

#	Pg	Para #	Line#	DOC	Comment	Recommendation	Rationale	Govt Response
1	14	3.2.1	137	SPS	With respect to section 3.2.1, the FL and RL definitions associated with S-Band and C-Band links are not provided. Previous specification (29 Sept 2014) had comment on S and C-Band (line 206) that stated if transmitting in S- Band, would receive in C-Band and vice versa	Add requirement that clarifies that in S- or C-Band the transmit and receive link shall not be in same band (e.g.: XMT in S-Band/ RCV in C-Band and vice versa)	There is no specified FL and RL band given in section 3.2.1. If not clarified can drive implementation and cost unnecessarily	SPS updated. See Section 3.2.1
2	16	3.2.2.2	185	SPS	Current specification does not explicitly define 360 degree coverage.	In addition to this table the number of physical antennas for 360 degree coverage shall take into account a minimum of 60 (TBR) degree ship blockage.	Takes into account, given practical antenna installation locations, the blockage of the ship superstructures and the impact on azimuth coverage for a particular link.	SPS updated. See section 3.3.1
3	16	3.2.2.2	190	SPS	There is no definition of the maximum number of links in a single quadrant.	after "constitutes add a link" add the following language: "All 5 links may be in a single quadrant."	Provides clarity to the required number of links within a single 90 degree sector that was described in tables 3.3, 3.5, 3.7 of previous Specification (29 September 2014)	SPS updated. See section 3.2.2.1
4	18	3.2.3.1	227	SPS	Graphic has comment "*** Tx/Rx Isolation replaced Diplexer" This drives an architectural implementation.	Remove ** comment specification	The Figure is a functional diagram, by description and title. The comment seems to specify implementation.	Figure deleted.

#	Pg	Para #	Line#	DOC	Comment	Recommendation	Rationale	Govt Response
5	29	3.3	480	SPS	With respect to Figure 3-3, the following external interface definitions do not seem to be part of the RFP documentation: "NAV", "Track Data", "On-Deck Link Subsystem (On-deck Hardwire Interface)" and "TVS."	Provide information on where the offeror can obtain documentation associated with these external interfaces.	Need for thorough specification.	The On-deck link sub-system is a part of NTCDL and is the vendor's responsibility (SPS Section 3.3.2). Details for TVS interface are listed in SPS Section 3.3.3.3. The remaining external interfaces identified are external to NTCDL and interface with GFS.
6	31	3.3.1.3.1.1	527 & 532	SPS	Tables do not contain contiguous angle requirement and provides overlap (i.e. -15 to 10.9 and 11-23.9)	$-35 \geq \theta < -15$ , $-15 \geq \theta < 11$ , ....	Removes ambiguity of [T] and [O] overlap	SPS updated. See SPS Section 3.3.1
7	32	3.3.1.3.1.1	540	SPS	Defining EIRP with a step function reduction at 30 degrees does not take advantage of the natural reduction in EIRP required as elevation angle to target decreases.	Define elevation EIRP reduction in equation such as $\cos(\text{angle})^{1.5}$	Could allow supplier to make antenna system smaller, thus reducing SWAP-C.	SPS updated. See SPS Section 3.3.1
8	32	3.3.1.3.1.1	544	SPS	Defining EIRP with a step function reduction at 30 degrees does not take advantage of the natural reduction in EIRP required as elevation angle to target decreases.	Define elevation EIRP reduction in equation such as $\cos(\text{angle})^{1.5}$	Could allow supplier to make antenna system smaller, thus reducing SWAP-C.	SPS updated. See SPS Section 3.3.1
9	33	3.3.1.3.2	590	SPS	The requirement states that the Ku-Band beamwidth has a step increase at 45 degrees that does not reflect normal antenna performance.	Change the requirement to allow the beamwidth to increase related to scan angle.	Is in line with flat panel antenna performance.	SPS updated. See SPS Section 3.3.1
10	33	3.3.1.3.2	591-598	SPS	Specification has overlapping angles, e.g. 30 degrees; with dBi being +20 or +8.	$\geq 15$ to $< 30$ for the +20 dBi [T] requirement. $\geq 30$ to $< 60$ for the +8 dBi [T] requirement ...	Removes ambiguity of angular range requirement.	SPS updated. See SPS Section 3.3.1
11	34	3.3.1.4.1.1	629 & 633	SPS	Tables do not contain contiguous angle requirement and provides overlap (i.e. -15 to 10.9 and 11-23.9)	$-35 \geq \theta < -15$ , $-15 \geq \theta < 11$ , ....	Removes ambiguity of [T] and [O] overlap	SPS updated. See SPS Section 3.3.1
12	33	3.3.1.3.2	638	SPS	X-Band G/T step at 45 does not reflect any antenna technology	Define G/T reduction in equation such as $\cos(\text{angle})^{1.5}$	Could allow supplier to make antenna system smaller, thus reducing SWAP-C.	SPS updated. See SPS Section 3.3.1
13	33	3.3.1.3.2	645	SPS	Ku-Band G/T step at 45 does not reflect any antenna technology	Define G/T reduction in equation such as $\cos(\text{angle})^{1.5}$	Could allow supplier to make antenna system smaller, thus reducing SWAP-C.	SPS updated. See SPS Section 3.3.1

#	Pg	Para #	Line#	DOC	Comment	Recommendation	Rationale	Govt Response
14	35	3.3.1.4.1.4	656, 659	SPS	In the context of Para. 3.3.1.4.1.6 SCE RL In-Band Isolation, what is the government's intended purpose of this requirement? What is the definition of "simultaneous signals" e.g.: adjacent channel CDL desired signals. What is the frequency separation between the lowest and highest power density signals? What does "processing" mean?	Clarify intention of this specification and define "processing" and frequency separation parameters. Relate to para. 3.3.1.4.1.6 for in-band isolation.	Requirement does not provide sufficient information or a quantitative measure for validation	SPS updated. See SPS Section 3.3.1
15	36	3.3.1.4.1.5	661	SPS	Defining the out-of-band suppression with a value of 75 dB is overly constraining. Additionally, the response to a previous question that resulted in this specification was only referencing "self-interference".	New 3.3.1.2.1.6 language, "NTCDL out-of-band receive power spectrum [shall] be suppressed for SCE to prevent RF out of band impact to and from own ship emitters in accordance with MIL-STD-461F. [T]"	Requirement is an over specification. SPS already includes the requirement for the system to meet performance specifications while exposed to MIL-STD-461F environment.	Out of band suppression is specified as intended
16	36	3.3.1.4.2	694 & 701	SPS	Tables do not contain contiguous angle requirement (i.e. -15 to 10.9 and 10-23.9)	$-35 \geq \text{to} \geq -15, -15 > \text{to} > 11, \dots$	Removes ambiguity of [T] and [O] overlap	SPS updated. See SPS Section 3.3.1
17	37	3.3.1.4.2	695 & 701	SPS	Tables do not contain contiguous angle requirement (i.e. -15 to 10.9 and 10-23.9)	$-35 \geq \text{to} \geq -15, -15 > \text{to} > 11, \dots$	Removes ambiguity of [T] and [O] overlap	SPS updated. See SPS Section 3.3.1
18	38	3.3.1.4.2	733-740	SPS	Specifications have overlapping angles, e.g. 30 degrees. With dBi being +20 or +8.	$\geq 15 \text{ to } < 30$ for the +20 dBi [T] requirement. $\geq 30 \text{ to } < 60$ for the +8 dBi [T] requirement ...	Removes ambiguity of angular range requirement.	SPS updated. See SPS Section 3.3.1
19	45	3.3.3.1.1	948	SPS	Should Hotel be Host	Change Hotel to Host	Typo	"Hotel" is intended.
20	47	3.3.4	1047	SPS	Our interpretation of the following: "... preserve encryption key for 5 minutes..." is that this refers to a minimum period of time.	Please clarify. Add words such as, minimum, maximum....	Specification completeness.	Key retention requirements are specified as intended. 5 minutes is the exact requirement for key retention.
21	67	3.4.1	1527	SPS	Figure 3.6 does not include a connection between the LMS and the EDUT's. However Figure 3.3 does show a control interface between these subsystems.	Update Figure 3.6 to reflect the connection between the LMS and EDUI Subsystems.	Consistent with governing documents	Figure has been deleted.

#	Pg	Para #	Line#	DOC	Comment	Recommendation	Rationale	Govt Response
22	69	3.5.2	1584	SPS	What is the maximum number of simultaneous security enclaves that the system needs to support?	Please clarify.	Identify resources needed	Per SPS Section 3.4.2, "NTCDL [shall] be configured to support Multiple Independent Levels of Security (MILS) which is defined as support for links operating in separate security enclaves ranging from Unclassified up through TS/SCI concurrently.[T]"
23	79	3.6.2.5	1881	SPS	In Table 3-24, the column headings are confusing relative to data in the tables.	Update table 3-24. Modify the column headings to: "Variant; Antenna Configuration; Required Quantity "	Column heading is not representative of the data entries and clarification of the intention of the SWAP restrictions	Table 3-24 has been deleted. A total antenna install location volume has been provided in addition to a NTE antenna location size
24	79	3.6.2.5	1881	SPS	In the descriptions of all antenna types (Para. 3.6.2.x), the headings include "or similar". However, in Table 3-24, only the "Flat Panel" has that qualifier ("or similar").	Update table 3-24: Either add "(or similar)" to all antenna types or remove "(or similar)" from all.	This change would provide consistency across section 3.6.2	Table 3-24 has been deleted. A total antenna install location volume has been provided in addition to a NTE antenna location size
25	79	3.6.2.5	1881	SPS	Antenna SWaP by Surface Terminal variant restricts the supplier to certain antenna configurations.	Re-iterate the words in lines 1824-1826 in relation to table 3-24 "The requirements in table 3-24 are intended to establish the NTCDL antenna SWAP and should not be viewed as an endorsement for any particular antenna technology."	Eliminates ambiguity about whether or not specific antenna technologies are being specified	Table 3-24 has been deleted. A total antenna install location volume has been provided in addition to a NTE antenna location size
26	82	3.7.1.5.2	1947	SPS	Note 2 in table 3-26 defines the maximum junction temperatures in degrees F, which are not in line with typical requirements	For example, change "105 degrees F" to "105 degrees C."	Industry Standards	Table 3-26 has been deleted and replaced with a requirement for electronic parts derating in accordance with the Reliability Engineer's Toolkit dated April 1993 Commercial Practices Edition Topic D1 (severe environment and best commercial practices).
27	89	3.10.2.5	2162	SPS	Reference to Table IA in MIL-STD-464C. Not able to locate this table	Clarify which table is being referenced.	Need clarification for which table to reference.	SPS has been updated to cite MIL-STD-464C Table 9.
28	110	4.3.5.2	2856	SPS	Terms "Certification and Accreditation" have been replaced by "Authorization" per DODI 8500.01 (RMF).	Update	Consistent with governing documents	The SPS has been modified to reflect current Navy Cybersecurity/IA language.
29	110	4.3.5.2	2858	SPS	Term "C&A" has been replaced by "Authorization" per DODI 8500.01 (RMF).	Update	Consistent with governing documents	The SPS has been modified to reflect current Navy Cybersecurity/IA language.

#	Pg	Para #	Line#	DOC	Comment	Recommendation	Rationale	Govt Response
30	110	4.3.5.2	2859	SPS	The term "Designated Approval Authority" has be replaced by "Authorizing Official (AO)" per DODI 8500.01 (RMF).	Replace "Designated Approval Authority" with "Authorizing Official (AO)"	Consistent with governing documents	The SPS has been modified to reflect current Navy Cybersecurity/IA language.
31	110	4.3.5.2	2860	SPS	Term "C&A" has been replaced by "Authorization" per DODI 8500.01 (RMF).	Update	Consistent with governing documents	The SPS has been modified to reflect current Navy Cybersecurity/IA language.