

PORTABLE RADIOS DRAFT RFP N00039-11-R-0069
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Date: 09/06/2011

Question 1: Does SPAWAR plan to submit Attachment 4 (Technical Acceptability Matrix) as called out in the RFP, Section J (e.g. List of Attachments) and other sections of the solicitation?

Answer 1: Yes. The document has been renamed to Salient Characteristics Matrix and a draft of this document has been posted on the SPAWAR e-Commerce website.

Question 2: Will SPAWAR accept a SF-295 and a DCMA approved Commercial Small Business Plan as a satisfactory alternative to requirements 1, 2, and 3 in RFP Section 7, Small Business Utilization?

Answer 2: Paragraph (1) of the Small Business Utilization paragraph in L-316 Small Business Subcontracting Plan has been modified to include a SF 295. An individual subcontracting plan for this procurement is still required for evaluation. See updated Draft RFP.

Question 3: Will SPAWAR make available 170-CMP-Version 2 (PEO C4I PMW/A 170, Configuration Management Plan (CMP) dated 01 October 2008 as called out in the Statement of Work (SOW), Section 4.1?

Answer 3: References to this document have been removed. See updated Draft SOW.

Question 4: Will SPAWAR make available the latest revision of GIDEP Requirements Guide, NAVSEA S0300-BU-GYD-010 as called out in the Statement of Work (SOW), Section 4.1?

Answer 4: See section 6.32 of the Draft Statement of Work for information in obtaining the GIDEP Guide.

Question 5: There appears to be an inconsistency between SOW Paragraph 6.27 and Exhibit A. Does SPAWAR plan to add the CLIN X301 series in Exhibit A?

Answer 5: The X301 series are "un-kitted" ancillaries and per SOW section 6.28, will be identified by a Provisional Item Ordering (PIO) CLIN. Therefore, these items will be identified after award, and in the meantime, are identified in Exhibit A as "un-kitted" ancillary parts with CLIN values pre-established.

Question 6: The table in Appendix A of the PRP Specification lists "Wideband Networking" as a required waveform or mode. Can the Navy provide further definition of this requirement? Is it a standard JTRS networking waveform such as WNW or SRW?

Answer 6: The generic requirement for "wideband networking" is to provide the capability to create mobile ad hoc networks (MANETs) between radios to permit the user to establish tactical data networks simultaneously with a voice circuit. There are a number of vendor proprietary protocols that can deliver this requirement as well as the future SRW and/or WNW waveform. In conjunction with the specifications addressing SCA compliant hardware for radios with the wideband networking requirement, the government's purpose here is to allow early introduction of wideband networking to the operating forces while ensuring a seamless migration to a DoD-approved wideband networking waveforms in the future.

Date: 10/11/2011

Question 7: Contractor does not understand the requirement pursuant to 5.1.7 in the Statement of Work relating to "cost and personnel information". The draft RFP does not contain cost reimbursement line items, which indicates the need for this data is inappropriate. Does the Government intend to add cost reimbursement CLINs?

Answer 7: No, the Government will not create a cost reimbursement CLIN for cost and personnel information as required in 5.1.7 of the SOW. The contractor shall provide the cost information as required by this paragraph for each of the items ordered by the Government. The Government will consider an exception if the item meets the definition of Commercial Item at FAR 2.101.

Question 8: The delivery requirement of 150 days ADA in Section F, 52.211-8 is unreasonable in light of the maximum order quantities stated in Section I, 52.216-19. Contractor respectfully requests that either the maximum order quantities are reduced to a reasonable level (i.e. single item maximum order quantity of 250 units) or the delivery schedule is revised to be a start date as opposed to a completion date.

Answer 8: The Government will require delivery to be within 150 days after award of delivery order. The Government will be revising the clause as follows:

- (1) Any order for a single item in excess of **quantity 500;**
- (2) Any order for a combination of items in excess of **quantity 1200;**

Question 9: Section L-316, under Small Business Utilization states the requirement for an Offeror to provide a copy of the latest SF294 or SF295 for each of the contracts identified in the proposal as "Past Performance". If past performance isn't an evaluation factor, is an SF294 or SF295 still required?

Answer 9: The Government intends to remove Paragraph 1 under Section L-316 Small Business Utilization and renumber the remaining paragraphs since Past Performance is not an evaluation factor/subfactor.

Question 10: May a Contractor provide a proposal for items under individual Delivery Orders even if the CLIN was not part of their Base Contract?

Answer 10: No.

Question 11: If an individual Delivery Order requests multiple CLINs, such as handhelds and manpacks, may a Contractor provide a proposal for only select CLINs?

Answer 11: Delivery Orders will be competed among awardees, and a contractor may provide its proposal on any discrete CLIN item.

Question 12: In paragraph 3.0, Scope, of the Statement of Work, Contractors are required to supply radio systems and related ancillary parts that are "*subsequently interchangeable and interoperable with presently fielded Harris handheld, manpack, fixed mount and/or base station configurations of radio families*". The use of proprietary software by Harris in their radios prevents a radio using any other waveform or encryption from being compliant because no other software will operate with the Harris proprietary software. This inoperability will render a competing radio technically unacceptable. As such, there is no other radio that will meet the requirements of interoperability with the presently fielded Harris configuration of radio families. Imposing this requirement essentially excludes any other radio from being compliant with the RFP. In view of the foregoing, how can another Contractor's radio be interoperable with presently fielded Harris radio families?

Answer 12: The proprietary software and waveform have been removed from the requirements.

Question 13: The term interchangeability is defined in MIL-STD-196E and MIL-HBK-61A. Please define what is meant by “interoperable” with the presently fielded Harris radio families?[Reference Spec]

Answer 13: The term “interoperable” is taken to mean the condition achieved among communications-electronics systems or items of communications-electronics equipment when information or services can be exchanged directly and satisfactorily between them and/or their users (Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) Pub 1-02.). In practical terms, a proposed system is interoperable with currently fielded systems when it is capable of exchanging information with a currently fielded system using the waveforms and encryption methods detailed in the SPEC.

Question 14: The “*Interoperability Certification*” sections of the specification document (Sections -16) require that the products protect information *up to and including TOP SECRET SCI*. We believe that this should read *up to and including TOP SECRET* as this is the level of the certification granted by NSA. The requirement of TOP SECRET is also specified in the “*INFOSEC and Cryptographic Requirements*” sections of the handheld radio specifications. Suggest change all references of TOP SECET SCI to TOP SECRET.

Answer 14. The Government agrees and has made the change in the SPEC.

Question 15: [Reference Spec- 1.2.4.2.4 & 1.8.8.1.3] In the “*Document Description*” portion of the specification document, the last paragraph states: “*Appendix B provides a listing of service-common, previously fielded battery types with which items detailed in Part I of this specification must be interoperable.*” The “Power” section in each of the handheld product specs also repeats this requirement. The referenced Appendix B only includes “Service-common” batteries specific to the Harris handheld radios. Please add to Table 1 the following Government handheld batteries:

NOMENCLATURE	CAGE	DESCRIPTION	NSN
1600515-7	23386	4.8 AH Lithium-Ion Rechargeable Battery	6140-01-487-1153
1600686-2	23386	5.8 AH Lithium-Ion Rechargeable Battery	Not assigned yet
4101240-501	23386	Battery Cell Holder	6135-01-351-1131

Answer 15: No, the above listed batteries are not needed for this Request for Proposal.

Question 16: [Reference Spec- 1.2.4.4.2, 2.2.4.4.2, 3.2.4.4.2, & 4.2.4.4.2] The “Environmental Specifications” section of the handheld radio related products require that the radios “*be coated in Green per FED-STD-595B*”. Suggest changing requirement to read “*be coated in Green per FED-STD-595B or have a black hard anodized finish*”.

Answer 16: The Government agrees in part and has removed the requirement for coating in Green per FED-STD-595B. For this requirement, the specification will not reference color in sections 1.2.4.4.2, 2.2.4.4.2, 3.2.4.4.2, & 4.2.4.4.2.

Questions 17: [Reference Spec- 19.] The VHHR GPS handheld radio specification has been written specifically around the Harris RF-7800V-HH product. One key example of this is the requirement for “*CITADEL II encryption capability*”, which is a Harris proprietary encryption

capability. Suggest specifying a non-proprietary encryption standard such as AES, and eliminating the CITADEL II requirement.

Answer 17: Harris proprietary software and CITADEL II have been removed from the requirements.

Question 18: The requirements in the current draft solicitation are written around the Harris radios, even down to the listing of Harris part numbers. Procurements of equipment and systems to satisfy Government requirements should foster full and open competition to the maximum extent practicable. This solicitation is written in such a way that it restricts competition and creates an unfair bias in favor of Harris. The following questions are areas where Harris requirements have been cited as the criteria to meet in the RFP. It is believed that the Government should refine this solicitation and reword the RFP Spec/SOW to include vendor-neutral requirements that encourage competition and give other qualified suppliers the same opportunity to compete.

Answer 18: Requirements are driven by form, fit, functions requirements of the warfighter and not intended to limit competition. While the government has provided Harris part numbers, salient characteristics have been identified so vendors can propose brand name or equal products.

Question 19: [Reference Spec- 24.1] Specification document appears to have an error. It currently states:

The basic component defined by the requirements within this section is the standard a very high frequency manpack receiver/transmitter unit. The VDCS (GPS) is a single-channel, handheld format, software defined radio whose requirements are defined within this section.

Since this is intended to be a handheld based configuration, it is believed that the Paragraph should read:

The basic component defined by the requirements within this section is the standard a very high frequency handheld receiver/transmitter unit. The VDCS (GPS) is a single-channel, handheld format, software defined radio whose requirements are defined within this section.

Answer 19: The Government agrees and has made the requested change to the SPEC.

Question 20: [Reference Spec- 1.5.2.1 & 1.5.2.2] Suggest the requirement be changed to only the display of coordinates in the latitude and longitude format obtained from the Military Grid Reference System data.

Answer 20: Different operating environments will require different grid reference formats. Therefore, the SPEC regarding coordinates is the requirement as defined by the warfighter.

Question 21: [Reference Spec- Sections 2, 4, 15 & 16] Would a small external accessory which includes a remote radio control capability for the GPS receive functionality be acceptable? This approach has the benefits of (1) positioning the GPS antenna in a higher and less obstructed location on the soldier for better GPS performance, (2) providing compact convenient radio remote control capabilities such that the radio R/T can be stored away in the ruck or on the webgear, and (3) allowing the procurement of a basic radio which can later be easily upgraded for GPS. For reasons of providing these benefits to the war fighter and for allowing multiple sources, thus providing competition under the PRP procurement, we recommend that the requirements for the GPS enabled radio configurations be changed to allow the GPS functionality to be provided from either an embedded GPS or from an external accessory.

Answer 21: The SPEC is specific as to when internal or external GPS functionality is required.

Question 22: [Reference Spec- 16.] The only immersion requirement for the Multiband Handheld Radio NSW Dive Capable radio is 2M, should this be corrected to reflect 20M immersability?

Answer 22: The Government agrees and has made the requested change to the SPEC.

Question 23: [Reference Spec- 1.7.1.4] Suggest that transmit OTAR requirement be removed.

Answer 23: Transmitting OTAR is a warfighter requirement as listed in the SPEC.

Question 24: [Reference Spec- 19.2.3.4] Suggest that the harmonic suppression be changed from 50 dBc to 42 dBc.

Answer 24: The Government agrees and has made the requested change to the SPEC.

Question 25: [Reference Spec- 13.3.2.6] Reference is made to "Section 1.2.3.6" which does not exist. Please correct or remove.

Answer 25: The Government agrees and has corrected the reference in the SPEC

Question 26: [Reference Spec- 19.2.1.2 & 25.2.1.2] Requirement that VHHR GPS unit frequency resolution shall be no more than 10 Hz in fixed frequency mode. Request that this be changed to 5 kHz.

Answer 26: The stated requirement in the SPEC is correct as written.

Question 27: [Reference Spec- 25.2.3.4] Suggest that the spurious suppression be changed from 50 dBc to 40 dBc.

Answer 27: The Government agrees and has made the requested change to the SPEC.

Question 28: [Reference Spec Appendix A] Suggest that the waveforms Quicklook 1A and Wideband FSK be removed.

Answer 28: The Government agrees and has made the requested change to the SPEC.