the attachments and confirm which timeline is the correct PoP?	Per the SF-33, Attachment 16 PWS, Attachment 11 Cost Model, Attachment 23 Delivery Schedule. The Base and Ordering Periods are correctly stated in the SF33 and the Performance Work Statement (PWS), establishing a total contract Period of Performance of eight (8) years. The Cost Model has been amended per RFP Amend 02. For clarification, Base Year of 24 months and each ordering period has a duration of 12 months for the placement of orders, but the period of performance for the completion of deliveries under any given order is the PoP column varying from 12 to 24 months as referenced in the Delivery Schedule Attachment 23.
12	The quantities for Lab and Simulator kits identified in PWS Appendix A, Statement of Objectives (page 77) do not reconcile with the quantities specified in Attachment 11 Cost Model. Which quantities should offerors use for proposal purposes?	The Government has updated PWS Appendix A, Table 6, to delineate the quantities of simulator kits for each ordering period. The associated cost model has been revised to reflect these updated quantities.
13	This section refers to Table 7 and Table 8 for electromagnetic environments. Neither of those tables have electromagnetic environments in them. Should this reference Table 9?	See RFP Amend 02, Amended SRD

14	This section refers to Table 9 for electromagnetic environments. Should this reference table 10?	See RFP Amend 02, Amended SRD
15	Sec. C.d lists 4 specific topics to address for sustainment. However, there is one paragraph after #(4) that is not numbered. Should the paragraph that starts with "Document supply, support, and logistics including …" be #5? Or is this part of #4?	See RFP Amend 02, Attachment 14 Section L paragraph 5 added
16	The original RFI (Section 4.6, Schedule Information) encouraged respondents to propose alternative or accelerated schedules if feasible, stating: "Respondents are also encouraged to indicate if a more accelerated schedule is feasible. If the proposed approach can deliver sooner than the target, or cannot meet the target, provide an alternative schedule outlining achievable timelines." However, the current RFP and its attachments (including the PWS and Section L) instruct offerors to align with the Government's baseline schedule, and do not explicitly reference or encourage the submission of alternative or accelerated timelines. a) Will the Government please clarify whether alternative or accelerated EMD and fielding schedules are desired and will be considered favorably under this RFP? b) If so, should offerors include both the baseline and an alternative/accelerated schedule in their proposal?	See RFP Amend 02, Section L, D.1 amended, Section M, II.A.2.c amended.
17	Can the Government please confirm that no Contractor Logistics Support (CLS) should be proposed for this effort?	See RFP Amend 02, See amended PWS, Paragraph 4.10.8 added.
18	Is the USAF interested in Qty break pricing for DVES or is the intent to propose pricing only for the QTY of A and B kits requested per ordering period?	The intent is to provide pricing for the A Kit and B Kit per each ordering period as the RFP states.
19	Will the Government please confirm that the USAF is not requesting individual spare LRU pricing, just spare kits?	Pricing is for spare kits and not the individual LRUs.
20	Is the Government able to provide a cost estimate or funding profile for the base period and potential option periods?	The Government will not be providing cost information. Offerors are required to submit their own cost estimates to accomplish all specified requirements, including Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E), Kit Procurement, and Production Installations.
21	Can you confirm this effort is to be CPFF?	Please refer to the solicitation each line items pricing arrangement is called out in Section B.
22	Regarding section 2.2.2 within the SRD, KSA #1 states a TRL 8-9 technology and KSA #2 states a MRL 9 or above. Are these readiness levels for the entire DVES system solution, or are these evaluated at the component level?	The TRL and MRL are the readiness levels for the entire DVES solution being proposed for integration to the HH-60W.
23	Is the Government requiring an Air Worthiness certification for the entire DVES solution?	Yes, the DVES solution shall have airworthiness certification and the HH-60W airworthiness will require updating during program.
24	Does the DO-178 DAL-C certification for the software need to be established prior to award?	Yes, the proposed solution shall have DO-178 DAL-C certification
25	Can you confirm a DO-254 HW certification for the hardware solution(s)?	Yes, the proposed solution shall have DO-254 HW certification.
26	Can the government share more clarity on the provided Delivery Schedule? The Base CLIN appears to be entirely an RDT&E phase; Given the TRL/MRL requirements, does the government anticipate there to be NRE for the DVES solution itself? Or is the NRE only anticipated for the integration of the DVES solution with the platform?	The Government expects proposed DVES solutions to be certified to the levels previously stated in the solicitation at time or proposal submittal. The Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E) phase, covered under the Base CLINS, is allocated for the integration of the proposed solution with the HH-60W platform. This integration process will encompass the necessary Design, Prototype, Verification, and Testing activities. Any Non-Recurring Engineering (NRE) is anticipated for the platform integration effort, not for the development of the DVES solution itself.