

Industry Day Q&A  
N00039-14-R-0001  
1 October 2015

1. For the services and spares CLINs is the offeror required to bid the full NTE cost?  
**Answer: Yes**
2. Please clarify Government providing ITSD as GFP given there are requirements for offeror to provide ITSD through FAT during EDM.  
**Answer: Yes 1 of 3 ITSD's will be provided as "ship in place". As per CLIN 0001, EDM and ITSD delivery are at 36 MACA, therefore the offeror will have access to the EDM and ITSD prior to 36 MACA to support activities. Per GFP memo, ITSD is provided "(CAP ship in place)" at 36 MACA. NTCDL system and ITSD FAT occurs at 30 MACA. DD250 is signed at 36 months after shock testing.**
3. For deliverable EDM systems does it need to include components required for ship variants B and C?  
**Answer: Yes. The EDM design and deliverable needs to support variants A, B, and C. The EDM design needs to be scalable and modular to support Variants A, B, and C requirements (e.g. performance and SWAP). If there are unique items to outfit Variants B and C, then those items will need to be demonstrated in order to pass FAT.**
4. Does the requirement that no single antenna shall have 360 degree field of view apply to ship variants B and C?  
**Answer: Yes**
5. FAT slide talked to flight test but did not mention NTCDL being under motion. The SPS seems to suggest NTCDL must be under motion during flight test. Please clarify.  
**Answer: NTCDL SPS takes precedence over the Industry Day slides. As per NTCDL SPS Table 4-1 Flight Test Parameters, testing does require the NTCDL system be tested under motion.**
6. Please clarify share ratio below target on CLIN 0001, or confirm 100/0.  
**Answer: Yes, 100/0 (Government/contractor) is correct for underrun.**
7. How will the Government evaluate offerors relative to their applicability to future NTCDL Increments?  
**Answer: Future increments are not a part of this solicitation or evaluation.**
8. Will the full rate production be a full and open competition?  
**Answer: The Government anticipates procuring the full rate production via full and open competition.**
9. If FAT is conducted without Government furnished software, will the human factor requirements in the SPS and SOW not apply to the contractor supplied "fill-in" software?  
**Answer: Human factor requirements will not apply to the contractor provided LMS substitute software (e.g. engineering test software). However, human factor requirements still apply to the NTCDL effort (see SOW 3.2.3.4 and SPS 3.9.4).**

10. Given the NSA mini crypto module is not complete/released at this time, when shall we assume the modules are to be delivered to the program?  
**Answer: Prototypes are available today through the CDL PMO. The contract delivery of GFP is 9 months after contract award for EDMs and 30 days after option(s) exercised for LRIPs.**
11. How will meeting objective requirements be evaluated? For example, network radio waveforms, which are not part of released CDL specs.  
**Answer: Evaluation factors are identified in Section L. The Government may give strengths or major strengths to any objective requirements including NRW. This determination is subjective; however, the evaluation team shall evaluate equally and consistently among offerors.**
12. How will “cost realism” be evaluated? And, do offerors have the ability to propose firm fixed price (FFP) and will it be positively evaluated?  
**Answer: Cost realism will be evaluated in accordance with Section M-307 of the RFP. Yes, an offeror may propose FFP for a cost reimbursable CLIN; however, the proposal will still need to provide with rates broken out so the Government can evaluate.**
13. Are standard transmission path conditions defined as part of the link budget parameters provided in Appendix 2 or Attachment 9?  
**Answer: Yes, the transmission path parameters are included in the link budget data provided in Appendix 2 of the NTCDL SPS.**
14. What is the worst case field of view of each antenna location (large radome, small radome, and phased array) for each variant (A, B, C)?  
**Answer: The government is unable to provide worst case field of view for each antenna location. System design (i.e. scalability and modularity) should support installation details, such as field of view blockages, which vary from ship to ship. Installation details will be addressed in Government Shipboard Installation Drawings for each ship. Per NTCDL SPS Section 3.3.5.6.2 Antenna Transitions, NTCDL [shall] be capable of executing antenna handoff.[T] NTCDL [shall] transfer the active link (transmit and receive) from one antenna to another with no more than 200 ms of data loss [T], no data loss [O]. Antenna coverage overlap regions [shall] be user-adjustable.[T]**
15. Do all FAT flight tests have to be performed at 274 Mbps to all platforms, as well as lower rates?  
**Answer: During FAT flight tests, at least one Ku link must demonstrate 274 Mbps. In accordance with NTCDL SPS Table 3-3, X and Ku links are required to support 274 Mbps, and S/C links are required to support 45 Mbps.**
16. Has a Milestone B decision been granted?  
**Answer: No.**
17. What is the current program funding profile?  
**Answer: Not able to provide.**
18. Why did the program acquisition profile change?  
**Answer: It was a management decision.**

19. What is projected timeline for full rate production?  
**Answer: The Government anticipates Full Rate Production after completion of LRIP contract and after successful completion of IOT&E and delivery of TDP.**
20. When will variant A LRIPs be contracted for relative to EDM programs?  
**Answer: Upon successful milestone C.**
21. Can the Government define its position of delivery of source code for previously developed software and firmware that was developed on IRAD?  
**Answer: The delivery of source code shall be in accordance with the SOW, SPS, and CDRLS.**
22. Attachment 8 Pricing Formats request breakout for total WBS, labor, labor hours, material, ODC and subcontract for all CLINs. Should they only be filled out for the cost plus CLINs (0001, 0004, 0005, 1003, and 2003) and not for the FFP CLINs?  
**Answer: Attachment 8 is not at the direct labor and indirect labor breakout, but rather at the WBS. This spreadsheet should be completed for all CLINs. The detailed cost information required would be for the cost CLINs only and that should be broken down to direct labor rates and indirect rates in MS Excel.**
23. Please define the Phases (1B, 1A, IIB, etc.) for the phase summary.  
**Answer: NTCDL Increments 2-4 are not part of this solicitation. The only phases of the contract are the EDM and LRIP. LRIP is Increment 1A only and EDM is Increment 1A, 1B, and 1C.**
24. Please clarify B-2 Pricing tables – in one place identifies quantity 10 max and in another quantity 5 max per production year.  
**Answer: It should be 5 max. See Amendment 0001.**
25. For EDM CPIF cost proposal, if a subcontractor supplier was selected based on competition for a FFP subcontract is submission of the competitive cost analysis sufficient to fulfill the requirements of Section L, page 85 (1) cost section?  
**Answer: Yes, subcontractor could bid FFP proposal. However, the Government would still require a cost breakout of the rates and hours, direct rates, indirect rates in MS Excel.**
26. Is the system required to meet max range link performance at all elevation angles (e.g. 240nmi @ zenith). If not how should proposed calculate link requirements relative to elevation angle?  
**Answer: No. For example, a remote platform operating at 65,000 feet at 240 nmi at 274 Mbps at zero degrees elevation is the maximum link performance requirement. As the remote platform flies closer to NTCDL, the link performance requirements needed to maintain the link decrease with the reduction in maximum possible range at 274 Mbps.**
27. SPS 3.3.3 – Does routing of TS/SCI data to dedicated, Separate Radio Terminal Subsystem imply physical separation of associated TS/SCI EDUI hardware in a dedicated rack?  
**Answer: There is no EDUI (or LMS) associated with TS/SCI dedicated equipment.**
28. SPS 3.3.3 – When routing TS/SCI data to Separate Radio Terminal Subsystem, how many links shall be allocated for this purpose?

**Answer: At least 1.**

29. SPS 3.3.6.2 – KVM CAC readers cannot span classification levels; rack consolidation of CT and PT EDUI components precludes this requirement – are separate, dedicated CAC readers sufficient?

**Answer: Yes.**

30. SPS 3.4.2 – What data formats are the CDS guard between the LCS and the Radio terminals/ RFE required to be capable of processing? For example, the CDS guard between the LMS and the EDUI is required to process XML – no such specification is given for the LCS to Radio Terminal guard.

**Answer: The data formats between the LCS and radio terminals/RFE are vendor trade space.**

31. SPS 3.8.2 – Rack consolidation of LCS and LMS is in conflict with SPS 3.5.3 wherein LCS is excluded from being consolidated onto the rack hosting the LMS equipment – Which section takes precedence?

**Answer: NTCDL SPS section 3.5.3 takes precedence. NTCDL SPS section 3.8.2 has been revised. See Amendment 0001.**

32. In general, does CANES or the hosting enclaves provide vulnerability management functions for NTCDL as part of the RMF continuous monitoring phase?

**Answer: NTCDL is responsible for all IA/Cybersecurity/RMF requirements and may not rely on vulnerability management functions that exist in CANES or other shipboard systems.**

33. Link Budget 5.3 will indicate an error for entry of the minimum slant ranges of 0.5 and 0.1 nm without changing the aircraft altitude. Is the intention that the range in this case shall be ground range, in which case the 65K ft. altitude yield approximately 10.2 miles of slant range? Alternatively, is the intention that the aircraft altitude is allowed to be modified to allow a slant range of 0.5 & 0.1 nm?

**Answer: The NTCDL system is required to meet the link performance requirements outlined in Table 3-3. For the mandatory requirement and proposals the maximum range link budgets are required. For the minimum slant range values used in the Link Budget 5.3 calculations, the platform altitude should be set to the shipboard antenna altitude (100 ft).**

34. Can you elaborate on the funding profile for this RFP effort/ award; along with the production years?

**Answer: See Answer to Q17.**

35. With regards to FAT, is the government providing the airborne terminal equip?

**Answer: No. The offeror is wholly responsible for airborne testing and associated assets (e.g. CDL terminals, aircraft, etc.).**

36. The specification has changed since the latest release. 45 days is insufficient to update the proposal with the requested changes to offer the best solution to the Government. 60 day proposal response time is requested.

**Answer: We have de-scoped work significantly and released 3 days earlier. At this time, the Government does not believe extension is necessary.**

37. Evaluation criteria for Objective Requirements will not be provided. The Government may give strengths or major strengths to offers that meet objective requirements. Can the Government provide evaluation criteria?  
**Answer: Evaluation factors are identified in Section L. The Government may give strengths or major strengths to any objective requirements. This determination is subjective; however, the evaluation team shall evaluate equally and consistently among offerors.**
38. Recommend operational spec instead of design spec for receive sidelobe levels (para 3.3.1.8). Specify a point source interferences/jamming rejection requirements in lieu of specifying sidelobe levels.  
**Answer: The Government is unable to provide point source interferences/jamming rejection requirements for each antenna location. The sidelobe requirements as specified provide the best information available without knowing specific installation details.**
39. In the requirement that “no individual NTCDL antenna [shall] have a full 360-degree Field of View (FOV).[T]”, would have multiple electronically scanned antennas wrapped around the main mast be considered non-compliant because of the individual panel locations are so close to one another?  
**Answer: Because the question states multiple antennas, the configuration in question does not violate the “no individual NTCDL antenna [shall] have a full 360-degree FOV” requirement. However, the Government is unable to provide best case FOV for each antenna location (i.e., the ideal mast mount is highly unlikely to be available). The offeror’s design should support scalability and modularity to allow the system to be installed in less than ideal locations.**
40. Is it required that the X-band link needs to operate simultaneously with the Ku-band long range link?  
**Answer: No. The system is required to support both one X-band link at maximum data rate (274 Mbps) and maximum range (240 nmi) and one Ku-band link at maximum data rate (274 Mbps) and maximum range (240 nmi) but not simultaneously. The system is required to support multiple 274 Mbps links simultaneously per NTCDL SPS Table 3-3 but not all at maximum range (240 nmi).**
41. NTCDL requirements xx and xx called out Std Rev H-2, sections A.2.3.2.7.1., A.2.3.2.7.2., A.2.3.3.9.1., and A.2.3.3.9.2. for implementing the EFC and EFD functions in the FL and RL transmitters and receivers. Is NTCDL program’s intent to implement all NR labeled EFC and EFD commands and discrete bits even though they drive up cost but offer marginal values to the system operation and interoperability?  
**Answer: Yes. The Government requires the implementation of all NR labeled EFC and EFD commands and discrete bits.**
42. In 3.1.3 and 3.1.9.5: Additionally, the contractor shall have access to SIPRNET at their facility to support NTCDL requirements. Can we use a SIPRNET drop at a government facility to support this program?  
**Answer: No.**
43. B-2 pricing tables, are the max quantities 10 per year or 5 per year?  
**Answer: See Answer to Q24.**

44. SPS 2.1, 3.3.4: CCM doc revisions do not correlate to dates. Recommendation of Embedment Manual 75AF00002-Rev XE, Core Interface Spec. 55AB00006-Rev D, 75AF000036- Rev D. Rationale: Most recent NSA CCM documents.  
**Answer: The CCM document references above are incorrect. The latest CCM Document references have been updated. See Amendment 0001.**
45. SPS 3.3.1.4.2 Far out sidelobe requirements (i.e., offset > 90 degree) appear to be significantly more restrictive than what was previously specified for CDLS. These requirements drive antenna performance more than either G/T or EIRP and can effectively preclude the use of some antenna technologies that otherwise provide significant system level benefits. Recommendation: Relax sidelobe levels to be more consistent with CDLS requirements (e.g., maximum sidelobe level at >90 degree offset less than 0 dBi). Specify statistical processing of sidelobes to allow for some sidelobes to exceed mask (e.g., 90 percent of sidelobes shall be less than...) similar to ITU-R S.732.1. Rationale: consistency with requirements levied on currently fielded systems. Reduced cost/complexity of antenna system. Allows maximum flexibility in selection of antenna technology to provide a best value system level solution.  
**Answer: NTCDL SPS has been revised to "...gain of the antenna assembly [shall] be such that at least 90% of the sidelobe peaks ....". See Amendment 0001.**
46. SPS 3.5.2 All antennas now specified to have no more than 4 feet of physical separation between antenna locations. Previous SPS allowed a minimum of 20 foot separation for Omni directional antennas which help prevent the second harmonic of S-band from jamming C-band. Recommendation: Add the following to line 1583: NTCDL [shall] be capable of meeting link performance requirements with a minimum physical separation of 20 feet for omnidirectional antennas. Rationale: Helps prevent S-band from jamming C-band.  
**Answer: Recommendation will not be implemented, NTCDL SPS specified as intended.**
47. SPS 3.2.2.1 RHCP polarization specified in Table 3-3 for remote platform S-band and C-band antennas. Previous SPS require vertical Linear Polarization. Is Table -3- correct? Recommendation: Change S-band and C-band antenna polarizations to vertical linear polarization. Rationale: Do not want to lose 3 dB of antenna gain going from Vertical Linear to RHCP.  
**Answer: Yes, NTCDL SPS Table 3-3 is correct. STD-CDL Rev. H-2 Section 3.6.9 requires RHCP for all STD-CDL compliant systems. Vendor trade space allows for the ability to perform both RHCP and linear polarization in S and C band.**
48. SPS 4.3.3.1 (line 2457) and section 4.3.3.1.1 (line 2465) require antenna performance testing of parameters such as sidelobe levels, transmit power control, etc, be tested under platform motion conditions. Typically, these parameters are characterized in a much more controlled environment (e.g. anechoic chamber). Testing of these parameters under full platform motion is expensive and likely impractical. Recommendation: Separate out sentence 2465 from section 4.3.3.1.1 or exclude 4.3.3.1.1 from Flight Table 4-1.  
**Answer: In the NTCDL SPS Section 4, sentences of the form: "... [shall] be verified in accordance with Section 4.2.5.[T]" are not to be associated with the preceding paragraph rather Section 4.2.5. For example, line 2465 represents a place holder for sections 3.3.1.2 through 3.3.1.8 and are associated with Section 4.2.5., not associated with paragraph 4.3.3.1.1.**

49. LCI 4: LCI IDD references “Systems Performance Specification for the Link Management Subsystems (LMS) and the External Data User Interface (EDUI) for NTCDL, January 2015”. We have not been able to locate this document. Recommendation: please provide referenced document.  
**Answer: The requested document is an internal government document. Compliance with the LCI IDD does not require the referenced document.**
50. SOW pg. 5 para 2.2 Table C. Previous SOW Table 2-2 listed as a TSRD. Recommendation: Identify an applicable TSRD. Rationale: The TSRD describes the requirements and tasks applicable to the INFOSEC Boundary components and all associated hardware, software, programmable logic, and firmware under development. The TSRD states what must be provided to support the NSA evaluation for a certifiable product.  
**Answer: TSRD has been posted on NESI. SOW table 2.2 has been revised. See Amendment 0001.**
51. CDRLS pg 22 A021 Although block 16 states “the government reserves the right to further tailor this CDRL as required to meet emerging IA requirements”, it is reasonable to call out the required RMF documentation. Recommendation: Documentation to include security plan, security assessment plan, security assessment report, POA&M (as required). Rationale: DoDI8510.01 RMF for DoD IT.  
**Answer: The term IA in the referenced CDRL was used as a generic reference to Cybersecurity activities and thus implied the use of RMF which is the current state of practice for IA/Cybersecurity documentation.**
52. CDRLS pg 38 A034: NSA required documentation includes the KCMA and KCMP. Both documents must include current CDL Key Management content. No CDL KMP has been provided in the draft RFP document packages. Recommendation: include the CDL KMP in the FRP package. Rationale: Needed to prepare NSA documents identified in CDRL A034.  
**Answer: A CDL Key Management Plan (KMP) is outside the scope of the NTCDL program. References to KCMA and KCMP have been removed from CDRL A034. See Amendment 0001.**
53. CDRLS pg 38 A034: Some CDRL documents listed address security requirements normally provided by the NSA in an INFOSEC Security Requirements Document (IASRD) and a Technical and Security Requirements Document (TSRD), tailored for the program. No IASRD or TSRD are identified. Recommendation: Government provides an NSA-tailored IASRD spreadsheet that describes the security requirements of the product/system. Government provides appropriate TSRD. Rationale: Both the TSRD and the IASRD are key requirements documents that define out baseline security requirements for ECU development. Without and IASRD, the NSA CDRL documents called out in CDRL A034 have no meaning, as they are (almost) all written against IASRD requirements.  
**Answer: TSRD has been posted on NESI. The IASRD is a classified document provided by the NSA and is not required for proposal purposes. The document can be requested from the NSA upon contract award.**
54. CDRLS pg 38 A034: Does SPAWAR has a User Partnership Agreement (UPA) with NSA for NTCDL? If no UPA is in place, then is it SPAWAR’s expectation that the contractor will develop the NTCDL ECU with NSA under contractor funding – such as through a Commercial COMSEC Endorsement Program?

**Answer: No. It is expected that the offeror will develop the NTCDL ECU with NSA under NTCDL funding.**

55. COST Attachment 8 Tabs: Tabs, New Material Dollars & New ODC Dollars do not have the same WBS structure as the other tabs splitting out the Recurring vs. non-recurring requirement as stated in the other tabs. Recommendation: Delete the WBSs 2. # and 3. # leaving on the 1. # WBSs with requirements remaining that all of the cost reports need to segregate the recurring and non-recurring in the cost reporting formats OR make the WBS structure consistent across all of the tabs within Attachment 8.

**Answer: Attachment 8 has been updated. See Amendment 0001.**

56. RFP: CLIN 1001, 2001, 1002, and 2002 – Section B-2a and B-2b of the RFP is not clear, Does the Government intend for a maximum quantity of 10 or 5 systems per CLIN?

**Answer: See Answer to Q24.**

57. RFP: Attachment 8 – Phase Summary Tab. The Phase Summary tables include rows for variant A, B and C however per the FRP LRIP production only requires Variant A. (CVN) pricing. Please clarify.

**Answer: Attachment 8 has been updated. See Amendment 0001.**

58. RFP: Attachment 9 – Use Cases and Attachment 1 – SPS do not appear to have been posted with the final RFP. Attachment 4 – CDRLs is corrupted and the file will not open. Please provide these documents.

**Answer: Attachment 9 is Distribution D, which was posted on NESI. Attachment 4 is not corrupted. It can be opened and saved.**

59. RFP: Section L, Factor I Technical Approach, Subfactor 1.1. Waveforms (pg. 78). – The instruction references over-the-air testing and SPS sections 4.3.2.3.1 and 4.3.2.3.2. Both these sections reference testing per SPS section 4.2.5 General Examination Requirements. Is over-the-air testing part of SPS sections 4.3.2.3.1, 4.3.2.3.2, 4.2.5, or did they mean to reference Section 4.2.6 Flight testing in SPS sections 4.3.2.3.1 and 4.3.2.3.2 instead of 4.2.5?

**Answer: See answer to Q48.**

60. RFP Section L, Fact I Technical Approach, Subfactor 1.3, Scalability and Modularity (pg. 79) – the instruction references “to the below deck equipment to include the internal interfaces that will be documented per SPS Section 3.4.1”. Section 3.4.1 was “Notional Key Internal Interfaces” in the old SPS which has been deleted. Did they really mean to reference SPS section 3.5?

**Answer: No, the notional key internal interfaces section had been replaced with the following in Section 3.4.1: “The contractor [shall] utilize documented interfaces for all subsystem to subsystem connections and significant internal subsystem interfaces (e.g. antenna and COMSEC components).[T]”.**

61. RFP: Section L, Factor I Technical Approach, Subfactor 1.4 Scalability and Modularity (pg. 79) – the instruction references “internal and external interconnections (NTCDL SPS Section 3.4)”. Again, Section 3.4 was “Interface Requirements” in the old SPS which has been deleted.

**Answer: The NTCDL SPS summarizes internal and external interconnections in Section 3.4**

62. CLIN 1 Delivery is stated as 30 months. Does CLIN 1 continue after delivery? Prior draft RFPs seemed to indicate the contractor could complete Crypto certification and JTIC certification after the 30 month delivery.

**Answer: See Industry Day slide 10. CLIN 0001 is 48 months. Complete crypto certification and JTIC certification (SOW Section 3.2.1) are entrance criteria to EDM FAT, which completes 30 MACA, which is part of the 48 month development PoP.**

63. COST: The cost spreadsheet supplied with the RFP release contains references to the Variants B and C of the NTCDL system. The RFP seems to request only the pricing of Variant A (CVN). Why are Variants B and C referenced in the Cost Spreadsheet? (e.g. the Tab named "Phase Summary").

**Answer: Attachment 8 has been updated. See Amendment 0001.**

64. RFP: 2 dB margin requirement over performance specified in SPS (called out in sections L and M) drive cost and SWAP. Suggest setting a target of 2 dB but allowing lower margin at worst case scan angles.

**Answer: The 2 dB margin requirement is stated as intended. The overall system must provide the 2.0 dB link margin 0 to 360 degrees, 0 to zenith about the ship, not on an individual antenna. See the answer to question 26 for further clarification.**

65. SPS dated 4 March 2015 section 3.2.2 states: "High gain Ku-Band and X-Band links will not be used simultaneously ". This statement is deleted in the SPS dated 14 Sept 2015. Is it now the intent to operate the 240 nmi scenario Ku band (high gain) and X band links at the same time?

**Answer: No. The system is required to support both one X-band link at maximum data rate (274 Mbps) and maximum range (240 nmi) and one Ku-band link at maximum data rate (274 Mbps) and maximum range (240 nmi) but not simultaneously. The system is required to support multiple 274 Mbps links simultaneously per NTCDL SPS Table 3-3 but not all at maximum range (240 nmi).**