

#	Doc	Pg	Para #	Line#	Type	Comment	Recommendation	Rationale	Response
1	DRFP (dtd 13 APR 2015) & SOW (dtd 9 SEP 2015)	DRFP Pg 2-17 SOW Pg 72-73	DRFP CLINs/ SOW 3.3.5 & 3.3.6	CLINs 1004/5, 2004/5, 3004/5, etc. SOW line # N/A	C	[Production Year Provisioning Items Ordered and Field Engineering Service CLINs] The Government's response to Industry question 27 concerning substantiation of Service CLINs states: "Government will evaluate the hours proposed within the Government NTE amounts for these CLINs."  For these CLINs, how will the hours proposed be evaluated?	Update Section M to either: (a) add evaluation criteria and scoring for Engineering Service CLINs or (b) supply a fixed number of hours for each service CLIN and let the contractors bid the cost. If (b) approach is chosen then the evaluation will occur as part of the TEP.	If the proposed hours will be evaluated then evaluation criteria is required.	Offerors shall propose the hours and labor categories NTE the total amount of dollars provided. The Government will evaluate the labor mix.
2	DRFP (dtd 13 APR 2015) & SOW (dtd 9 SEP 2015)	DRFP Pg 92 SOW Pg 49	DRFP Sect L-317.7 Subfactor 1.1 SOW (3.2.6.1.4)	DRFP Subfactor 1.1 SOW line # N/A	S	[Network Radio Waveform (NRW)] Per section L and the SOW, the Government is requiring a Contractor who is proposing a Networked Radio Waveform to perform a demonstration. This in turn will increase the Contractors bid and TEP. Clarify how the TEP for a Contractor proposing a NRW will be evaluated against the TEP of a Contractor not proposing a NRW.	Recommend that the test cost of the Network Radio Waveform (NRW) be segregated from the TEP in an unevaluated cost CLIN.	This will provide an even comparison of TEPs.	A demonstration is required if an objective (e.g. NRW) is proposed or not. There will not be segregated, unevaluated cost for the NRW, or any objective requirement offered. Objective requirements identified in the SPS, are goals of the NTCDL system. The Government will evaluate the extent to which the proposed system architecture and system design (including hardware, software and associated subassemblies) meet and/or exceed the performance, environmental, and interface requirements as provided in the NTCDL SPS, SOW, and the relevant incorporated references cited therein. The evaluation board will consider the objective requirements price/cost as part of the overall price.
3	SOW	71	3.3.2 3.3.3	N/A	C	The SOW paragraphs formerly describing the NTCDL Surface Terminal - Variant B and NTCDL Surface Terminal - Variant C have been changed to [RESERVED]. Is it Government's intent to remove the requirement in the Production Option years for the B & C variants from the Total Evaluated Price and are B & C variant requirements still intended to be designed and proven for the NTCDL System for the EDM	Clarify by updating the RFP document (CLINs, IDIQ and Total Evaluated Price tables) consistent with the SOW update or provide further update to the SOW.	Clarification needed.	The RFP has been revised. The NTCDL system is required to support all variant configurations documented in the SPS (variants A, B, C). The NTCDL system design is required to allow for reconfiguration of Variant A components to support Variant B and C and their respective requirements, to include SWaP.
4	SOW		3.2.8.3.5 & 3.2.1		S	There are multiple references to the shock test requirement that require clarification	Clarify that the shock test is a one-time test to be performed during the 18-month period after the delivery of the EDM systems per paragraph 3.2.1.	Shock test is a potentially destructive test that should be performed post-EDM delivery.	Shock testing is anticipated to be a one-time test to be performed during the 6-month (not 18) period between First Article Test (FAT) and EDM acceptance. However, the NTCDL system is required to successfully pass shock testing. If an item fails shock testing, the contractor will be required to retest the failed item(s).