

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 The SLIRBM

The SLS shall be designed to accommodate multiple SLIRBMs within the SSGN missile tube. Preliminary missile design information is available in the SLIRBM RFI Contractor Data Augmentation Request (RFI Solicitation Number 08252003-0358). For purposes of design of the SLS, preliminary SLIRBM specifications are as follows:

Total Length = 32 ft ? 1 ft
 Missile Diameter = 31.5 in +1 in/-1.5 in
 Gross Lift-off Weight = 15,000 lbs

The development of the SLS is to include a four-year program for a sea-based (though not from a submarine) system demonstration/risk reduction flight test, with design and production to follow.

2.2 Information Requested: Provide conceptual technical information, comments and ROM cost assessments for the following items:

1. Concept of Operations (CONOPS) and associated operational scenarios to be employed for SLS concepts. Design should minimize required SSGN platform modifications for SLS integration. Launch preparation, maintenance and downtime should be minimized. Ability to launch the missile from a wide range of depths, speeds and sea conditions should be optimized, but design should emphasize a low-cost approach. Minimizing cost of the SLS shall be a predominant programmatic consideration. Ideas that limit CONOPS in favor of cost savings should be considered.
2. Methods to mechanically support SLIRBMs in the SSGN missile tube (MT) including a discussion of the technical advantages and disadvantages of encapsulated missile (e.g., All-up-Round Canister) and bare missile (e.g., Trident D5 Launcher) concepts.
3. Discussion of the expected trade space available for lateral/vertical support and retention and how this space may be impacted if two, three or four SLIRBMs are to be integrated in each SSGN MT.
4. Mitigation of shock, minimization of vibration transmission and discussion of the proposed method for systems level shock qualification.
5. Approaches for converting the SSGN to/from a SLIRBM strike configuration and replenishing (i.e., refurbishment and reload) fired weapons. Responses should address potential trades that will facilitate reduced conversion/replenishment timelines.
6. Release/eject mechanisms including a discussion of the feasibility of ?cold gas? vs. traditional gas generator concepts. Responses should emphasize ?cold gas? launch as a potential lower life cycle cost alternative to an ordnance-based gas generator. Discuss potential operational limitations (e.g launch depth) of a cold gas eject mechanism relative to gas generator. CONOPS limitations that result in significant cost savings will be considered when finalizing an approach for missile eject.
7. Methods for providing services to the missile including tube pressurization/environmental control, communications and power. Responses should be sure to address the technical feasibility of both wireless and wired (i.e., an umbilical cable) communications/power concepts.
8. Closure design concepts including a discussion of the technical feasibility and cost implications associated with domed, flat, hard-shell and fly-through closure variations.
9. Discussion of the challenges associated with the release/ejection, underwater trajectory and post-broach flight of a SLIRBM. Include comments on feasible approaches for mitigation of adjacent launch affects and debris fallback.

10. Design to Cost concept for an affordable design and life cycle support cost.

The response shall comment on requested design considerations. Discuss items that are not clear or may be construed as overly restrictive. If appropriate, recommend additional capabilities or considerations that may not have been documented in the RFI.

Ensure that response adequately addresses the following:

- a. Description of concepts (Use drawings, diagrams, etc. as necessary).
- b. Technical advantages, disadvantages and perceived implementation risks associated with these concepts.
- c. ROM development costs for proposed, four-year demonstration program.
- d. If necessary, provide the rationale for concepts that may have been difficult to fit within the specified system architecture.

3. STRUCTURE FOR RESPONSES

Contractors should respond to this RFI in writing and should provide their responses both in electronic and hardcopy form. Limit response to a maximum of 150 pages. One electronic copy of the response shall be provided in PDF format and must be received by the specified due date. Contractors shall also submit five hardcopies to the Government. The hardcopies must be typewritten on single-sided 8 1/2 by 11 paper with one-inch margins on all sides and double-spaced text, and bound in standard binders. Use 12-point font with normal (uncondensed) spacing.

4. INFORMATION EXCHANGE MEETING

The Government reserves the right to arrange an Information Exchange Meeting(s). These private sessions would provide a closed forum for individual contractors to share proprietary conceptual information with the Government. The exact format and date of these meetings has yet to be determined; however, the decision to hold an Information Exchange Meeting will be based on the number of requests to participate that are received.

5. LEGAL DISCLAIMER

This RFI is issued solely for information and planning purposes. It does not constitute a solicitation and should not be viewed as a request for procurement. All information received in response to this RFI that is marked Proprietary will be handled accordingly. Responses to the RFI will not be returned. The responses will not be considered offers and will not be accepted by the Government to form a binding contract. Responders are solely responsible for their expenses associated with responding to this RFI.

6. CONTACT INFORMATION

The Point of Contact (POC) for this RFI, including requests for the Information Exchange Meeting, is as follows:

Mr. Thomas Heilig (SPN62)
Contract Specialist
Strategic Systems Programs
Nebraska Avenue Complex
287 Somers Court NW
Suite 10041
Washington, DC 20393-5446
Phone: (202) 764-1704

Fax: (202) 764-2162
E-mail: SPN62@ssp.navy.mil

Please submit electronic responses (via email) to the POC above no later than 5PM EST on 31 March 2005. All hardcopies (5 copies each) must be received by the POC no later than 3 business days after the due date for electronic submission. Additional promotional materials may be submitted in conjunction with delivery of the hardcopies.

Original Point of Contact

Thomas Heilig, Contract Specialist, Phone 202-764-1704, Fax 202-764-2162, Email SPN62@SSP.Navy.Mil - GERARD MISKELLY, Contract Officer, Phone 202-764-1706, Fax 202-764-2162, Email GMISKELLY@SSP.SPHQ.NAVY.MIL

Current Point of Contact

Thomas Heilig, Contract Specialist, Phone 202-764-1704, Fax 202-764-2162, Email SPN62@SSP.Navy.Mil

Place of Performance

Address: SSP, Nebraska Avenue Complex, Attn: Mr. Thomas Heilig (SPN62), 287 Somers Court NW, Suite 10041, Washington, DC
Postal Code: 20393-5446
Country: USA

[Register to Receive Notification](#)

[Government-wide Numbered Notes](#)

You may return to Business Opportunities at:

- DON SSP listed by [\[Posted Date\]](#)
- DON Agencywide listed by [\[Posted Date\]](#)

[\[Home\]](#) [\[SEARCH synopses\]](#) [\[Procurement Reference Library\]](#)