



**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS:
April 21, 2017**

**PERIOD OF PROPOSAL SUBMISSION ENDS:
May 30, 2017**

ABOUT PROPOSALS. The U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission (hereafter “the Commission”) invites submission of proposals to provide a one-time unclassified report on China’s development of advanced weapons.

ABOUT THE COMMISSION. The Commission was established by Congress in 2000 to monitor and report to Congress on the national security implications of the bilateral trade and economic relationship between the United States and the People’s Republic of China. Further details about the Commission are available on its website at: www.uscc.gov.

The Commission solicits this research pursuant to its Congressional mandate (contained in P.L. 113-291, Section 1259B), which states, “The Commission ... shall investigate and report ... on...”

“(B) ...the adequacy of United States export control laws in relation to the People’s Republic of China.”

“(E) The military plans, strategy and doctrine of the People’s Republic of China, the structure and organization of the People’s Republic of China military, the decision-making process of the People’s Republic of China military, ... deployments of the People’s Republic of China military, resources available to the People’s Republic of China military (including the development and execution of budgets and the allocation of funds), force modernization objectives and trends for the People’s Republic of China military, and the implications of such objectives and trends for the national security of the United States.”

The scope of this report will be the following:

Assessments regarding weapons China is researching or developing at or near the global technological frontier (i.e., weapons recently developed, currently being developed, or not yet developed by other countries). This scope should include, but not be limited to, the following areas:

1. Maneuverable re-entry vehicles, including hypersonic glide and supersonic combustion ramjet engine-powered vehicles;

2. Directed energy weapons, to include high power radiofrequency weapons, high energy lasers, and particle beam weapons, with effects ranging from satellite jamming to target damage;
3. Electromagnetic railguns;
4. Direct-ascent, co-orbital, and other anti-satellite weapons in addition to counterspace electronic warfare capabilities; and
5. Unmanned and artificial intelligence-equipped weapons.

These assessments should consider and emphasize updates to the research presented in the October 25, 2016 report on “China’s Industrial and Military Robotics Development” prepared on behalf of the Commission, as well as the Commission’s February 23, 2017 Hearing on “China’s Advanced Weapons.” The report should not replicate work already done, although it may make note of such.

This report’s key research requirements are:

1. **Assess China’s advanced weapons programs.** Based on open source writings, government statements, and testing and deployment activities, what advanced weapons programs is China pursuing? For each of these programs, what specific capabilities do People’s Liberation Army (PLA) and defense industry weapons developers and scientists discuss in their writings? Where are each of these programs currently located within China’s defense research and development timeline? In general, what writings, statements, and other indicators are the most reliable and useful open source indicators for assessing these developments? What do PLA doctrine and gray literature, as well as academic and defense industry publications, tell us about how China’s advanced weapons are intended to be operationally employed? How do these programs compare with publicly-reported U.S. activities in these technology areas?

Approximate emphasis: 25 percent

2. **Assess the drivers of China’s consideration or development of advanced weapons.** When did China’s attempts to develop each of these systems begin? Was the decision to develop them made in response to a specific U.S. system, or do they target specific U.S. vulnerabilities? Are they seen as providing economic benefits? Does China perceive the development of advanced weapons as achievable, or based on the need to “follow the leader” in advanced technologies with no precise outcome in view?

Approximate emphasis: 15 percent

3. **Assess the inputs to China’s consideration or development of advanced weapons.** What are the critical enabling factors for developing weapons at or near the technological frontier in general, and for each of these systems in particular? What fundamental scientific knowledge, critical components, and other enablers (i.e., abstract skills, tools, and techniques) are necessary to develop each system?

How have China's capabilities in relation to these factors progressed over the past decade? What remaining gaps does China face in its research, development, and acquisition efforts for advanced weapons, and how do you expect them to be filled? To what extent will these solutions be accessible to China through open commercial or academic exchanges going forward? To what extent do current U.S. laws, regulations, policies, and practices delay or deny China's access to these solutions?

Approximate emphasis: 25 percent

- 4. Assess the implications of China's advanced weapons programs for the United States.** What are the operational and strategic implications of China's future employment of these advanced weapons for the United States, U.S. allies, and U.S. regional partners in the Indo Pacific? Given what can be observed regarding these weapons' development timeline, will the United States likely be vulnerable to them at the time of their potential deployment? Given their key inputs, can the trajectory of China's development of these systems be altered, and, if so, how? What countermeasures to these systems could be developed? What policies would enable the United States to develop these weapons itself more quickly? What advantages and disadvantages does the United States have in competing with China to develop these advanced weapons?

Approximate emphasis: 35 percent

The report should include an **executive summary** of the report's key findings; a **brief overview of the sources and analytic methodology used for the report**; and a **brief explanation of the scope and limitations of the report**.

Additional Requirements:

1. Prior to the award of any contract, the contractor must be registered in the federal System for Award Management (SAM).
2. Once the Commission selects a contractor for this project, and a contract is signed, public notice of this may be made on the Commission's website.
3. The Commission's goal is to have a report prepared for review in a timely fashion. In ordinary circumstances, once the Commission selects a contractor and a contract is signed, a draft report must be submitted to the Commission for review no later than 90 days from the date the contract is signed. The Commission will then endeavor to provide comments and requests for adjustments within 30 days; subsequently, the final report must be submitted within 30 days of formal receipt of the Commission's comments. The Commission recognizes, under certain circumstances, a contractor may wish to have more time to prepare the first draft of the report under the contract. The contractor, in their contract proposal, should stipulate the time frame for submission of the draft report. It is to be understood;

however, that time is of the essence in completing research contracts for the Commission.

4. As work on the report progresses, the Commission's Research Director shall act as the Commission's representative in monitoring the progress, quality, and responsiveness of the report to the major issues of concern identified in this Request for Proposals (RFP). The Research Director shall, on request to the contractor, be entitled to informal briefings on the status of the research work and to readings of the draft in progress.
5. The report shall be free of typographical errors and conform to the Chicago Manual of Style. Upon receipt of all drafts, the Commission will inspect the document for typographical errors and deviations from the Chicago Manual of Style guidelines. At the discretion of the Commission, if a draft contains excessive deficiencies, the Commission will return the draft to the contractor and request the contractor cure the draft of deficiencies within five (5) working days (not counting weekends and Federal holidays). Upon resubmission of the draft by the contractor to the Commission, should deficiencies remain, the Commission, at its discretion, will submit the draft to its copyeditor for correction, the cost of which (\$45.34 per hour) will be deducted from the final cost of the contract. The contract shall be subject to termination if the Commission deems that the work is of unsatisfactory quality.
6. At the Commission's discretion, the report procured via this RFP may be posted on the Commission's website.
7. Each organization or individual responding to this request must warrant they will perform this work solely for the Commission, and the resulting report will not be shared with other parties without the prior written consent of the Commission.
8. The Commission expects contractors to identify all personnel working on the contract, and that there will not be any delegation of responsibilities to other parties without prior written approval of the Commission.
9. After completion of the report, the Commission staff, in consultation with the contractor, will prepare a short summary of the research for posting on the Commission's website and other media. The Commission staff shall consult with the contractor in preparing said document.
10. At the discretion and request of the Commission, the contractor shall, within a year after publication of the report, agree to participate in up for two (2) separate briefings, and up to one (1) public hearing, held by the Commission, of up to two (2) hours each in the Washington, DC area, supported by at least one (1) individual affiliated with the contractor identified as "key personnel." This could include, but not necessarily be limited to, briefing the content of the research to Commissioners and Commission staff, appearing as witnesses at a public hearing held by the Commission, and briefing the content of the research to Members of Congress

and/or their staff. No additional remuneration will be provided to the contractor for these briefings or a hearing. The Commission will make a good faith effort to schedule briefings and a hearing at times that are subject to mutual agreement.

Primary Selection Criteria:

1. The Commission will determine which organization or individual responding to this request will be awarded the contract based on a comprehensive “best value” analysis of the proposals received, to include costs, technical value, and ability to complete the work satisfactorily and on time, and past performance with the Commission, if applicable.
2. The primary weighting criterion in selection shall be the assessed qualifications and ability of an organization or individual to address the fundamental research points enunciated above (“key research requirements”).
3. The cost and amount of time necessary to complete the report will also be considered as criteria in the selection process.

Proposal submissions should include:

1. A statement of the applicant’s relevant qualifications to satisfy the terms of this RFP, to include curricula vitae for personnel intended for work on the project.
2. Identification of the principal researchers who will be responsible for the preparation of the report. It is understood that the designation of the researchers is a critical element of the proposal, and any changes regarding which individuals will be involved in the report’s preparation must be approved by the Commission in advance and in writing.
3. A description of the research methodology the applicant proposes to employ. In describing methodology, the submission should provide detailed descriptions of the sources and methods that will be used to research the report’s topic and the extent to which Chinese language sources, if any, and other primary materials will be used.
4. A list of any entities for whom you have conducted research or provided consulting services in the past. The Commission understands you may be limited in providing such information by confidentiality agreements.
5. An estimate of the time the applicant will need to complete the required work.
6. The price the applicant will charge to the Commission to complete the work set forth in this RFP.

Organizations and individuals wishing to submit a proposal in response to this RFP must ensure that the response arrives at the location noted below by **5:30PM (EST) on May 30, 2017**, or it will not be accepted or considered.

Electronic submissions are acceptable.

Proposals, as well as inquiries or any other correspondence related to this matter, should be directed to:

Katherine Koleski
Research Director
U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission
Hall of the States, Suite 602
444 North Capitol Street NW
Washington, DC 20001
phone: 202-624-1482
e-mail: kkoleski@uscc.gov