

NTCDL Q&A
N00039-14-R-0001
2 November 2015

1. Regarding spec 3.3.1.5 Receive Survivability:

- a) Is the receiver expected to continuously operate in this environment? If so, what is the definition of the stopband for each RF band (S, C, X, and Ku?)
- b) For a combined X/Ku band antenna system, is there a different stopband requirement? For example, for a combined X/Ku band antenna system, when operating in Ku band, must it operate in the presence of an interfering X-band signal or is this excepted?

Answer: 1a) Yes, the receiver is expected to continuously operate in this environment. Additionally, the NTCDL SPS has been amended to clarify that the receiver is required to suffer no permanent damage after being exposed to this environment. See Amendment 0003.

1b) No, there is not a different stopband requirement. When operating in Ku band, NTCDL must operate in the presence of interfering signals outside its operating band (e.g. X-band). Likewise, when operating in X-band, NTCDL must operate in the presence of interfering signals outside its operating band (e.g. Ku-band).

2. Regarding spec 3.3.1.6 Receive Out-of-Band Suppression:

- a) What is the absolute level of the interfering signal?
- b) What is the definition of out-of-band for each RF band (S, C, X, and Ku?)
- c) For a combined X/Ku band antenna system, is there a different stopband requirement?
- d) Will the transmitter be operational when this test is performed?

Answer: 2a) NTCDL SPS 3.3.1.6 has been amended. See Amendment 0003.

2b) NTCDL SPS 3.3.1.6 has been amended. See Amendment 0003. Note: the guard bands between X FL and X RL, and Ku FL and Ku RL are considered in-band.

2c) No. See answer 1b.

2d) Yes, each NTCDL transmitter will be operational when NTCDL SPS Section 3.3.1.6 requirements are tested.

3. Regarding RFP Subfactor 2.4:

In the Government's response to questions on 16 Oct 2015 it was stated that a large contractor can submit " a copy of the first page of the comprehensive small business plan for the Government's verification." For a Large Business with a current, approved Comprehensive Small Business Plan (CSP), does the submittal of this CSP satisfy the requirements of Subcontract Business Plan Utilization (Section L Volume I Subfactor 2.4) and Response to Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Volume III-Section E)?

Answer: Yes.

4. Amendments 0001 and 0002 have not provided updated versions of the conformed RFP. Offerors are required to provide a Completed SF33, and Completed RFP Sections B through K. The RFP amendments have changed these sections, but only the original RFP, issued 30 September 2015, is available to populate for proposal submission. Please provide an updated conformed RFP with all changes through Amendment 0002, or clarify how the changes should be accounted for in Volume III: Contracts Documents, Section A submissions.

Answer: The amendments must be signed by the PCO which requires them to be posted as PDF. Vendors can copy the information from PDF into a MSWord document to fill-in and then convert back to PDF when they sign and submit with their proposal.

5. "Question number 35 from the "RFP Q&A 16 October 2015" responses states that the Government intends to have clause 52.209-3 in the contract. Given CLIN 0001 is CPIF, would it be appropriate to remove the following sentences from the clause, which would be "substantially the same as" the clause as written in the FAR, removing significant ambiguity from the contract? Specifically, suggest removal of the following sentences from paragraph (c): "All costs related to these tests are to be borne by the Contractor, including any and all costs for additional tests following a disapproval." and "The Government reserves the right to require an equitable adjustment of the contract price for any extension of the delivery schedule, or for any additional costs to the Government related to these tests."

Answer: In accordance with FAR 9.308-1, the Government has chosen not to alter FAR 52.209-3.

6. Section L Subfactor 2.2 states " The IMS shall be delivered in MS Project (version 2010 and backward compatible to MS Project 2007)". Please confirm that this statement is requesting Offerors to deliver a softcopy of the complete IMS as an attachment to the proposal. A typical IMS for a project of this size, complexity and duration would require far more than 10 pages in order to have a meaningful level of detail.

Answer: The Government has excluded the IMS MS Project softcopy file from the page count. See Amendment 0003.

7. SOW para 3.1.9.5 The contractor needs to have access to SIPRNET to execute this program, but the SIPRNET does not have to be physically located at their facility. Change the wording to "Additionally, the contractor shall have access to SIPRNET to support the NTCDL requirements."

Answer: SOW has been updated. See Amendment 0003.

8. RFP Section L-317.7 The page limit for the Subfactor 1.1 Waveforms is 5 pages. Change the page limit to Subfactor 1.1 Waveforms to 15 pages. Waveforms is the most important subfactor of the most important technical factor (Technical Approach). Yet this subfactor has the most restrictive page count limit. Additional pages are needed to support.

Answer: The page count for Subfactor 1.1 Waveforms has been increased from 5 pages to 10 pages. See Amendment 0003.

9. Para 3.3.1.5 This section is for Receive Survivability, which implies that the receiver will not have to meet all operational functionality when exposed to MIL-STD-464C. Add a clarification that the receiver can have degraded performance in this environment, and define the stopband for each RF band (S, C, X, and Ku).

Answer: See answer to Q1a. See Amendment 0003.

10. Para 3.3.1.6 MIL-STD-461F CS104 does not define signal levels and signal types, and the definition of out-of-band Define the absolute level of the interfering signal, the type and number of signals, and frequency separation from the passband.

Answer: NTCDL SPS has been amended. See Amendment 0003.

11. Para 3.3.1.6 Additional clarification of how the system will be tested is needed Define the state of the transmitter. Will the transmitter be operational when the test is performed?

Answer: NTCDL SPS has been amended. See Amendment 0003.

12. Amendment 0002 states "The following have been added by full text" and cites: 5252.216-9203 PAYMENT OF INCENTIVE FEE (JAN 1989)..." However page 3 references "The following have been deleted: 5252.216-9203 Payment of Incentive Fee (Jan 1989) OCT 2006." Was insertion of clause in full text on page 2 an error? State/clarify that clause 5252.216-9203 has been deleted and FAR 52.216-10 Incentive Fee was added by reference as it's replacement.

Answer: There was an issue with the tool which required it to be deleted and re-inserted. The tool documents all changes.

13. Can Government facilities be used to conduct testing (e.g FAT Flight Testing)?

Answer: Government (Navy) facilities have been contacted on numerous occasions in regard to Government support and/or conduct of NTCDL First Article Test (FAT) Flight Test requirements. As stated in Industry Day Q&A 1 October 2015 response to Item 35, "The offeror is wholly responsible for airborne testing and associated assets (e.g. CDL terminals, aircraft, etc.)."

The Government will not accept proposals that delegate, subcontract, or otherwise hold the Government responsible for conduct of FAT, to include flight testing.

Assets required for testing can be rented and/or leased from commercial sources.

14. Request incorporation DFARS Clause 252.219-7004 which recognizes use of "Comprehensive Small Business Plan" subject to Government verification.

Answer: Upon contract award to a vendor that has a comprehensive subcontracting plan approved under the test program, this clause will be included. At this time DFARS 219.708 identified the use of 252.219-7003 [Small Business Subcontracting Plan (DoD Contracts), which is already included in this RFP.