Question & Answers
N00039-14-R-0001
6 December 2016

1. Q: The original proposal allowed for the use of 11" x 17" foldouts. Will the Government still allow for a 11 x 17" format in our electronic submission?

A: See Amendment 0005, 11x17 are allowed; however they will be considered as two pages towards the page count, and should be marked as two pages (e.g. pg. I-1-1/2).

2. Q: Cost Proposal Format (Page 17) Reference Cost Breakdown (Applicable to CLINs 0001, 0003, 0004, 1003, and 2003) to be included in Attachment 8.
The original RFP referenced Cost Breakdown (Applicable to CLINs 0001, 0004, 0005, 1003, and 2003).

A: See Amendment 0005, CLIN 0003 has been changed to CLIN 0005.

3. Q: Is the Government willing to allocate 2 additional pages for the technical volume in order to summarize changes?

A: No. Suggest using track changes, highlighting changes, or another method to identify changes within the proposal.

4. Q: Data Rights-clarify using a rating above acceptable or what can be done to receive a higher rating.

A: RFP Section L states in part that the Government desires "Government Purpose Rights". Accordingly, offerors proposing GPR should receive a rating of Acceptable. Further, RFP Section M, Subfactor 2.3 Data Rights states in relevant part that "[t]he offeror may receive higher consideration for proposing to provide greater than 'Government Purpose Rights'" for Commercial and Non-Commercial TD/CS, and computer documentation delivered under this contract.

5. Q: Para L-371.4.6, what is the recommended method for electronic delivery of the proposal to DCAA?

A: Each company has its own representative and they can coordinate with them as to how DCAA would like the submission.

6. Q: Page 16, Section L refers to PIO CLIN(s) 3002 and 4002, however these CLINS are not listed in Section B of the RFP. Are these new CLINs and if so what are their NTE values?

A: See Amendment 0005, deleted reference to CLINs 3002 and 4002.

7. Q: There is an apparent omission of text in the Amendment 4 vs. the [original] RFP. At the end of the third paragraph in this part of Amend 4 there is a full colon implying there is additional text. In the original RFP, five sub-bullets followed the colon.

A: There is no omission. Amendment 0005 deletes "including the:" and inserts a period.

8.Q: Why was the TRL evaluation removed from Section M of Subfactor 1.2 (RF Performance)?

A: TRL is evaluated under Subfactor 1.4.

9.Q: Section L removed the reference to NRW in Subfactor 1.1. What is the reasoning for removing this?

A: NRW is one objective and there are multiple objectives identified in the SPS. NRW was removed by name, but will be evaluated with other objectives identified under SPS 3.2.3 NTCDL Waveforms. .

10.Q: Page 7 of the 2014 ACT presentation shows notional configurations for variants B and C. Does the government consider these to be valid as they appear to conflict with the requirements of the SPS?

A: The notional configurations in the 2014 ACT are examples. Offeror's need to propose to the SPS/SOW requirements not the notional configurations identified in the 2014 ACT.

11.Q: Will the government define acceptable number of apertures for variants Band C?

A: Variant B is 2 links (threshold) 360 degrees about the ship and Variant C is 1 link (threshold) 360 degree about the ship.

12.Q: X, S, and C bands are stated as requirements in the SPS in Table 3.3 for variants B and C. Can the government confirm that these are required for variants B and C? The required number of links in Table 3.2 appears to conflict with the Table 3.3. Are all the bands required for Variant C given the weight and size constraints of the platforms?

A: Yes for all variants.

13.Q: Is simultaneous PCE/SCE truly required for Variants B and C when Variant C only requires 1 link?

A: Yes.

14.Q: Amendment 004, page 15 Volume I – Factor 3: Past Performance requires Attachment 6, Past Performance Questionnaire to be submitted for reference programs that do not have CPARS. If the offeror is submitting the same references as the original submission, does the Government want us to request new questionnaires be sent?

A: No, but there should be a US Government point of contact identified on the form with phone number.

15.Q: Based on the revisions in Amendment 0004 will the Government consider an extension.

A: Yes, the final proposal revision v2 has been extended to 03 January 2017, see Amendment 0005.