

GPNTS – RFP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS UPDATE 5 – OCTOBER 07, 2010

Q1. <GPS-020> When in GPS INIT Mode, the most recently received data SHALL be used by the GPS Receiver. Can requirement GPS-020 therefore be deleted? If not, please define how this conflict should be resolved.

A1. The <GPS-020> requirement in the GPNTS TRD v2.3 dated 05 August 2010 has been updated and now states "When in GPS INIT Mode, the most recently received data SHALL be used by the GPS Receiver, unless specified otherwise in IS-GPS-167."

Q2. <GPS-278> The GPS Receiver SHALL be capable of processing externally provided sources of precise time (e.g., Cesium Beam Time Standard, etc.) in its blending filter for the purpose of determining frequency and phase error estimates of the time source.

If a given receiver meets the requirements of the GRAM specification, does this requirement become an objective rather than a threshold?

A2. The <GPS-278> Type in the GPNTS TRD v2.3 dated 05 August 2010 has been updated and now states that it is an "Objective".

Q3. <GPS-278A> In the event that less than 3 SVs are able to be tracked by the GPS Receiver, the GPS receiver SHALL use the calibrated time source outputs for measurement information.

If a given receiver meets the requirements of the GRAM specification, does this requirement become an objective rather than a threshold?

A3. The <GPS-278A> Type in the GPNTS TRD v2.3 dated 05 August 2010 has been updated and now states that it is an "Objective".

Q4. Due date on the e-commerce site for the proposal is 9/27. Will you post a new date and if so, when?

A4. See updated answer A134.

See e-Commerce update dated 12 August 2010. Proposals are due 12 October 2010.

Q5.

7870 **Description:** N/A

7871 <HR-124> All switches, buttons, and touch-screens SHALL have an expected operating life of 7872 10 million presses/operations or higher.

7873 **Source:** 6.1.1.4 **Type:** Threshold **Verify by:** Analysis

The above requirement seems to apply to controls at an operator or user would expect to be using on a regular or daily basis verses power switches or circuit breakers that are normally set and left in single states for extended periods of time. Is this a correct interpretation of the requirement?

A5. From A180 in Draft RFP Q&As.

The TRD v2.3 dated 05 August 2010 reflects the following changes:

CHANGE

<HR-124> All Circuit Breakers SHALL have an expected operating life of 6 thousand On/Off Cycles or higher.

ADD

Description: N/A

<HR-220> All Mechanical Switches SHALL have an expected operating life of 10 thousand On/Off Cycles or higher.

Source: 6.1.1.4 Type: Threshold Verify by: Analysis

ADD

Description: N/A

<HR-221> All Membrane Switches SHALL have an expected operating life of 100 thousand On/Off Cycles or higher.

Source: 6.1.1.4 Type: Threshold Verify by: Analysis

ADD

Description: N/A

<HR-222> All Touch-Screens SHALL have an expected operating life of 1 million presses or higher.

Source: 6.1.1.4 Type: Threshold Verify by: Analysis

Q6.

6536 **Description:** N/A

6537 <PO-041> The GPNTS UPS input power SHALL be protected by a MAIN Input Power

6538 ON/OFF circuit breaker switch (type ALB).

6539 **Source:** 6.1.1.4 **Type:** Threshold **Verify by:** Analysis, Test

The above requirement says "(type ALB)" On/Off circuit breaker switch which appears to be a panel board mounting type with a stab terminal type connection for the line side. Is this defining the type of breaker that will be protecting the AC power coming to the GPNTS rack or the type of breaker required within a GPNTS rack?

A6. <PO-041> defines the type of circuit breaker required within the GPNTS rack.

Q7. What is the status of the GPNTS CDD? Has it been approved?

A7. The CDD is on track to be approved Q4 FY10.

Q8. The NAVSSI source code was posted for review on the GPNTS RFP GFI Project Site in two pdf files. In order to allow meaningful code review and analysis, we respectfully request the native source code files be provided.

A8. The NAVSSI native source code files were posted to NESI 25 August 2010.

Q9. RFP Section L, page 131, Paragraph 3.1.4. The RFP states "Of these five (5) relevant past performance experiences, three shall be from the prime contractor and the remaining two (2) will be from the two (2) largest subcontractors (measured by dollar value)."

Is the referenced "dollar value" measured from EMD (CLIN 0001) only, or from EMD, LRIP and FRP?

A9. The "measured by dollar value" is in reference to CLIN 0001 only. RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.1.4 will be amended to read as follows: "Of these five (5) relevant past performance experiences, three shall be from the prime contractor and the remaining two (2) will be from the two (2) largest subcontractors (measured by dollar value for CLIN 0001 only)." This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q10. RFP Section F, bottom of page 48. The RFP has two notes as follows:

**Deliveries will be made one (1) per month commencing three (3) months AOA.

**Deliveries will be made two (2) per month commencing three (3) months AOA."

Is the intent of these notes to reflect deliveries to begin in the third month, or three (3) months after the option award date which is effectively the fourth month of the exercised option's period of performance?

A10. The intent of these notes is to indicate that delivery of the first unit shall occur three (3) months AOA and continue at the specified rate until deliveries are complete.

Q11. RFP Section F, bottom of page 48. The RFP has two notes as follows:

**Deliveries will be made one (1) per month commencing three (3) months AOA.

**Deliveries will be made two (2) per month commencing three (3) months AOA.”

Will the Government accept early delivery of systems under the LRIP and FRP CLINs?

A11. Yes, if the early delivery supports the fielding schedule.

Q12. RFP Section F, page 49, and Section H, page 69. Periods of Performance for the Contract’s Option Items are listed on page 49 and Option Exercise Dates are listed for the same Option Items on page 69.

The Option Exercise end dates listed on page 69 and the Period of Performance end dates listed on page 49 are the same for the respective CLINs, which could result in Option CLINs being exercised immediately prior to its PoP completion date.

Request the dates in these sections be reconciled.

A12. The dates do not require reconciliation. The Period of Performance (PoP) information in Section F sets forth the period that the Government may procure hardware or services under the applicable CLINs. If the Government exercised an option immediately prior to a PoP expiration date, the delivery requirements would be as set forth in clause F-302, Time and Place of Delivery – F.O.B Destination.

Q13. RFP Section L, page 147, Paragraph 3.3.1. The RFP states “The above listed information (items 1 – 7) shall also be provided for proposed first tier subcontractors.”

The Cover Letter is limited to three pages. Can first tier subcontractor information for items 1 – 7 be provided as an enclosure to the cover letter?

A13. RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.3.1 will be amended to read as follows:

“Prime contractors shall ensure that all first tier subcontractors include the information (items 1-7) in their cost proposal submission to the Government.”

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q14. RFP Section L, page 147, Paragraph 3.3.1. The RFP states “The Offeror’s proposal shall provide a completed SF 33 and Sections B-K.”

May a Microsoft Word version of Sections B-K be provided to facilitate the contractor in completing the sections requiring Contractor input?

A14. No

Q15. RFP Section M, page 157, Paragraph 3.2. The last paragraph in 3.2 states “. . . (5) for LRIP and FRP options (CLINs 1000-1002, 2000-2002, 3000-3002, 4000-4002, 5000-5002, and 6000-6002) a total evaluated price for a best estimated quantity of four (4) GPNTS Configuration As, twelve (12) GPNTS Configuration Bs, and four (4) GPNTS Configuration Cs for each option year; . . .”.

The quantities listed appear to be applicable to the FRP CLINs only. Can you confirm the quantities to be used for evaluation of the LRIP CLINs?

A15. RFP Section M-307, Paragraph 3.2: Factor 6-Cost/Price, will be amended to read as follows:

...“(5) for LRIP options (CLINs 1000-1002) a total evaluated price for a best estimated quantity of two (2) GPNTS Configurations As, six (6) GPNTS Configurations Bs, and two (2) GPNTS Configurations Cs; (6) for FRP options (CLINs 2000-2002, 3000-3002, 4000-4002, 5000-5002, and 6000-6002) a total evaluated price for a best estimated quantity of four (4) GPNTS Configuration As, twelve (12) GPNTS Configuration Bs, and four (4) GPNTS Configuration Cs for each option year; (7) the not to exceed amounts provided in Section L for Provisioning Item

Order CLINs (CLINs 1003, 2003, 3003, 4003, 5003, and 6003); and (8) the not to exceed amounts provided in Section L for upgrade kit CLINs (CLINs 1004, 2004, 3004, 4004, 5005, and 6004).” This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q16. RFP Section L, page 131, Paragraph 3.1.4. RFP states “The Offeror shall provide information on a total of five (5) previous Government contracts whose effort was relevant to the effort required by this solicitation using the contract reference form provided as **Attachment 5** to this solicitation....”

Is the intended attachment reference supposed to be Attachment 7 (Reference Information Sheet)?

A16. Yes, the referenced attachment should be Attachment 7-Reference Information Sheet. RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.1.4 will be updated to reflect this change in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q17. RFP Section L, page 140, Paragraph “**Attachment 5-1**” instructions. The RFP states “The Offeror/Major Subcontractor shall provide a time-phased (by Government Fiscal Year Quarter, Government Fiscal Year and Calendar Year), detailed cost element breakout of labor, material, subcontracts and G&A/other costs at Level 2 of the WBS (Attachment 5-1) for each CLIN. **Attachment 5-1 (and all other attachments)** shall be provided for each CLIN specified on the first sheet of Attachment 5-1 titled “Matrix” for the particular attachment. ”

The first paragraph of the instructions state Attachment 5-1 is for each CLIN. The Cost Template “Matrix” indicates Attachment 5-1 is for CLIN 0001 only. Please clarify whether Attachment 5-1 is for each CLIN or CLIN 0001 only.

A17. Attachment 5-1 is for CLIN 0001 only. RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-1 Instructions will be updated to reflect this change in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q18. RFP Section L, page 140, Paragraph “**Attachment 5-1**” instructions and RFP Section L, page 145, Contractor Rates paragraph. On page 140, the RFP states:

“Attachment 5-1 shall be provided in soft copy in a Microsoft Excel-compatible format with working formulas intact. These formulas shall apply the proposed labor rates to the proposed labor hours and the Offeror’s/Major Subcontractor’s overhead and other burden rates to their respective baseline costs. If Offerors/Major Subcontractors direct and indirect rates are composite rates, the formulas showing how the composite rates were calculated shall be included.”

“Attachment 5-1 shall be completed for the Offeror, each Major Subcontractor (see specific requirements for Major Subcontractors elsewhere in this appendix including potential exceptions to the requirement) and a summary.”

On page 145, the RFP states: “**CONTRACTOR RATES** (applicable to CLINs 0001, 1005, 2005, 3005, 4005, 5005 and 6005). The Offeror and each major subcontractor shall provide the rates used in the proposed cost in accordance with the format described in this section. Due to the proprietary nature of company rates, this information may be presented separately for each Offeror and major subcontractor”

The RFP on page 145 recognizes and acknowledges the proprietary nature of subcontractor’s rates and that the Contractor and Subcontractor rate information can be submitted separately to the government. As such, this makes combining Contractor and Subcontractor rate information for summary and spreadsheet linkage from tables 5-12 and 5-13 into table 5-1 impossible.

Request the RFP Section L be clarified to allow separation of Offeror and major subcontractor rate information.

A18. The prime will include subcontractor cost totals in Attachment 5-1. The prime and subcontractors shall work together to ensure that the subcontractor totals in the prime’s Attachment 5-1 match the calculations and totals included in the subcontractors’ Attachment 5-1. RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-1 Instructions, will be amended to read as follows:

“Attachment 5-1 shall be provided in soft copy in a Microsoft Excel-compatible format with working formulas intact. For both the Offeror and Subcontractor’s Attachment 5-1 the formulas shall apply the proposed labor rates to

the proposed labor hours and the Offeror's or Major Subcontractor's overhead and other burden rates to their respective baseline costs. **If Offeror's or Major Subcontractor's direct and indirect rates are composite rates, the formulas showing how the composite rates were calculated shall be included.** The Offeror shall include subcontractor cost totals in its Attachment 5-1 submission to the Government. The Offeror and Subcontractor shall work together to ensure the total from the Subcontractor Attachment 5-1 matches the total used in the Offeror's Attachment 5-1." This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q19. RFP Section B, page 25, Stepladder Pricing Tables. The RFP states "If the Government identifies requirements for additional systems within 45 days of the initial option exercise, or within 45 days of issuance of a modification to procure additional GPNTS systems, the Government shall receive the benefit of quantity discounts by treating these purchases as combined buys."

The inclusion of the statement "within 45 days of issuance of a modification to procure additional GPNTS systems" appears to provide the government with unlimited ability to add quantity as long as each subsequent modification was issued within 45 days of the previous modification.

Is it the government's intent that the benefit of quantity discount could be extended beyond 45 days from original option award?

A19. Yes.

Q20. RFP Section H, page 57, and SOW, Paragraph 6, page 46. The RFP states the GFP antennas will be provided 30 days ACA. The SOW states the GFP antennas will be provided no later than 60 days after contract award.

Request the RFP be amended to remove the inconsistency.

A20. The SOW will be revised to state the GFP antennas will be provided 30 days ACA. This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q21. SOW, page 5, Paragraph 3.2 "Other Government Documents", references many documents that are required for contractor review and analysis to ensure submittal of a compliant proposal.

Please provide the following documents:

- GPNTS Capability Development Document (CDD) Increment 1 V1.0
- GPNTS System Engineering Plan (SEP) V 1.08
- Programmatic Environmental, Safety, and Health Evaluation (PESHE)
- GPNTS Human Systems Integration (HSI) Plan
- GPNTS Test and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP)
- GPNTS Life Cycle Support Plan (LCSP)
- GPNTS Training Resources Planning Process Methodology (TRPPM)
- PMW/A 170 Global Positioning System (GPS) Risk Management Plan (RMP) – WRN-6, DAGR, and GPNTS
- PMW/A 170 Configuration Management Plan

A21. All documents listed above, except for the TEMP, were posted to the "GPNTS RFP Other Government Documents" folder in the GPNTS RFP GFI project on NESI on 24 August 2010. The GPNTS TEMP was posted on NESI on 10 September 2010.

Q22. RFP Section L, page 127, "Format" paragraph, and RFP Section L, page 148, paragraph L-349. Page 127 states that the electronic proposal submission shall be made using **Microsoft Office 2007 applications / files**. Drawings, figures, and tables can be no smaller than Times New Roman **6 point**. Page 148, Paragraph L-349 states the electronic submission shall be made with **searchable PDF files**. Tables, drawings and graphics can be no smaller than Times New Roman **10 point**.

Please identify the file format to be used for submittal and the font size.

A22. See updated answer A37.

All text documents should be prepared in Microsoft Office 2007 in Times New Roman 10 point font and converted to searchable PDF files for submission. Microsoft Excel and Project 2007 files should be submitted in the original electronic format.

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 2.1.2-Format, first and second paragraphs will be amended to read as follows:

Paragraph 1, sentence 2: "Type size shall be Times New Roman and no smaller than 10 point in the text, 10 point in spreadsheets, and 10 point on drawings, figures, and tables." And

Paragraph 2: "Each electronic proposal, to include submission to SPAWAR E-Commerce and the CD-ROM copy, shall include uncompressed electronic copies of each Volume on separate CD-ROMs. Documents shall be prepared using Microsoft Office 2007 or compatible software suite including: all text documents shall be prepared in Microsoft WORD 2007, *.doc, and converted to searchable "PDF" documents for proposal submission;"

RFP provision L-349, paragraphs 1 and 2 will be amended to read as follows:

Paragraph 1, sentence 3: "Foldouts may be used, but shall be no larger than 17" by 11", shall be printed on one side only, and shall count as two pages. The type used shall be no smaller than Times New Roman, 10-point. Tables, drawings and graphics may be single spaced, with type no smaller than Times New Roman, 10-point." And

Paragraph 2, sentence 2: ... "Electronic proposals must be identical to the signed paper proposal submission and all text documents and shall be prepared in Microsoft WORD 2007 and converted to searchable "PDF" documents for submission. All Microsoft EXCEL 2007 and Microsoft PROJECT 2007 documents shall be submitted in the original electronic format."

These changes will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q23. RFP Section L, page 126, paragraph 2.1.2. The proposal volume table states "Section D – Relevant Past Performance (Evaluation Factor 4) 3 pages total per reference (Exclusive of CPARS evaluations (if provided))".

Request clarification if Attachment 7, Reference Information Sheet, is exclusive of the three-page page count for each reference.

A23. The three (3) pages total per reference does include Attachment 7-Reference Information Sheet. RFP Attachment 7-Reference Information Sheet has been condensed to one (1) page to allow for two (2) pages of additional information as stated in Block 15 of the Reference Information Sheet. This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q24. SOW, page 38, Paragraph 4.1.15. SOW states "The Contractor shall ensure compliance with Information Assurance (IA) requirements as outlined in DoDD 5000.1, DoDI 5000.2, SECNAVINST 5000.2D, and the GPNTS IA Strategy".

Please provide the "GPNTS IA Strategy" document that is referenced in the SOW paragraph.

A24. The GPNTS IA Strategy was posted to the "GPNTS RFP Other Government Documents" folder in the GPNTS RFP GFI project on NESI on 3 September 2010.

Q25. The Test and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP), the System Engineering Plan (SEP), and the Life Cycle Support Plan (LCSP) government documents are required for contractor review and analysis to ensure submittal of a compliant proposal. The Statement of Work requires the Contractor to understand the requirements contained in these documents for bidding and proposal compliance purposes as follows:

TEMP:

SOW Paragraph 4.1.9.1.1: "The Contractor shall develop the Test and Evaluation Program Plan (TEPP) consistent with **PMW/A 170 GPNTS Test and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP)**."

SOW Paragraph 4.1.9.1.1.4: “The Contractor shall perform environmental and shock testing on rack #2 of EDM-C using the methods defined in the GPNTS TRD and **GPNTS TEMP.**”

SEP:

SOW Paragraph 4.1.3.1: “The Contractor shall prepare, deliver, update and maintain a Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP) in accordance with the **GPNTS Systems Engineering Plan (SEP).**”

SOW Paragraph 4.1.3.3: “All technical reviews listed and described in the upcoming sections shall be in accordance with the **GPNTS SEP.**”

LCSP:

SOW Paragraph 4.1.12.2 “The Contractor shall establish an Integrated Logistics Support (ILS) program as specified by MIL-HDBK-502, MIL-PRF-49506, and the **PMW/A 170 GPNTS Life Cycle Support Plan (LCSP)** to ensure that supportability design criteria and characteristics are considered and incorporated into the system design and that the system will meet the operational availability, maintainability, training, and manning requirements established in the GPNTS TRD and this SOW.”

If these documents are unavailable, what direction does the government provide the contractor to ensure a compliant and accurately costed proposal submittal?

A25. The GPNTS SEP and LCSP were posted to the “GPNTS RFP Other Government Documents” folder in the GPNTS RFP GFI project on NESI on 24 August 2010 and 25 August 2010, respectively. The GPNTS TEMP was posted to the GPNTS RFP GFI project site on NESI on 10 September 2010.

Q26. The RFP Integrated Testing requirements per Sub Factor 1.4 refers to the PMW/A 170 GPNTS Test and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP), will a copy of this document be provided for reference to support compliant proposal development?

A26. See A21.

Q27. Please clarify the following: Paragraph 2.1.2, item number 3 of Section L states “pages shall be numbered consecutively within each section to indicate the volume, section, and page. For example, page 19 of Volume I, Section 3 would be numbered I-3-19.”

However, the sections are listed in Paragraph 2.1.2 Proposal Format as A, B, C, etc. Therefore, the proposal pages would be numbered with the Section letter, such as I-A-1. Please identify the required page number format?

A27. RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 2.1.2, Paragraph 3 will be amended to read as follows:

“3. Numbering: Pages shall be numbered consecutively within each section to indicate the volume, section, and page. For example, page 19 of Volume I, Section C would be numbered I-C-19. Pages in the Cost Proposal volume shall be numbered consecutively.”

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q28. What are power draws for the GFE?

A28. Per IS-GPS-099, listed in Table 2 of the TRD, Other Government Documents Drawings and Specifications, the maximum ADAP power consumption is 52 W. Per CI-GAS1-AE-300C_APPEND_I, also listed in Table 2 of the TRD, the maximum GAS-1 power consumption is 38 W. Note that GPNTS is not required to supply the power for the GFP antennas, because they are intended to draw power from a source external to GPNTS.

Q29. SOW Paragraph 4.1.12.2 states the contractors shall establish an ILS program as specified by MIL-HDBK-502, MIL-PRF-49506, and PMW/A 170 GPNTS Life Cycle Support Plan (LCSP). Section 3.2 indicates that the GPNTS Life Cycle Support Plan (LCSP) is data TBD. Does that indicate that it does not exist yet? Will guidance be provided to support setting up the ILS program? Will that requirement be removed from the SOW?

A29. See A21.

Q30. SOW Paragraph 4.1.12.2 identified 8 specific LMI summaries that are to be provided. The following are not defined in MIL-HDBK-502, nor are MIL-PRF-49506 Appendix A or B worksheets provided to define required data.
a. Failure Modes Effects Analysis Summary - (Does CDRL A070 provide sufficient data for this summary?)
b. Supportabilities Summaries – No definition exists.
c. Demilitarization and Disposal Summary (Does CDRL A078 provide sufficient data for this summary?)

A30. a.) Yes, CDRL A070 provides sufficient data for this summary. b.) It is sufficient for Contractor to provide best practices or recommended data for Supply Support Summary. c.) Yes, CDRL A078 provides sufficient data for the Demilitarization and Disposal Summary.

Q31. Since the MIL-PRF-49506 Appendices are not provided, is it sufficient for the contractor to provide recommended data fields to be completed and submitted as part of the LMI summaries?

A31. MIL-PRF-49506 and appendices are available online. The document and appendices have been uploaded to the GPNTS RFP GFI project site on NESI for your convenience.

Q32. Is the Provisioning Technical Documentation required by SOW paragraph 4.1.12.4 sufficient to fulfill the Supply Support Summary required by SOW paragraph 4.1.12.2?

A32. No. The Provisioning Technical Documentation (PTD) required by SOW para 4.1.12.4 is not sufficient to fulfill the Supply Support Summary required by para 4.1.12.2. The Supply Support Summary is still required in order to complete Performance Based Logistics (PBL). It is sufficient for Contractor to provide best practices for the Supply Support Summary.

Q33. In SOW paragraph 3.2, document N2N6-TRPPM-E-70-0810, GPNTS Training Resources Planning Process Methodology (TRPPM) has a date of November 2010. Will that document or a draft be made available to support proposal preparations?

A33. See A21.

Q34. **Section L, paragraph 3.1.1.5** Integrated Logistics Support (ILS) (Subfactor 1.5) The Offeror shall describe its approach to meeting the ILS requirements specified in Sections 4.1.12-4.1.12.5 and 4.2.11 of the GPNTS SOW. The contractor shall describe how their design minimizes life cycle cost and provide an estimate of a total life cycle cost. **The estimate should assume 20 year sustainment after production.** Does the highlighted section mean that the contractor will establish a depot facility to repair the GPNTS for a 20 year period? Is this supposed to be a Performance Based Logistics approach that is to be considered?

A34. The contractor is not required to establish a depot facility to repair the GPNTS for a 20 year period. The life cycle cost estimate will be considered as part of the Government's evaluation of how the Offeror's proposed design minimizes life cycle cost.

Q35. Submittal Time - SF33 states 02:00 pm local time 12 Oct 2010 however Section L, page 148, L-349 states 10:00 am San Diego, CA time on 12 Oct 2010. Please clarify time deadline.

A35. See updated answer A134.

Proposals are due to the Government at 10:00 AM Pacific Standard Time on 12 October 2010. This change will be made to the SF33 and will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q36. Progress Payments - Section G, page 51, G-311 provides Progress Payments Invoicing Instructions; Section I, page 71, includes Clause 52.232.16 Progress Payments; in conflict with these two is Section M, pg 152 which includes the Clause 52.232-15 Progress Payments Not Included. Please clarify if Progress Payments are allowed.

A36. RFP Section M, FAR Clause 52.232-15 will be deleted. This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q37. Given the limited page restrictions contained within Volume I and the amount of detail required to respond to all “shall” requirements, the current Times New Roman 10 point requirement for spreadsheets, tables, drawings and figures does not provide for an adequate level of detail for proposal compliance nor the necessary level of detail for SPAWAR to adequately evaluate responses.

In regard to your response to Q22, would you consider the following modification and presentation alternative to paragraph 1, sentence 2 (referenced in A22):

- ... “Type size shall be Times New Roman and no smaller than 12 point font in the text. Type size shall be Arial and no smaller than 8 point in spreadsheets, drawings, figures, and tables.”

A37. All text documents should be prepared in Microsoft Office 2007 in Times New Roman 10 point font and all spreadsheets, drawings, figures, and tables should be prepared in Times New Roman 8 point font.

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 2.1.2-Format, first paragraph will be amended to read as follows:

Paragraph 1, sentence 2: “Type size shall be Times New Roman and no smaller than 10 point in the text, 8 point in spreadsheets, and 8 point on drawings, figures, and tables.” And

RFP provision L-349, paragraph one will be amended to read as follows:

Paragraph 1, sentence 3: “Foldouts may be used, but shall be no larger than 17” by 11”, shall be printed on one side only, and shall count as two pages. The type used shall be no smaller than Times New Roman, 8-point. Tables, drawings and graphics may be single spaced, with type no smaller than Times New Roman, 8-point.”

These changes will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q38. In the GPNTS-TRD-VER2.3 it makes reference to Object Access Protocol (SOAP) on the following pages:

Page 11: “SOAP v 1.2 (series) Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) 27-Apr-07”

Page B-4: “To demonstrate a PNT Web Service capability, GPNTS will provide a description of an XML formatted message with OD19 data that is registered in a Universal Description, Discovery and Integration (UDDI) registry. This Web Service is based on a programming model and schema which are platform and language agnostic. The format is provided by an XML Schema file for the UDDI Application Program Interface (API) data model and replication. The API includes definitions for performing discovery and publishing, where the API syntax describes the request/response structure semantics, error handling, and Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) details.”

Nowhere does it have a “SHALL” use SOAP; is this to state that SOAP must be used within the SAC or is this more of a suggested method?

Recently other protocols have merged that give the same functionality with reduced complexity and overhead than SOAP. Can one of these newer technologies be used in place of SOAP?

On page B-4, it ties (but no “shall”) the use of SOAP to the formatting of OD messages, is this a required or a suggested method, or can other protocols be used if they can be demonstrated to have the same ability to standardize the discovery and publishing of data?

A38. Offerors may use SOAP or other protocols within the SAC. SOAP is one example of a method that may be used but SOAP is not required. The GPNTS TRD, Section B.2 will be updated as follows:

“...The API includes definitions for performing discovery and publishing, where the API syntax describes the request/response structure semantics, error handling, and other details (e.g. SOAP, AJAX, etc).”

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q39. RFP, Section I, page 82. FAR Clause 52.204-10, Reporting Executive Compensation and First-Tier Subcontract Awards (Jul 2010), is not required in classified solicitations and contracts per the citation at FAR 4.1403(a) and (b). FAR 2.101, (Definitions) states that a “classified contract means any contract in which the contractor or its employees must have access to classified information during contract performance. A contract may be a classified contract even though the contract document itself is unclassified”.

Is it correct to assume that since the GPNTS contract will require access to classified information (supported by the DD254 classification), that it is deemed a classified contract and FAR Clause 52.204-10 is not required?

A39. ~~FAR Clause 52.204-10 will be deleted.~~

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q40. RFP, Section L, page 150, Organizational Conflict of Interest clause. The first paragraph of the OCI clause identifies only the “Contractor”. However, the OCI Mitigation Plan description, subparagraph (f), states that any mitigation plan should address “How the OCI clause is flowed down to subcontractors and how that process is administered”.

Should this be interpreted that the restrictions contained in the first paragraph of the OCI clause also apply to the prime’s subcontractors?

A40. Yes, the restrictions in the first paragraph of the OCI provision apply to the subcontractor as well.

RFP provision Organizational Conflict of Interest, paragraph one will be amended to read as follows:

“...The term “contractor” means the contractor, its subsidiaries and affiliates, joint ventures involving the contractor, any entity with which the contractor may hereafter merge or affiliate any other successor of the contractor and any subcontractors of the contractor. ...”

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q41. RFP, Section L, Paragraph L-349, page 148. RFP states “Offerors shall submit ... no later than 10:00 a.m., San Diego, CA time on 12 October 2010.”

Request clarification as to the time the proposal is due as the solicitation Standard Form 33 states it’s due at 2:00 p.m..

A41. See updated answer A134.

See A35.

Q42. SPAWAR RFP Questions and Answers, #18, regarding Attachment 5-1 Cost Element CLIN Traceability Breakout. Question: Request the RFP Section L be clarified to allow the separation of Offeror and major subcontractor rate information. Answer: The prime (Offeror) will include the subcontractor cost totals in Attachment 5-1.

The prime contractor’s Attachment 5-1 submittal will include subcontractor values at the subcontractor’s total amount line (cost plus fee), therefore the prime will only be submitting one Attachment 5-1. Does the Government agree?

A42. Yes, the prime will only be submitting one Attachment 5-1. Each major subcontractor will submit their own Attachment 5-1.

Deleted: No, The GPNTS contract will not be a classified contract.

Deleted: is required

Q43. RFP, Attachment 5-12 Indirect Rates, page 145. The instructions on page 145 require the Offeror and major subcontractors to describe and substantiate the development of indirect rates. Furthermore, they shall submit detailed definitions, and identify for each account (1) the specific costs that accrue to it and (2) a breakout of the top 80% of the cost.

Recommend that submittal of Indirect / Direct Rate Development information be waived if the contractor has approved CAS disclosures, onsite DCAA supervision, and regularly submits Forward Pricing Rates to the DACO for review / government rate recommendations.

A43. The following sentence will be added to the last paragraph as the last sentence of RFP Section L-317, 3.2, "Attachment 5-12: Indirect Rates":

If the Offeror has a Forward Pricing Rate Agreement (FPRA) or a Forward Pricing Rate Proposal (FPRP) which has been approved by DCAA for use on proposal submission the Offeror is not required to describe, substantiate or provide definitions of indirect rates. The Offerors shall identify the effective date of the FRPA/FPRP that is in place at the time of proposal submission.

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q44. RFP, Attachment 5-13 Direct Rates, page 145. The instructions on page 145 require the Offeror and major subcontractors to document the development of composite direct rates. In addition, they shall submit detailed definitions of each direct labor category. They also shall include the basis for any projected annual increases and any other factors applied to direct rates.

Recommend that submittal of Direct Rate development information be waived if the contractor has approved CAS disclosures, onsite DCAA supervision, and regularly submits Forward Pricing Rates to the DACO for review / government rate recommendations..

A44. The following sentence will be added to the first paragraph as the last sentence of RFP Section L-317, 3.2, "Attachment 5-13: Direct Rates":

If the Offeror has a Forward Pricing Rate Agreement (FPRA) or a Forward Pricing Rate Proposal (FPRP) which has been approved by DCAA for use on proposal submission the Offeror is not required to document the development of, provide definitions, or include a basis for direct rates. The Offerors shall identify the effective date of the FPRA/FPRP that is in place at the time of proposal submission.

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q45. RFP Attachment 5-14, ESS Summary, page 146. The instructions state For evaluation of ESS pricing, the Offeror shall provide the direct and indirect costs for both the prime contractor and subcontractor.

Due to the proprietary nature and business sensitivity of Company rates, major subcontractors may not provide detailed cost element breakdowns required for an Attachment 5-14 ESS Summary. Please clarify these instructions.

A45. The prime will include subcontractor cost totals in Attachment 5-14. The prime and subcontractors shall work together to ensure that the subcontractor totals in the prime's Attachment 5-14 match the calculations and totals included in the subcontractors' Attachment 5-14.

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-14 ESS Summary, will be amended to read as follows:

"The Offeror and Major Subcontractors shall provide information to support evaluation of the labor mix for the ESS CLINs identified in the ESS summary paragraph. For evaluation of ESS pricing the Offeror and Major Subcontractor's shall provide the direct and indirect costs for both the prime contractor and subcontractor."

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q46. RFP, Attachment 5-12 and 5-13, page 145. The instructions for Attachments 5-12 and 5-13 request rates by Calendar Year quarter, however, Attachment 5-1 which requires "linkage" to 5-12 and 5-13 is by "Government Fiscal Year Quarter".

Please clarify whether calendar or fiscal year terms should be used.

A46. RFP Attachments 5-12 and 5-13 should be by Government Fiscal Year quarter.

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-12 Indirect Rates, will be amended to read as follows:

"The Offeror and major subcontractors shall describe and substantiate the development of composite indirect rates that represent a combination of company labor categories, functional elements, or Government Fiscal Year accounts." And

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-13 Direct Rates, will be amended to read as follows:

"...The Offeror and major subcontractors shall document the development of composite direct rates, which represent a combination of company labor categories, functional elements, or Government Fiscal Year accounts." And

RFP Attachment 5, Tabs 5-12 Indirect Rates and 5-13 Direct Rates will be amended to reflect the usage of Government Fiscal Year.

These changes will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q47. SPAWAR Questions and Answers, Question 11 regarding early delivery. SPAWAR will allow early delivery if it supports the fielding schedule.

Since the fielding schedule has not been released, will the Government accept early delivery of the systems for storage (at Government or Contractor facility) if fielding opportunity is not immediately available?

A47. If there is a delay in installation schedule, the Government will store the system in a Government facility.

Q48. RFP Section G, page 51, paragraph G-311, Progress Payments Invoicing Instructions (SEP 1992).

Request the Government add a Performance Based Payment clause for LRIP and FRP.

A48. The Government will not add a performance based payment clause.

Q49. RFP Section L, page 147, paragraph 3.3.5. Paragraph states that the Offeror shall submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan as part of Volume IV.

Should the proposal Volume reference be "III"?

A49. Yes, the Small Business Subcontracting Plan should be submitted in Volume III

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.3.5-Small Business Subcontracting Plan, will be amended in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q50. SOW, page 7, paragraph 4.1. Paragraph states "The NAVSSI Block 4.2 Technical Data Package (TDP) listed in Table 2 may be reviewed and considered for reuse;"

The TDP is listed in Table 3. Request resolution of the error in reference.

A50. Paragraph 4.1 in the GPNTS SOW will be updated to reflect Table 3 vice Table 2 and will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q51. TRD, Sections 3.4 and B.2, pages 81 and B-4. Section 3.4 "The indirect part of the SAC can be hosted locally in a small scale configuration where a CCE is not available, or remotely where a CCE is available, and can be logged into by both user-operator and admin-operator. If the remote environment is of a higher classification domain than the Unclassified GPNTS system, then a High Assurance Guard (HAG) is used between the Direct and Indirect SAC parts, where the HAG resides at the remote high side of the interface".

Appendix B.2: "Description: The SAC must be capable of providing a web based graphical interface for entering privileged admin-operator and unprivileged user-operator commands locally and remotely. <SL-140> The SAC SHALL provide local and remote access controlled web browser based interface."

Request clarification of the intended shipboard technical approach when the Indirect SAC unclassified display resides in a higher security domain. Is the intent for the display to run within a Common Display System (CDS) with a separation kernel, or on a separate unclassified display within the high side environment?

A51. In either case, if the Indirect SAC is on a dedicated classified host or on a split kernel host that is classified, the high side host is responsible for the HAG and cross domain certification and not GPNTS. The GPNTS TRD, Section 3.4 will be updated as follows:

"...If the remote environment is of a higher classification domain than the Unclassified GPNTS system, then a High Assurance Guard (HAG) is used between the Direct and Indirect SAC parts, where the HAG resides at the remote high side of the interface and is the responsibility of the host CCE and not GPNTS."

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q52. QUESTIONS, DATED 25 AUGUST 2010; Question 21, SOW, page 5, Paragraph 3.2 "Other Government Documents", references many documents that are required for contractor review and analysis to ensure submittal of a compliant proposal.

Response stated that the CDD, and LCSP would be on NESI in the GPNTS Other documents folder but they do not exist. Will they be uploaded to NESI?

A52. The GPNTS CDD and LCSP were posted to the "GPNTS RFP Other Government Documents" folder in the GPNTS RFP GFI project on NESI on 25 August 2010.

Q53. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; Pg 21 – CDRL A088, IETM Book Plan Outline, Validation/Verification Plan for System-Level Hardware/Software, COTS/GOTS and

Is there further information at the end of the Title?

A53. The title for CDRL A088 has been changed to "IETM Book Plan, Validation/Verification Plan (DI-MISC-80508B)".

The RFP CDRL A088 Title will be updated accordingly and will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q54. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; Pg. 127 – L-317, Volume Matrix – II Cost/Price Proposal – (Evaluation Factor 6); Pg. 149 – L-349, Volume Matrix – II Cost/Price Proposal – (Evaluation Factor 5)

We are assuming L-349 should reflect Factor 5 and that L-348 should include Factors 4 & 5 in this table.

A54. RFP Section L-349, Table, will be amended to read "Section D-Relevant Past Performance (Factor 4)", Section E-Small Business Participation (Factor 5)", and "II. Cost/Price Proposal (Factor 6)".

These changes will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q55. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; Pg. 127 – L-317, SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS (COMPLEX) (JUL 1999), 2.1.2 Proposal Format, Table, Section F – Correlation Matrix; Pg. 149 – L-349 SUBMISSION OF ELECTRONIC PROPOSALS (SEP 2003), Table, Section F – Correlation Matrix.

What is the Section Suffix required for delivery of the Correlation Matrix?

A55. RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 2.1.2, Table, Section F-Correlation Matrix will be amended to read Section Suffix “V1.MATX and RFP Section L-349, Table, Section F-Correlation Matrix will be amended to read Section Suffix “V1.MATX.

These changes will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q56. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; Pg. 127 – L.2.1.2.3, Numbering - “Pages shall be numbered consecutively within each section to indicate the volume, section, and page. For example, page 19 of Volume I, Section 3”

Does this requirement apply to Volume III – Contracts in that the majority of Volume III will be the model contract?

A56. Yes, this requirement applies to Volume III-Contracts.

Q57. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; Pg. 134 – 3.2(b), Other Direct Costs: “. . . These amounts are non-fee bearing . . .”

Attachment 5-1 “Cost Element CLIN Traceability Breakout is applying fee to ODCs. Should the Attachment 5-1: Cost Element CLIN Traceability Breakout (applicable to CLIN 0001) be changed to not include fee on ODCs?

A57. No, RFP L-317, Section 3.2(b) applies to only ODC CLINs 0005, 1007, 2007, 3007, 4007, 5007, and 6007. RFP Attachment 5-1 Cost Element CLIN Traceability Breakout only applies to CLIN 0001.

Q58. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; Pg. 137 BOE CLIN 0001, “The Offeror’s BOEs shall distinguish between recurring and non-recurring efforts.”

Does this requirement only apply to the BOE supporting language or does it also apply to the hours by labor category, proposed material and any other costs associated with that WBS element?

A58. The requirement to distinguish between recurring and non-recurring efforts only applies to the BOE narrative.

Q59. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; Pg 139, ADJUSTMENTS TO DERIVE THE PROPOSAL ESTIMATE “The BOEs shall be based on the WBS provided with a BOE for each WBS element. A separate set of BOEs **shall be included for each CLIN.**”

Are the BOE substantiation paragraphs specific to CLIN 0001? If so it would appear that BOEs only apply to CLIN 0001 which be in conflict with the reference RFP Citation. Please clarify.

A59. RFP L-317, 3.2, Paragraph “Adjustments to Derive the Proposal Estimate”, first sentence will be amended to read as follows:

The BOEs shall be based on the WBS provided with a BOE for each WBS element for CLIN 0001 only.

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q60. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; Pg 142, ATTACHMENT 5-6 and 5-7: MATERIAL DOLLARS BY WBS

Should ATTACHMENT 5-6 and 5-7: MATERIAL DOLLARS BY WBS really be ATTACHMENT 5-6 and 5-7: MATERIAL DOLLARS BY WBS/SUBCONTRACTOR DOLLARS BY WBS?

A60. RFP L-317, 3.2, "Attachment 5-6 and 5-7: Material Dollars by WBS" title will be amended to read as follows:

"ATTACHMENT 5-6 and 5-7: MATERIAL DOLLARS BY WBS/SUBCONTRACTOR DOLLARS BY WBS"

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q61. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; Pg 142, ATTACHMENT 5-8

Should ATTACHMENT 5-8: OTHER DIRECT COST BY WBS/ SUBCONTRACTOR DOLLARS BY WBS really be ATTACHMENT 5-8: OTHER DIRECT COST BY WBS?

A61. RFP L-317, 3.2, "Attachment 5-8: Other Direct Cost By WBS/Subcontractor Dollars By WBS" title will be amended to read as follows:

"ATTACHMENT 5-8: OTHER DIRECT COST BY WBS"

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q62. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; Att. 5-12 Indirect Rates, Att. 5-13 Direct Rates, Cost Templates

These attachments are titled with Calendar Fiscal Year. Should they be labeled Government Fiscal Year Quarter to line up with Attachment 5-1?

A62. See A46.

Q63. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; Pg. 146, Attachment 5-14 – "For evaluation of ESS pricing the Offeror shall provide the direct and indirect costs for both the prime contractor **and subcontractor.**"

Does this requirement only apply to major subcontractors or all subcontractors?

A63. RFP L-317, 3.2, "Attachment 5-14: ESS Summary", first paragraph, second sentence will be amended to read as follows:

"...For evaluation of ESS pricing the Offeror shall provide the direct and indirect costs for both the prime contractor and all subcontractors."

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q64. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; Pg 147 – L.3.3.1, "If subcontracting with another company(ies) is proposed, a copy of the subcontractor agreement(s) shall be provided as an enclosure(s) to the cover letter."

Please clarify as to what type of agreement. (i.e. teaming agreement, subcontractor proposal, draft model subcontract etc.)

A64. RFP L-317, 3.3.1 last paragraph, last sentence, "If subcontracting with another company(ies) is proposed, a copy of the subcontractor agreement(s) shall be provided as an enclosure(s) to the cover letter.", will be deleted.

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q65. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; Pg. 147 – L.3.3.5, "... submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan (or approved comprehensive plan), as part of Volume IV . . ."

Should this be revised to read "Volume III"?

A65. See A49.

Q66. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; SF33 Blk., “Sealed offers in **original and 1 copies** for furnishing the supplies or services in the Schedule will be received at the place specified in Item 8, or if hand-carried, in the depository located in see L-349 until **02:00 PM** local time 12 OCT 2010”; Pg. 148 – L-349, “Offerors shall submit **one (1) signed paper** versions of their entire proposal to Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, Attn: Frederick D. Renz, Code 02A2-D, 4301 Pacific Highway, San Diego 92110-3127 not later than **10:00 a.m.** San Diego, CA time on 12 October 2010”

Inconsistency with SF33 Blk. 9 and L-349. Please verify the number of hard copies to provide and the time the proposal is due.

A66. See updated answer A134.

See A35. Offerors are only required to submit one (1) signed paper version of their proposal. This change will be made to the SF33 and will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q67. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; Pg. 148 – L-335, “For Bidding/Proposal purposes the estimated effective date of contract award is 02 May 2011.”

What is the Authorization To Proceed (ATP) date for estimating purposes. Should we 1 June 2011?

A67. The Offeror should consider the ATP date to be the same as contract award date of 02 May 2011.

Q68. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; Pg 146. 3.3.1, “Offerors shall expressly grant the Government permission to provide copies of all portions of their proposal to Booz Allen Hamilton in their cover letter”; Pg. 150- Notification of Use Of Contractor Support, . . . Booz Allen Hamilton under contract N00178-04-D-4024, task order NS22, will be used to **assist in the review and evaluation** of proposals submitted in response to solicitation “. . . This assistance will not include analyzing or reviewing proposals . . .”.

Please provide clarification on the specific service(s) and assistance Booz will perform on behalf of the Government with regard to Offeror’s proposals. Such clarification will also assist in defining the purpose of individual proposal access agreements between Booz and Offerors.

A68. RFP, Section L provision, “Notification of Use of Contractor Support”, first paragraph will be amended to read as follows:

Pursuant to 41 U.S.C.419, Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 37.204, and other applicable laws and regulations, contractor support personnel from Booz Allen Hamilton under contract **N00178-04-D-4024, task order NS22**, will be used for administrative support during the evaluation of proposals submitted in response to this solicitation. Examples of administrative support include document control, arranging facilities, organizing proposals, note taking in source selection meetings, transcribing, and finding references within documents. This support will not include analyzing or reviewing proposals, answering technical questions, writing draft reports, or any other tasks requiring the rating or scoring of the proposal itself.

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q69. GPNTS RFP_N00039-10-R-0032_08122010; Pg. 153 - M-307, “Note that the Government will not award a contract to an Offeror’s team that has an organizational conflict of interest unless an approved mitigation plan is on file with the Contracting Officer.”

If an Offeror submits an OCI mitigation plan what is the Government’s approval process and timeline for approval?

A69. If an OCI mitigation plan is required, an approved plan is a condition for award. Therefore, an OCI mitigation plan must be approved before contract award.

Q70. ATTACHMENT 2-GPNTS_TRD_VER2.3_08052010; Pg. 58 para 3.3.3.6.1, "Alarms, GPNTS System Power Failure indicates that the ship service power to the RTC rack has failed. This condition does not signal an immediate RTC shutdown, as a UPS within the rack is capable of supplying enough power for approximately 30 minutes of continued operation. However, immediate attention to the problem and quick resolution will prevent an undesirable RTC shutdown."

Will all equipment in each rack require power for 30 minutes including hotel services?

A70. Yes, see PO-023 of the GPNTS TRD.

Q71. ATTACHMENT 2-GPNTS_TRD_VER2.3_08052010; Pg. 247 para 3.13.2, Form Factor, GPNTS Configuration B system rack 1 SHALL accommodate 19" wide rackmount equipment with standard RETMA rail 10-32 threaded-hole spacing for front panel rails, rear panel rails, and internal left and right side (front + rear) equipment mounting rails in a "Full-height NEMA Type 3 (min) equipment rack with external dimensions 24"W x 32"D x 68"H.

Do the external rack dimensions specified for configurations B and C represent actual required dimensions for the rack enclosures or maximum allowable dimensions?

Are any protrusions beyond these dimensions allowed?

Additionally, is it required that the internal left and right equipment rack mounting rails be threaded with the RETMA 10-32 threaded-hole spacing required for the front and rear mounting rails?

A71. The external rack dimensions specified for Configurations B & C are the actual required dimensions of the rack enclosures are stated in TRD 3.13.2. Protrusions (e.g. switches, handles, covers, connectors, etc.) are permitted as long as the maximum envelope under environmental conditions, stated in TRD 3.13.2 is not exceeded. RETMA 10-32 threaded hole spring is required for the front and rear mounting rails.

Q72. ATTACHMENT 2-GPNTS_TRD_VER2.3_08052010; General, SOW AND TRD

With regard to environmental testing, there are significant requirement differences between the SOW and the TRD. The TRD requires an extensive battery of tests including inclination, drip proof, spray tight, airborne noise, structure born noise, etc with testing required for verification. The SOW requires shock and vibe on rack # 2of EDM-C. Which document takes precedence?

A72. SOW section 4.1.9.1.1.4 states "The Contractor shall perform environmental and shock testing on rack #2 of EDM-C using the methods defined in the GPNTS TRD and GPNTS TEMP." This requires system rack #2 of EDM-C be tested to all applicable environmental requirements defined in the TRD, including but not limited to shock, vibration, inclination, airborne noise, structure borne noise, temperature, humidity, etc. Note that drip proof and spray tight only apply to Configuration A and are not applicable to system rack #2 of EDM-C.

Q73. ATTACHMENT 4-GPNTS_CLIN-SOW Matrix; 4.1.2.4, Transition plan says "it will be discussed at PRR and subsequent PMR's." CDRL A006 states submissions will be delivered 30 DB SRR and at each tech review thereafter.

Appears to be a block 13 copy of A002, in error. Please confirm delivery requirements.

A73. CDRL A006, Transition Plan, Block 12, will be updated to show the date of first submission as 30 DB PRR. Block 16 will be updated as follows: "BLK 13: First submission shall be 30 days before each technical review starting with PRR. The Transition Plan shall be updated, as needed, and resubmitted for Government approval 30 days after Government request." This change will be included in an upcoming amendment.

Q74. ATTACHMENT 4-GPNTS_CLIN-SOW Matrix; 4.1.12.3.1, This SOW section discusses TECH Manual WG and establishes IETM IPR's at PDR, CDR, FCA and a joint validation at 100% IETM. CDRL A091 refers to the IETM Book Plan Outline, V&V Plan and has a required submittal of 30 DB PDR .

Does not appear to go with the SOW section. What are the CDRL requirements?

A74. CDRL A091, IETM Validation/Verification Report (DI-MISC-80508B), requirements will remain the same, but will be moved up to section 4.2.12.3, in order to align with the correct paragraph. This change to the SOW will be included in an upcoming amendment.

Q75. Exhibit A; A019, A030, A021 Block 3, Production Design Review (PDR)

Should "Production" be replaced with "Preliminary" ?

A75. Block 3 of Exhibit A CDRLs A019, A020 and A021 will be corrected to replace "Production" with "Preliminary". The corrected CDRLs will be included in an upcoming amendment.

Q76. Are the "upgrade kits" (SOW 4.2.4, SOW 4.3.4, SOW 4.1.2.5) the same as the "kits" as noted in the TRD (ref fig 2, fig 16, fig 17, 3.10.2, CON-023, CON-023B, CON-023D, CON -115), and Section L-317 (3.2 (d))?

A76. The upgrade kits in the SOW are the same as the upgrade kits in Section L-317, but not necessarily the same as the kits noted in the TRD (see A73). The "upgrade kits" will be defined by the Contractor as part of the recommended kit structure.

Q77. Additional clarification is requested on the DDS related requirements of Appendix B: OC-041, OC-042, OC-043, OC-044, OC-045. The TRD states Appendix B "define[s] the requirements for the Indirect SAC", yet these five DDS requirements contain shall statements against the GPNTS system as a whole—rather than the Indirect SAC. Is the government's intention to make the GPNTS system responsible for these requirements when an Indirect SAC is present or to make the Indirect SAC directly responsible for satisfying each of them? This clarification is requested because some requirements, such as OC-044 and OC-045, describe RTC like functions for subscribing and integrating sensor data into the PNT solution.

A77. The GPNTS system is responsible for these requirements in accordance with Appendix B.

Q78. Section L, paragraph 1.3 states that the proposal due date is 2:00pm PDT on October 12, 2010. Section L, L-349 states that the proposal due date is 10:00am PDT on October 12, 2010. Which is the correct time?

A78. See updated answer A134.

See A35.

Q79. Section L, paragraph 3.3.4 states: "The Offeror shall submit draft versions of any required OCI Mitigation Plans, consistent with the guidance contained in section L-4, Notice of Organizational Conflict of Interest." There is no section titled L-4 however page 150 contains a section entitled ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST, is this section L-4?

A79. RFP L-317, 3.3.4 Section-D will be amended to read as follows:

"The Offeror shall submit draft versions of any required OCI Mitigation Plans, consistent with the guidance contained in the "Organizational Conflict of Interest" section in Section L."

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q80. Section L, paragraph 3.1.1.5 (pg 130) asks for a total life cycle cost estimate but on pg 127 it specifically states NOT to include cost information in any volume other than the cost volume. How would you like that information provided?

A80. RFP L-317, 3.1.1.5 will be amended to include the following as the last sentence of the paragraph:

The total life cycle cost estimate shall be provided with the cost proposal BOEs and include an explanation of how the estimate was derived.

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q81. Section L, "Adjustments to Derive the Proposal Estimate" (pg 139) states that ODCs and travel explanation / cost should be included in the BOE, however the government dictates the ODCs in section (a) of the Cost Volume "Organization" paragraph. Does the Government expect Offerors to justify the Government's dictated ODCs?

A81. No, the Government intends for the Offeror to use the provided ODC amount as a fill-in which the Offeror is not required to justify. However, if the Offeror proposes travel and ODCs related to GPNTS development, CLIN 0001, (exclusive of DT/OT support as described under CLIN 0005) Offerors shall provide an explanation of the proposed amounts.

Q82. There is no requirement mentioned for a Cost Data Summary Report (1921) or a Functional Cost & Hour Progress Curve Report (1921-1 and 1921-2). This has typically been a requirement on our cost plus programs. Please verify that this was purposefully omitted. If this was an oversight and this report will be required, please provide an estimate as to the number of submittals required.

A82. There is no requirement for a Cost Data Summary Report (1921) or a Functional Cost & Hour Progress Curve Report (1921-1 and 1921-2), as these reports are only required for ACAT I or IA programs.

Q83. Section L, paragraph 3.1.3.2 states: "The Offeror shall describe its policies, plans, and procedures for managing cost, schedule and performance risk." This talks to process and not an actual risk assessment of the proposed solution. Is the Offeror to provide a risk assessment with identified risks and mitigation activities or does the Government intend to assess risk based on the technical approach section?

A83. The Offeror is required to describe its processes for managing cost, schedule, and performance risk. Offerors are not required to provide a risk assessment. The Government will assess risks for all non-cost factors IAW the adjectival ratings contained in Section M of the RFP.

Q84. Section L, paragraph 3.1.1.1, sub-paragraph (a) requires the Offeror to describe the RTC "Software" whereas section M, paragraph 3.1.1.1, sub-paragraph (a) does NOT constrain the evaluation to just "Software". Was it intended that the entirety of the RTC (both HW and SW) be discussed under subfactor 1.1 (a) or just the software?

A84. It is intended that the entirety of the RTC (both hardware and software) be discussed Section L-317, paragraph 3.1.1.1, sub-paragraph (a) will be updated to remove the word "software" in an upcoming solicitation amendment..

Q85. FYI. A091 in the SOW is the IETM Validation/Verification report, and in the CDRL list there is a copy/paste error (duplicated the text from A088 inside A091). There are some other minor typos in the CDRL list (TOC and A069/A070 listed twice). We found a requirement for presentation material to be delivered 30 days prior to Post Award Conference (which is required to be held within 30 days of contract award). We assumed that a week is sufficient for PAC presentation material if presentation material is required ahead of time.

A85. CDRL A091 subtitle will be changed from "Interactive Electronic Technical Manual (IETM) Book Plan Outline, Validation/Verification Plan", to "Interactive Electronic Technical Manual (IETM) Validation/Verification Report", as well as CDRL A091 Block 12, Date of First Submission, will be changed from "30DB PDR" to '30DA PDR".

The TOC in the CDRL list will have the second instance of CDRL A069 Preliminary Hazard Analysis (PHA) DI-SAFT-80101B and A070 Safety Assessment Report (System Hazard Analysis) DI-SAFT-80102B deleted, as these CDRLs are currently and correctly listed in the TOC as A072 Preliminary Hazard Analysis (PHA) DI-SAFT-80101B and A073 Safety Assessment Report (System Hazard Analysis) DI-SAFT-80102B.

CDRL A020 Presentation Material ,BLK 16 – BLKS 12, 13, will change from : BLKS 12, 13: The Contractor shall submit the Presentation Materials 30 days before the meeting" to The Contractor shall submit the Presentation

Materials 30 days before the meetings mentioned above, except for the Post-Award Conference, which can be submitted seven (7) days before the meeting.”

These changes will be made in an upcoming amendment.

Q86. The SOW says the 90% ITEM completion point is due at FCA, and in the A088 CDRL, it says the 90% completion is due at PRR. A088 is in paragraph 4.1.12.3 and review completion milestones are in section 4.1.12.3.1. Which date is correct?

A86. SOW section 4.1.12.3.1 will be updated to include 90% completion is due at PRR. This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q87. A091 in the SOW is the IETM Validation/Verification report, and in the CDRL list there is a copy/paste error duplicated the text from A088 inside A091). Also, the SOW says the 90% ITEM completion point is due at FCA, and in the A088 CDRL, it says the 90% completion is due at PRR. A088 is in paragraph 4.1.12.3 and review completion milestones are in section 4.1.12.3.1

A87. See A86.

Q88. A SAR and an SHA are typically separate deliverables. A073 calls them both out, but only identifies the DID for the SAR. Is there a deliverable for a separate SHA? If so what is the DID it would need to comply to?

A88. Yes, there is a deliverable for a separate SHA called out in CDRL A106, System Safety Hazard Analysis. It needs to comply to DID DI-SAFT-80101B.

Q89. RT-548 and RT-549 define new threshold absolute performance requirements which are dependent upon the availability and quality of sensor data as well as the potential dynamics of the platform. Can the conditions under which this requirement is to be met be defined?

Key information would include position error at alignment, velocity error at alignment, misalignment error vector at alignment, gyro bias vector at alignment, accelerometer bias vector, etc. Also, it would be useful to know the altimeter bias for the vertical accuracy requirement (RT-549).

A89. The GPS sensor data quality is specified in section 3.6 of the TRD, the aiding sensor characteristics are the same as defined in requirement <GPS-230>, the platform dynamics are the same as specified in Table 8.

Q90. (U/FOUO) HS-019 states, "GPNTS SHALL be capable of accepting *black* crypto key data into storage in any of the following formats: DS-101, **DS-102** ..." <Bold text added for emphasis>. What is the purpose of DS-102 for *black* key material?

A90. DS-102 is a valid format for loading black keys.

Q91. The descriptions for these requirements stated that the SAC provide a resident console command line interface and a Web Browser interface for entering "all of its commands by an admin-operator." Requirements SL-065 and SL-067 (on page 89) called out the manually entered commands and status to be via the Web Browser application, without mentioning the command line interface. Does this mean that the command line interface would support only a limited set of commands/status for "emergency override capability" (as described in paragraph 3 on page 81)?

A91. No, the admin-operator command line interface must support all the functionality of the Direct SAC including manually entered commands and status.

Q92. Section 4.1.9.1 of the SOW defines all of the scope for Contractor Test and Evaluation. It seems clear that Offerors must bid all the effort defined in this SOW section. The SEP, however, defines many of the same testing events in section 6.4 and says that this testing will be performed by SSC Pacific personnel in Government facilities (SIT, FQT, and Environmental Testing. Does this reflect an inconsistency? Please confirm that the SOW takes precedent from a scope perspective.

A92. The SOW and TEMP take precedence over the SEP. The SEP will be updated to align with the SOW and TEMP, and uploaded to the NESI site on NLT 14 September 2010.

Q93. Last question relates to the reuse of NAVSSI IDD code:

The TRD States:

<OC-048> The GPNTS software SHALL not use or be developed in Ada code.

<OC-049> The RTC software SHALL be developed in GNU C/C++.

Section L States:

If the Offeror proposes to reuse software as part of its system design, the Offeror shall provide the rationale for which software was selected for reuse.

Use of NDI is the preferred method of satisfying operational requirements.....Offerors are "encouraged" to propose NDI...

Section M States:

If the Offeror proposes to reuse existing software as part of its design, the Government will evaluate the rationale for the software that was selected for reuse.....

In summary, cost/technical trade-offs will be made, and the extent to which one may be sacrificed for the other is governed only by the tests of rationality and consistency with the established evaluation factors.

Past Q&As on the topic include:

"Q114. Will there be any GFE/GFI supplied to the G-PNTS contractor? In particular, there seems to be emphasis on reusable software that would imply that existing NAVSSI software will be used for G-PNTS. Is this the case? If so, will the software design documentation be made available to bidders?" "

A114. The GFE/GFI will be provided to the Contractor as specified in the final RFP. Although available as GFI, NAVSSI software is not required to be used for GPNTS. Available NAVSSI software design documentation will be included in the NAVSSI TDP."

Q185. Will the government make NAVSSI code available with the RFP? If not, what information can the Government provide to determine what percentage of the NAVSSI lines of code will be: Re-Used, New, or modified or at a minimum can you provide SLOC count?

A185. Yes.

Question:

The Governments intention related to reuse of NAVSSI code is unclear. The fact that it was released for evaluation and the RFP states a "preference" for NDI and "reuse" indicates that reuse would be favorable, but exclusion of Ada code in the 1.3 revision of the TRD seems to directly contradict a desire for NAVSSI code reuse. What is the Governments position with respect to reuse? Would reuse of NAVSSI code be evaluated unfavorably in light of TRD requirements OC-048 and OC-049?

A93. The direct reuse of NAVSSI Ada code for GPNTS is not acceptable per OC-048. The adaptation of NAVSSI Ada code to GNU C/C++ is acceptable. Please note that not all NAVSSI code is in Ada and that the NAVSSI code does not meet all of the requirements for GPNTS. Reuse applies to any other previously developed software (Government or Industry) that can be used to meet GPNTS requirements.

Q94. DFARS 5252.237-9203; Would the Government give an example of a "report" they expect the information to be displayed on the cover page of the report.

A94. RFP Section D, 5252.237-9203-Marking of Reports will be deleted. This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q95. DFARS 5252.215-9210; Does the Government expect the Contractor's Subcontractors to complete the Representations and Certifications in Section K of the RFP, or only the prime contractor?

A95. The Government only intends for the Prime Contractor to fill-out Representations and Certifications in Section K. However, Offerors are advised to review the text of individual Section K provisions (e.g. 252.227-7017) that require Offerors to address the participation of subcontractors.

Q96. DFARS 5252.232-9206; Does DFARS 5252.232-9206 apply only to CLIN Item 0001?

A96. DFARS Clause 5252.232-9206 applies to all cost reimbursable CLINs including CLIN 0001 and engineering services CLINs 1005, 2005, 3005, 4005, 5005, and 6005.

Q97. Ordering Provisioning Items; In the first sentence of the clause, does "1003" need to be added as an applicable Option CLIN?

A97. RFP Section H-Ordering Provisioning Items should include CLIN 1003. This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q98. Subcontracts For Commercial Items; The text ".203-15" should be amended to "52.203-15.

A98. RFP Section I, 52.244-6(c)(1)(ii) should be 52.203-15. This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q99. FAR 52.234-4 [Section H] and DFARS 252.234-7002 [Section I]; In accordance with the prescription under 234.203 from DFARS 252.234-7002, it indicates that if the RFP/Contract includes DFARS 252.234-7002, it should not include FAR 52.234-4. Will FAR 52.234-4 be removed from Section H?

A99. RFP Section H, 52.234-4 Earned Value Management System (July 2006) will be removed. This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q100. Annual Representations and Certifications [see FAR 52.204-8 on Page 103 and DFARS 252.204-7007 on Page 112]; The requirements under FAR 52.204-8 [starting on Page 103] and DFARS 252.204-7007 [starting on Page 112] are duplicates. Shouldn't one of the provisions be deleted because they are requesting the same information? If one will not be deleted, can you explain why responses to both provisions are needed?

A100. RFP Section K, DFAR Clause 252.204-7007 will be deleted. RFP Section K, 52.204-8 paragraph (d) will be replaced with the following:

(d) The Offeror has completed the annual representations and certifications electronically via the Online Representations and Certifications Application (ORCA) website at <https://orca.bpn.gov/>. After reviewing the ORCA database information, the Offeror verifies by submission of the offer that the representations and certifications currently posted electronically have been entered or updated within the last 12 months, are current, accurate, complete, and applicable to this solicitation (including the business size standard applicable to the NAICS code referenced for this solicitation), as of the date of this offer, and are incorporated in this offer by reference (see FAR 4.1201); except for the changes identified below [offeror to insert changes, identifying change by clause number, title, date]. These amended representation(s) and/or certification(s) are also incorporated in this offer and are current, accurate, and complete as of the date of this offer.

FAR/DFARS Clause #	Title	Date	Change

Any changes provided by the Offeror are applicable to this solicitation only, and do not result in an update to the representations and certifications posted on ORCA.

These changes will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q101. Section M, 3.2, Factor 6; At the end of the text "... best estimated quantity of four (4) GPNTS Configuration As, twelve...", it appears some additional text is missing between "configuration" and "As" to complete the sentence. Can you confirm additional text is needed?

A101. No additional text is needed. The GPNTS system consists of three (3) systems, Configurations A, B, and C. See A15 for updated text.

Q102. RFP, under DFARS 252.204-7007, page 115, it does not appear that any of the certifications are checked. Would like to confirm that this reading is correct.

A102. RFP Section K, 252.204-7007 will be deleted. See A100.

Q103. With regard to Government Furnished Information / Data / Software, will the Government include a table in the RFP that will allow the Contractor to identify and list GFI / GFS?

A103. The Government will not include a table for the Contractor to identify GFI/GFP. The only GFI that will be provided by the Government is stated in the RFP.

Q104. Are the outputs synchros in configuration "C" control loads or torque loads?

A104. The output synchros are 25 VA control or torque loads. The TRD will be updated to reflect the following changes:

<RT-348B> The RTC SHALL be capable of transmitting data over Synchro Output interfaces at a minimum of 25 VA and be able to drive both Control Transformers and Torque Receivers.

<RT-351A> The RTC SHALL be capable of providing data received from ID5 via Synchro Interfaces at a minimum of 25 VA and be able to drive both Control Transformers and Torque Receivers.

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q105. SOW, page 26, paragraph 4.1.9.3. Paragraph states " All M&S applications used during the GPNTS T&E program shall be fully accredited in accordance with SECNAVINST 5200.40 prior to use. The Contractor shall provide the Government with evidence of accreditation prior to testing."

Request clarification of existing government-provided M&S applications that are available to support GPNTS. Request clarification of the accreditation status of each available M&S application.

A105. The Government will not provide Modeling and Simulation (M&S) applications to support GPNTS development. The CDRL A063 will be deleted and SOW paragraph 4.1.9.3 will be updated to reflect the following changes:

4.1.9.3 Verification and Validation

The Contractor shall develop an M&S Verification and Validation (V&V) Plan, which shall describe the V&V process and methodology. The Contractor shall provide the Government with evidence of validation prior to testing. CDRL Deliverables:

- (A061) DoD M&S Verification and Validation (V&V) Plan (DI-MSSM-81751)
- (A062) DoD M&S V&V Report (DI-MSSM-81752)

These changes will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q106. ATTACHMENT 1-GPNTS_SOW_08122010; Pg. 26 para 4.1.9.2, "The Contractor shall design, develop, integrate, test, and qualify the system such that it meets Electromagnetic Interference (EMI) and Electromagnetic Environment Effects (E3) control requirements specified in the TRD and this SOW."

Will the Government provide the three Hotel Systems as Government Furnished Property (GFP) to be included in testing the B and C configurations for system qualification?

A106. No, the Government will not provide the three (3) Hotel Systems as Government Furnished Property (GFP). SOW Section 6, Government Furnished Property, describes the GFP that will be provided to the Contractor. SOW paragraph 4.1.9.2 will be updated to reflect the following changes:

The Contractor shall design, develop and integrate the system such that it meets Electromagnetic Interference (EMI) and Electromagnetic Environment Effects (E3) control requirements specified in the TRD and this SOW. The contractor shall test and qualify rack #2 of EDM-C to verify that it meets the EMI and E3 control requirements specified in the TRD and this SOW. During these tests the Contractor shall not include the hosted systems. The Contractor shall verify EMI and E3 requirements for EDM-C System Racks 1 and 3, and EDM-B System Racks 1 and 2 by analysis, using the test data from EDM-C System Rack 2 and included the analysis results as part of the below CDRL Test Reports. The Contractor shall perform inspections, analyses, studies, and tests to establish E3 control requirements and features to be implemented in the design of the system and verify that the system meets its E3 control requirements. MIL-HDBK-237D may be used for guidance.

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q107. Are the "extension kits" referenced in the TRD (ref fig 2, fig 16, fig 17) the same as the "modular kits" (ref 3.10.2, CON-023, CON-023B, CON-023D, CON -115)?

A107. The "extension kits" may be the same as the "modular kits", depending on the Contractor's design approach.

Q108. The requested delivery schedule is atypical of MIL-STD-882, for example, that a SAR normally includes information from the other safety documents and is one of the last things delivered toward the end of the program, FQT or later. Is it the customer's intent to have these deliverables at non-standard time frames?

A108. No, it is not the intent of the Government to have these deliverables at a non-standard time frame. SOW Section 4.1.11.1, System Safety and Occupational Health, has been updated to reflect the following changes:

".....and human interfaces, and submit the results of the analyses in the System Hazard Analysis (SHA) and Operating and Support Hazard Analysis (O&SHA) report submit the O&SHA report, respectively."

CDRL A106, System Hazard Analysis (SHA) Report (DI-SAFT-80101B), has also been added.

Exhibit A, GPNTS CDRLS EDM, has been updated as follows:

- CDRL A106, System Hazard Analysis (SHA) Report (DI-SAFT-80101B), has been added to TOC.
- The delivery date of CDRL A072, Preliminary Hazard Analysis (PHA) (DI-SAFT-80101B), has changed from 60 DB PDR to 90DB PDR.
- The delivery date of CDRL A073, Safety Assessment Report (SAR) (DI-SAFT-80102B), has changed from 30 DB PDR to 60 days before FQT.
- The delivery date of CDRL A074, Safety System Safety Program Plan (SSPP), (DI-SAFT-81626), has changed from 30 DB PDR to 30 DACA
- The delivery date of CDRL A075, Operating and Support Hazard Analysis, (DI-MISC-80508B), has changed from 30 DB PDR to 45 DB PDR.

These changes will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q109. RFP Section L, page 142, Attachment 5-9 EMD ODC Instructions. The third paragraph, last sentence, states that ODC amounts are non-fee bearing. The EMD ODC costs, with exception of CLIN 0005 DT/OT ODC, are bid in CLIN 0001 which is CPIF. Please clarify the Government's intent.

A109. See A81.

Q110. Will the Government accept early delivery of hardware under LRIP and FRP CLINs in advance of the contract delivery schedule and/or Government's fielding schedule?

A110. See A11 and A47.

Q111. The RFP requires EDM delivery in 48 months After Contract Award (ACA), yet the TEMP has a schedule (Page 29) that depicts EDM delivery in Q1 GFY2014 (Oct CY2013). The RFP states that we are to use a May 2nd 2011 as the contract award date and also states in "Section F" Delivery tables that the EDM's are due 48 months later in ~May 2015. However, if we apply the schedule on page 29 of the TEMP, the EDMs are due in Oct 2013 which equates to ~32 months after contract award of May 2nd 2011.

However, the most recent Question and Answer release on September 13th (A92) states that the order of precedence is the SOW, TEMP and then the SEP.

Which time frame is correct?

A111. RFP Section F-302. CLIN 0001 has been updated to reflect a delivery date of 36 months after contract award (ACA).

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q112. Please define the content and/or intended application of the "Upgrade Kits" referenced in CLINs 1004, 2004, 3004, 4004, 5004, and 6004; and by Statement of Work paragraphs 4.2.4 and 4.3.4, and CDRLs B007 and C007.

A112. The intended application of the upgraded kits is defined in SOW paragraph 4.1.2.5(b) which states "Each GPNTS upgrade kit or replacement part kit shall consist of the hardware required to acquire a specific GPNTS functional interface (e.g. equipment, interface cards, cables, fasteners, and metal work)."

Q113. TRD Paragraphs 3.10.4, 3.10.5, and 3.10.6 define Configurations A, B and C requirements as follows:

3.10.4 - The GPNTS Configuration A is comprised of the core and additional modular kit(s).

3.10.5 - The GPNTS Configuration B is comprised of the core and additional modular kit(s) to back-fit into a non-synchro generation NAVSSI Block 4.2.1.

3.10.6 - The GPNTS Configuration C is comprised of the core and additional modular kit(s).

Please define which required external interfaces an offeror should include in respective Configurations A, B, and C for purposes of completing the Stepladder Pricing Table.

A113. The required external interfaces for Configuration A, B, and C are as defined in TRD Sections 3.10.4, 3.10.5, and 3.10.6 respectively. For instances where the external interface is dependent on platform configuration, the stepladder pricing table should include all possible hardware even though not all hardware will be physically installed in the system rack. For example, CON-085 states "Depending on the platform configuration, each GPNTS System in the GPNTS Configuration B SHALL provide either a RF Output on Port J416 in accordance with Section 3.7.3.2 and Section 6.4 or an Alarm Output on J419 in accordance with Section 3.3.3.6.1 and Section 6.4.", therefore the stepladder pricing table should include the hardware for both a RF output on Port J416 and an Alarm Output on J419.

Q114. Please confirm that RFP, L-317 Submission of Proposals, Section 3.1.3.2 Program Management Approach (Subfactor 3.2), reference to DFARS 252.234-7001 [Notice of Earned Value Management System (Apr 2008) REF: RFP Section K] and DFARS 252.234- 7002 [Earned Value Management Systems (Apr 2008) REF: RFP Section I] shall apply only to RFP CLIN 0001 [CPIF EMD and 3 Engineering Development Models (EDMs)] and shall not apply to any of the Firm Fixed Price (FFP) Option CLINs for LRIP and FRP nor CPFF CLINs for Engineering Support Services.

A114. RFP, L-317 Section 3.1.3.2 will be amended to read as follows:

Paragraph 1, sentence 3: ... “The Offeror shall describe its Earned Value Management System to be used in accordance with DFARS clause 252.234-7001 Notice of Earned Value Management System, and DFARS clause 252.234-7002 Earned Value Management System for CLIN 0001 only.”

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q115. A67 states - “The Offeror should consider the ATP date to be the same as contract award date of 02 May 2011”.

Clause H-405 on page 69 provides 12 month Option year periods starting 1 June 2015. Assuming a 48 month EMD phase and 12 month option periods, would the start of the first option period be 01 May 2015 versus 01 June 2015?

A115. RFP, Section H-405 will be amended to read as follows:

<u>ITEMS</u>	<u>OPTION EXERCISE DATE</u>
1000-1007	2 May 2015 – 1 May 2016
2000-2007	2 May 2016 – 1 May 2017
3000-3007	2 May 2017 – 1 May 2018
4000-4007	2 May 2018 – 1 May 2019
5000-5007	2 May 2019 – 1 May 2020
6000-6007	2 May 2020 – 1 May 2021

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q116. When the Information Assurance Strategy “Ser251-0_GPNTS_IA_Strategy_113009V1_.doc” paragraph 7.4 “National Security Telecommunication and Information Systems Security Policy (NSTISSP) 11”, sections 8. “CERTIFICATION AND ACCREDITATION (C&A)” & 8.1 “C&A Process and Status” states the systems will follow the DIACAP process. In the SOW section 4.1.15 “Information Assurance (RDT&E)” last paragraph “GPNTS shall use an EAL-4 or higher certified operating system and any IA service products, in compliance with the GPNTS TRD.” This combined with the GPNTS Questions Update 12.pdf – Q&A 6 defined that the RTC is a unclassified, this removed the requirement for a separation layer, this should have also removed the requirement for EAL-4. An already defined EAL-4 certified operating system and hardware combination, is constraining on the quote and increases the costs of the proposal. If you go to: <http://www.niap-ccevs.org/pp/> and Sort by "Tech Type" and you will ONLY see TWO profiles for "Operating System". You will see that High Robustness (SKPP) is akin to the old EAL6+ certification and is HW independent. “Operating System U.S. Government Protection Profile for Separation Kernels in Environments Requiring High Robustness, Version 1.03 High Robustness 2.x pp_skpp_hr_v1.03 NSA 2007-06-29 “

Is there still a requirement for EAL-4 requirement for the operating system?

A116. The EAL-4 is not just for classified systems, but also for mission critical functions and personal identifiable information etc. Navy systems are required to meet their functional requirements and applicable information assurance requirements in accordance with DIACAP. In order for the Navy to have reasonable assurance that the system can be certified to operate in the specific shipboard environment that includes providing information to higher classification domains as well as other mission critical systems, the EAL-4 was determined to be the most appropriate level for the operating system as a critical third party non development item.

Q117. Does the operating system have to be certified on some hardware so it has a track record of being approved for EAL-4 in the past?

A117. The operating system does not have to be certified for any particular hardware, but the hardware must support the proper configuration and execution of the operating system under the criteria used to certify it. Having a track record or an explicit approved hardware will certainly reduce the IA certification risk.

Q118. If the system must be submitted to NIAP for evaluation, per NIAP web site and current discussions, they are no longer doing EAL-4 certifications, what will be the process to be used?

National Information Assurance Partnership (NIAP)

<http://www.niap-ccevs.org/>

Protection Profile Updates (10 September 2010)

NIAP will only accept into evaluation:

1. Products claiming compliance with a U.S. approved Protection Profile (with an EAL no higher than that specified in the profile), or
2. When a U.S. approved Protection Profile does not exist and a government agency requests a Common Criteria evaluation, NIAP will consider accepting a product into evaluation at EAL2 only. Validator resource availability and customer need (as specified in the LOI) will serve as the basis for acceptance.

A118. SOW paragraph 4.1.15 states "GPNTS shall use an EAL-4 or higher certified operating system and any IA service products, in compliance with the GPNTS TRD." If a certified operating system is selected, there is no requirement to submit an operating system to NIAP for evaluation.

Q119. Excel spreadsheet Attachment 5-1, "COST ELEMENT CLIN TRACEABILITY BREAKOUT", states in cell C14 "For each required CLIN, ensure all the appropriate hours, dollars, and rates from all other attachments (tabs) for that CLIN link in EXCEL to this attachment (5-1) for the same CLIN to ensure complete traceability."

RFP Section L, ATTACHMENT 5-1, pages 140 – 141, includes specific direction that Attachments 5-12 and 5-13 must link to Attachment 5-1. However, there is no mention of other linkage required between attachments.

Please clarify whether additional links between spreadsheets are required.

A119. RFP, Section L-317 Attachment 5-1 first paragraph states:

"The Offeror/Major Subcontractor shall provide a time-phased (by Government Fiscal Year Quarter, Government Fiscal Year and Calendar Year), detailed cost element breakout of labor, material, subcontracts and G&A/other costs at Level 2 of the WBS (Attachment 5-1) for CLIN 0001.

The intent of Attachment 5-1 is to allow the Offeror/Major Subcontractor to provide a consolidated, fully traceable breakout of the proposed cost at Level 2 of the WBS, using the Offeror's/Major Subcontractor's own labor categories, burdens and other aspects of the Offeror's/Major Subcontractor's accounting structure."

Therefore, all attachments providing a detailed cost element breakout of labor, material, subcontracts and G&A/other direct costs at Level 4 of the WBS should match to Attachment 5-1. Put another way, any attachments required for the traceability of the breakout of proposed costs at Level 4 of the WBS should be matched to Attachment 5-1.

RFP Cost Spreadsheet Tab 5-1 "COST ELEMENT CLIN TRACEABILITY BREAKOUT" cell C14 will be amended to read as follows:

For CLIN 0001, ensure all the appropriate hours, dollars, and rates from all other Attachments (tabs) match to Attachment 5-1 to ensure complete traceability expect for Attachments 5-12 & 5-13 which should link to Attachment 5-1.

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q120. Reference Question and Answer 18 regarding proprietary nature of Major Subcontractor rates and that this information may be submitted separately to the Government by the Major Subcontractor. Specifically, this related to Attachments 5-1, 5-12 and 5-13.

Deleted: 2

Deleted: link

Deleted: 2

Deleted: link

a. Similar proprietary rate issues exist with a Major Subcontractor providing the Prime with information for Attachments 5-2, 5-3, 5-4, 5-5, 5-6, 5-7, 5-8, 5-9, and 5-11. Request the Government allow separate and direct submittal of these Attachments to the Government by the Major Subcontractor.

b. Attachments 5-2 through 5-8, and 5-11 require information be provided for “the Offeror, each Major Subcontractor, a total of other contractors and a summary. .”. A Major Subcontractor is defined as “a subcontractor at any tier whose proposal represents at least five (5) percent of the estimated cost for CLIN 0001 (exclusive of target fee).” Major Subcontractors will be separately providing the Government with their Attachment 5-1, 5-12, and 5-13 data. What is the definition of “other contractors”? As explained in (a) above, the Prime is unable to obtain accounting information at the level required by Attachments 5-2 through 5-8 and 5-11 from suppliers. Will the Government remove the requirement to provide element of cost/product cost accounting information for “other contractors”? As an alternative, the Prime can include the data from the “other contractors” in the prime’s Attachments using the other contractors’ “sell” values.

A120.

- a. RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-2 Instructions, will be amended to include the following as the last sentence of the first paragraph:

The Offeror shall include subcontractor cost totals in its Attachment 5-2 submission to the Government. This shall be accomplished by adding additional rows to the fourth level WBS to segregate the Prime Offeror, Major Subcontractor, and other subcontractor costs. The Offeror and Subcontractor shall work together to ensure the total from the Subcontractor Attachment 5-2 matches the total used in the Offeror’s Attachment 5-2.

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-3 Instructions, will be amended to include the following as the last sentence:

The Offeror shall include subcontractor cost totals in its Attachment 5-3 submission to the Government. The Offeror and Subcontractor shall work together to ensure the total from the Subcontractor Attachment 5-3 matches the total used in the Offeror’s Attachment 5-3.

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-4 Instructions, will be amended to include the following as the last sentence of the second paragraph:

The Offeror shall include subcontractor labor hour ~~totals~~ in its Attachment 5-4 submission to the Government. This shall be accomplished by adding additional rows to the fourth level WBS to segregate the Prime Offeror, Major Subcontractor, and other subcontractor costs. The Offeror and Subcontractor shall work together to ensure the total from the Subcontractor Attachment 5-4 matches the total used in the Offeror’s Attachment 5-4.

Deleted: s

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-5 Instructions, will be amended to include the following as the last sentence of the second paragraph:

The Offeror shall include subcontractor ~~labor dollar~~ totals in its Attachment 5-5 submission to the Government. This shall be accomplished by adding additional rows to the fourth level WBS to segregate the Prime Offeror, Major Subcontractor, and other subcontractor costs. The Offeror and Subcontractor shall work together to ensure the total from the Subcontractor Attachment 5-5 matches the total used in the Offeror’s Attachment 5-5.

Deleted: cost

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-6 and 5-7 Instructions, will be amended to include the following as the last sentence of the second paragraph:

The Offeror shall include subcontractor material dollar/subcontractor dollar cost totals in its Attachment 5-6 and 5-7 submission to the Government. This shall be accomplished for Attachment 5-6 only by adding

additional rows to the fourth level WBS to segregate the Prime Offeror, Major Subcontractor, and other subcontractor costs. The Offeror and Subcontractor shall work together to ensure the total from the Subcontractor Attachment 5-6 and 5-7 matches the total used in the Offeror's Attachment 5-6 and 5-7.

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-8 Instructions, will be amended to include the following as the last sentence of the second paragraph:

The Offeror shall include subcontractor ODC cost totals in its Attachment 5-8 submission to the Government. This shall be accomplished by adding additional rows to the fourth level WBS to segregate the Prime Offeror, Major Subcontractor, and other subcontractor costs. The Offeror and Subcontractor shall work together to ensure the total from the Subcontractor Attachment 5-8 matches the total used in the Offeror's Attachment 5-8.

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-9 Instructions, will be amended to include the following as the last sentence of the first paragraph:

The Offeror shall include subcontractor BOM cost totals in its Attachment 5-9 submission to the Government. The Offeror and Subcontractor shall work together to ensure the total from the Subcontractor Attachment 5-9 matches the total used in the Offeror's Attachment 5-9.

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-11 Instructions, will be amended to include the following as the third sentence of the first paragraph:

The Offeror shall include subcontractor software development cost totals in its Attachment 5-11 submission to the Government. The Offeror and Subcontractor shall work together to ensure the total from the Subcontractor Attachment 5-11 matches the total used in the Offeror's Attachment 5-11.

- b. The definition of "Other contractors" is less than 5% of CLIN 0001. The Prime contractor may include in the Prime's attachments the other contractors' "sell" values.

Q121. Reference the Technical Requirements Document, pages 249 and 250. Can the cabinet external dimensions for "height" be less than as identified in HR-119 (Configuration B Rack 1, H = 68"), HR-215 (Configuration B Rack 2: H = 61"), and HR-217 (Configuration C Rack 1, 2, 3 : H = 68") and maintain compliance to the maximum envelope as identified in HR-120 (Configuration B Rack 1, H = 76"), HR-216 (Configuration B Rack 2: H = 71.5"), and HR-218 (Configuration C Rack 1, 2, 3 : H = 76")?

A121. No. The external dimensions and maximum envelope shall be in accordance with the TRD.

Q122. Should EDM delivery occur 36 months after award and CLIN 0001 Period of Performance end 36 months after award or should CLIN 0001 Period of Performance end 48 months after award?

A122. CLIN 0001 EDM delivery is 36 months after award with a Period of Performance for CLIN 0001 of 48 months after award to account for testing. This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q123. Section B, pages 3 and 4, LRIP quantities have been increased to a maximum quantity of 12. The Stepladder Pricing Tables on page 26 require similar revision to accommodate the quantity change.

A123. RFP, Section B Stepladder Pricing Tables B-1, B-2 and B-3 will be amended to include quantities from 11-13 for FY 2015/16. This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q124. Reference RFP (09212010_Rev 1), page 123, "Format" paragraph, states: "Documents shall be prepared using Microsoft Office 2007 or compatible software suite including: all text documents shall be prepared in Microsoft WORD 2007, *.doc and converted to searchable "PDF" documents for proposal submission; Microsoft EXCEL 2007 for all spreadsheets in *.xls files [All Excel files shall be operable versus value only spreadsheets (i.e. formulas should be included in all applicable cells)]".

Reference RFP (09212010_Rev 1), page 144, Section L-349 Submission of Electronic Proposals, second paragraph states: "Electronic proposals must be identical to the signed paper proposal submission and all text documents shall be prepared in Microsoft WORD 2007 and converted to searchable "PDF" documents for submission. All Microsoft EXCEL 2007 and Microsoft PROJECT 2007 documents shall be submitted in the original electronic format."

Question/Answer 22 confirmed that Microsoft Office 2007 applications are to be used.

Reference RFP (09212010_Rev 1), page 146, first paragraph under table: please revise the reference to Microsoft Excel 2003 and Microsoft Project 2003 to reflect Microsoft Excel 2007 and Microsoft Project 2007.

A124. RFP, Section L-349 paragraph 4 (under table) will be amended to read as follows:

"Adobe Acrobat version 4.01 or greater shall be used to create the "PDF" files. All attachments that are required in Excel shall be provided in soft copy in Microsoft Excel 2007 **with all formulas intact**. Additionally, all text (e.g., BOEs) shall be provided in a searchable format (e.g., PDF). Any table that is provided in the cost volume shall either be in MS Excel **with all formulas intact** or shall have a backup in MS Excel **with all formulas intact**. The IMS shall be submitted in Microsoft Project 2007."

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q125. RFP page 123 of 156: L-317 SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS (COMPLEX) (JUL 1999), 2.1.2 Proposal Format, 2. Format, second paragraph states, Each electronic proposal, to include submission to SPAWAR E-Commerce and the CD-ROM copy, shall include uncompressed electronic copies of each Volume on separate CD-ROMs. Documents shall be prepared using Microsoft Office 2007 or compatible software suite including: all text documents shall be prepared in Microsoft WORD 2007, *.doc and converted to searchable "PDF" documents for proposal submission; Microsoft EXCEL 2007 for all spreadsheets in *.xls files [**All Excel files shall be operable versus value only spreadsheets (i.e. formulas should be included in all applicable cells)**]; Microsoft Project 2007 in *.mpp files shall be used for all schedules; and Microsoft PowerPoint 2007 in *.ppt for presentation slides." The file extensions still reflect the old (2003) versions: WORD (*.doc), EXCEL (*.xls), and PowerPoint (*.ppt).

Would you please clarify that the Microsoft file extensions currently cited should be updated to reflect 2007: WORD (*.docx); EXCEL (*.xlsx); and PowerPoint (*.pptx)?

A125. RFP, Section L-317, 2.1.2-Format second paragraph will be amended to read as follows:

Each electronic proposal, to include submission to SPAWAR E-Commerce and the CD-ROM copy, shall include uncompressed electronic copies of each Volume on separate CD-ROMs. Documents shall be prepared using Microsoft Office 2007 or compatible software suite including: all text documents shall be prepared in Microsoft WORD 2007, *.docx and converted to searchable "PDF" documents for proposal submission; Microsoft EXCEL 2007 for all spreadsheets in *.xlsx files [**All Excel files shall be operable versus value only spreadsheets (i.e. formulas should be included in all applicable cells)**]; Microsoft Project 2007 in *.mpp files shall be used for all schedules; and Microsoft PowerPoint 2007 in *.pptx for presentation slides.

This change will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q126. TFC TRD items <TF-240> (on page 111) and <TF-273> (on page 117) for the MGU and SDU respectively, state that "... shall maintain frequency accuracy of $\pm 1.0E-12$ for 5 days..." We request that the two 5 day frequency accuracy requirements be relaxed to $\pm 5.0E-12$ for 5 days. (Note that the other accuracy and drift/aging requirements would still be met, as would the time accuracy requirements stated at <TF-239> (on page 111).)

A126. The TRD will be changed to:

<TF-240> The MGU SHALL maintain frequency accuracy of $\pm 5.0E-12$ for 5 days in the event of loss of GPS signal.

<TF-273> When the MGU is not available, the SDU SHALL maintain frequency accuracy of $\pm 5.0E-12$ for 5 days.

These changes will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q127. TFC TRD items <TF-247> (on page 110) and <TF-279> (on page 118) for the MGU and SDU respectively, state that the systems "... shall achieve optimum frequency and timing pulse accuracy within 20 minutes after being powered on." We request that the two requirements be revised to state frequency accuracy achieved within a specified time period. The best performance that can be obtained from high performance rubidium atomic clocks would be: $\leq \pm 1.0E-10$ at 12 minutes, $\leq \pm 1.0E-11$ at 20 minutes, and $\leq \pm 5.0E-12$ at 55 minutes.

A127. The TRD will be changed to:

<TF-247> The MGU SHALL achieve the required frequency and timing pulse accuracy within 20 minutes after being powered ON.

<TF-279> The SDU SHALL achieve the required frequency and timing pulse accuracy within 20 minutes after being powered ON.

These changes will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q128. Can you please provide the normal operating and surge power requirements for the BFTT, WRN 7 and AIAS Hotel Units.

A128. The TRD will be changed to:

<CON-100> Depending on the platform configuration, GPNTS Configuration B system rack 1 SHALL support the mounting of the IP-1747/WSN-7 CDU Processor which is 19"W x 3.50"H x 26"D, weighs 47 lbs, and draws 78.2 W (operating) / 169.05 W (surge).

<CON-106> Depending on the platform configuration, GPNTS Configuration B system rack 1 SHALL support the mounting of the AN/USQ-46 BFTT NAVSIM which is 19"W x 14"H x 20.25"D, weighs 70 lbs, and draws 167.91 W (operating) / 212.75 W (surge).

<CON-110> Depending on the platform configuration, GPNTS Configuration B system rack 2 SHALL support the mounting of the CV-4095 AIAS which is 19"W x 8.75"H x 15.8"D, weighs 39 lbs, and draws 36.8 W (operating) / 230 W (surge).

<CON-154> Depending on the platform configuration, GPNTS Configuration C system rack 2 SHALL support the mounting of the IP-1747/WSN-7 CDU processor, which is 19"W x 3.50"H x 26"D, weighs 47 lbs, and draws 78.2 W (operating) / 169.05 W (surge).

<CON-160> Depending on the platform configuration, GPNTS Configuration C system rack 3 SHALL support the mounting of the AN/USQ-46 BFTT NAVSIM, which is 19"W x 14"H x 20.25"D, weighs 70 lbs, and draws 167.9 W (operating) / 212.75 W (surge).

<CON-164> Depending on the platform configuration, GPNTS Configuration C system rack 1 SHALL support the mounting of the CV-4095 AIAS which is 19"W x 8.75"H x 15.8"D, weighs 39 lbs, and draws 36.8 W (operating) / 230 W (surge).

These changes will be included in an upcoming solicitation amendment.

Q129. Paragraph 4.1.9.1.1 in the SOW States TEPP is due 30 DACA while the 1423 states 30 DBPDR. Can you please clarify?

A129. SOW section 4.1.9.1.1 has been changed as follows:

From: The Contractor shall deliver the TEPP to the Government 30 days after contract award for Government approval.

To: The Contractor shall deliver the TEPP to the Government 30 days before PDR for Government approval.

These changes will be made in an upcoming amendment.

Q130. SOW 4.1.5.4 states in part, “The Contractor shall conduct a quarterly Schedule Risk Assessment (SRA). The government may elect to participate in the SRA process. The SRA will assess the following paths:

- a. Project Critical Path – longest path through entire project
- b. Critical Path to next major milestone(s)
- c. Near Critical Paths to next major milestone(s)

CDRL Deliverable:

- (A031) Integrated Master Plan (DI-MGMT-80004A)”

CDRL A031, Block 16, makes no reference to SRA; however CDRL A032, Block 16, references SRAs in two separate entries; the first entry, a., references the IMP but makes no reference to Data Item A031.

Should the SRA discussions in SOW 4.1.5.4 be moved to 4.1.5.5 in order for the CDLRS to line up?

A130. The following text in SOW section 4.1.5.4 has been deleted and moved to SOW section 4.1.5.5:

The Contractor shall conduct a quarterly Schedule Risk Assessment (SRA). The government may elect to participate in the SRA process. The SRA will assess the following paths:

- a. Project Critical Path – longest path through entire project
- b. Critical Path to next major milestone(s)
- c. Near Critical Paths to next major milestone(s)

This change will be made in an upcoming amendment.

Q131. Does the Government intend to provide a "clean" RFP document for the last RFP version released (for signature and return purposes)?

A131. The Government will provide a clean copy of the last amended RFP with all track changes accepted for signature and return purposes.

Q132. Section B – Supplies or Services and Prices – For the The LRIP and FRP production CLINs, are the quantity, unit price, and amount to be left blank since the pricing is provided in the Stepladder Pricing Tables?

A132. Yes. However, Offerors shall ensure that they have completed all Stepladder Pricing Tables.

Q133. Section B – Supplies or Services – CLIN 1005 description reads Engineering Support Services for FY14-15. However, RFP Section H-405 states option exercise period for CLINs 1000-1007 is Jun 1015 – May 2016. Please clarify.

A133. See A115 for updated option exercise dates. CLIN 1005 description will be updated to state “Engineering Support Services for FY15-16”.

This change will be made in an upcoming amendment.

Q134. Due to the delayed posting of the supporting RFP documents and the 9/22/10 amendment that reduced the EMD phase from 48 to 36 months, Threshold vs. objective changes, other misc changes and unanswered questions we request an extension of the proposal due date from Oct 12th 2010 to Oct 22nd, 2012.

A134. Proposals will now be due to the Government at 10:00 AM Pacific Standard Time on **22 October 2010**. This change will be made to the RFP SF33, Section L-317, and Section L-349 and will be included in an upcoming

Deleted: 5

Deleted: 1

solicitation amendment. Please note that the PoP for the EMD phase has not been reduced from 48 to 36 months, see A122 for further information.

Q135. CDRLs A069 through A073; If you review Page 20 of Section B, there are two (2) A069s and A070s. In addition, the second set of A069 and A070 include the same "Guidance" Document and the same "Name" of the Document as A072 and A073. Should the second set of A069 and A070 be deleted?

A135. RFP, Section B Data Rights Table, the second instance of CDRL A069 Preliminary Hazard Analysis (PHA) DI-SAFT-80101B and A070 Safety Assessment Report (System Hazard Analysis) DI-SAFT-80102B will be deleted from the table. This change has already been reflected in the Attachment 1-GPNTS_SOW_09212010_Rev1 and Exhibit A-GPNTS CDRLs EMD Phase_09212010_Rev 1.

These changes will be made in an upcoming amendment.

Q136. CDRLs A069 through A073; If you review Page 3 of Exhibit A, there are two (2) A069s and A070s. In addition, the second set of A069 and A070 include the same "Guidance" Document and the same "Name" of the Document as A072 and A073. Should the second set of A069 and A070 be deleted?

A136. The second instance of CDRL A069 Preliminary Hazard Analysis (PHA) DI-SAFT-80101B and A070 Safety Assessment Report (System Hazard Analysis) DI-SAFT-80102B was deleted and included in the Exhibit A-GPNTS CDRLs EMD Phase_09212010_Rev 1 changes, uploaded to e-Commerce on 22 September 2010.

Q137. CLIN Item 1003; In the "Unit" Price column I believe the unit of measure be "Each" versus "Lot"?

A137. RFP, Section B CLIN 1002 unit of measure will be changed from "Lot" to "Each". CLIN 1003 will remain the same

This change will be made in an upcoming amendment.

Q138. In the Paragraph Title for 3.3.6 SECTION G [on Page 143] and in the Volume Column of the Volume Table under SECTION G [Page 146] should this be "SECTION F" in lieu of "SECTION G"?

A138. RFP, Section L-317, 2.1.2 Table Section III will be changed from "Section G: Foreign Owned Subcontractors" to "Section F: Foreign Owned Subcontractors".

RFP, Section L-317, 3.3.6 Title will be changed from "SECTION G – FOREIGN OWNED SUBCONTRACTORS" to "SECTION F – FOREIGN OWNED SUBCONTRACTORS".

RFP, Section L-349, Table Section III will be changed from "Section G: Foreign Owned Subcontractors" to "Section F: Foreign Owned Subcontractors".

These changes will be made in an upcoming amendment.

Q139. Reference Q&A Update 4:

A#120 adds the below paragraph to Attachment 5-2 thru 5-8 and 5-11 instructions:

The Offeror shall include subcontractor cost totals in its Attachment 5-xx submission to the Government. The Offeror and Subcontractor shall work together to ensure the total from the Subcontractor Attachment 5-xx matches the total used in the Offeror's Attachment 5-xx.

As previously instructed, Attachments 5-2 thru 5-9 should be linked and trace to Attachment 5-1. If subcontractor costs are included in individual attachments – how will they link to 5-1? For example: Attachment 5-5 Labor Dollars by WBS. If subcontractor labor dollars are included here, that would not match the total labor dollars shown on 5-1. As offeror, shouldn't all subcontractor costs be reflected in Attachment 5-1 as "Subcontractor" and in Attachment 5-7 Subcontractor Dollars by WBS?

A139. See A119 for updated instructions regarding linkage of EXCEL tabs.

Yes, as the Prime Offeror all subcontractor costs should be reflected in Attachment 5-1 under Subcontractor and in Attachment 5-7 Subcontractor Dollars by WBS.

Q140. Reference Section L, Attachment 5-1 (pg 136 of Rev 1):

Attachment 5-1 shall be provided in soft copy in a Microsoft Excel-compatible format with working formulas intact. For both the Offeror and Subcontractor's Attachment 5-1 the formulas shall apply the proposed labor rates to the proposed labor hours and the Offeror's or Major Subcontractor's overhead and other burden rates to their respective baseline costs. **If Offeror's or Major Subcontractor's direct and indirect rates are composite rates, the formulas showing how the composite rates were calculated shall be included.** The Offeror shall include subcontractor cost totals in its Attachment 5-1 submission to the Government. The Offeror and Subcontractor shall work together to ensure the total from the Subcontractor Attachment 5-1 matches the total used in the Offeror's Attachment 5-1.

Based on above, Rev 1 added that the offeror will include the subcontractor cost totals in the "Subcontracts" row on Attachment 5-1. RFP further states:

Attachment 5-1 shall be completed for the Offeror, each Major Subcontractor (see specific requirements for Major Subcontractors elsewhere in this appendix including potential exceptions to the requirement) and a summary.

Is offeror (prime) to include all subcontractor costs in their Attachment 5-1? If so, wouldn't the summary be a duplicate of the prime Attachment 5-1. If that is the case, can the requirement for the summary be removed since the offeror (prime) submittal will reflect the total program costs? The same question applies for Attachments 5-2 thru 5-14.

A140. Yes, the Prime Offeror should include all subcontractor costs in their Attachment 5-1. An additional summary is not required.

The following changes will be made accordingly:

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-1 Instructions, will be amended to read as the fifth bullet:

Attachment 5-1 shall be completed for the Offeror and each Major Subcontractor (see specific requirements for Major Subcontractors elsewhere in this appendix including potential exceptions to the requirement).

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-2 Instructions, will be amended to read as the first sentence of the first paragraph:

The Offeror shall provide the proposed contract cost for CLIN 0001 for the Offeror, major subcontractors, and a total of other subcontractors.

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-3 Instructions, will be amended to read as the first sentence of the first paragraph:

The Offeror shall provide a Program Summary Report for CLIN 0001 (**Attachment 5-3**) for the Offeror, each Major Subcontractor, and a total of other contractors.

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-4 Instructions, will be amended to read as the first sentence of the first paragraph:

The Offeror shall populate the template provided in **Attachment 5-4** (Labor Hours by WBS) for the Offeror, each Major Subcontractor, and a total of other contractors, in accordance with the following instructions:

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-5 Instructions, will be amended to read as the first sentence of the first paragraph:

The Offeror shall populate the template provided in **Attachment 5-5** (Labor Dollars by WBS) for the Offeror, each Major Subcontractor, and a total of other contractors, in accordance with the following instructions:

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-6 & 5-7 Instructions, will be amended to read as the first sentence of the first paragraph:

The contractor shall populate the templates provided in (**Attachments 5-6 & 5-7**) for the Offeror, each Major Subcontractor, a total of other contractors, in accordance with the following instructions:

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-8 Instructions, will be amended to read as the first sentence of the first paragraph:

The contractor shall populate the templates provided in **Attachment 5-8** (ODC Dollars by WBS) for the Offeror, each Major Subcontractor, and a total of other contractors, in accordance with the following instructions:

RFP Section L-317, Paragraph 3.2, Attachment 5-11 Instructions, will be amended to read as the first sentence of the first paragraph:

For each of the WBS elements in the contract cost/price, the Offeror shall provide nonrecurring software information included in **Attachment 5-11** for the Offeror, each Major Subcontractor, and a total of other contractors.

These changes will be made in an upcoming amendment.