

| # | Doc | Pg | Para # | Line# | Comment | Recommendation | Rationale | Response |
|---|-----|--------|--|-----------|--|--|---|--|
| 1 | RFP | 82 | Subfactor 2.4 - Small Business Utilization | | The paragraph identifies that the Offeror is required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan in accordance with FAR 52.219-9 | Request clarification if the Offeror can submit a Government approved Comprehensive Small Business Subcontracting Plan (CSP) as part of their small business utilization information. | In accordance with FAR 52.219-9 an approved "Master Plan" can be submitted as a Small Business Subcontracting Plan which under DFARS 252.219-7004 is identified as a "Comprehensive Small Business Plan". | There are only a very few large business that have approved comprehensive small business plans. If you are one of those vendors then you can submit a copy of the first page of the comprehensive small business plan for the Government's verification. |
| 2 | RFP | 91 | Volume III | Section D | Industry questions response dated 8/5/15, question number 29, asked for clause L-339 to be included in RFP and response was "updated" | Provide complete clause L-339 | L-339 "Notice of Organizational Conflict of Interest" clause is called out however it was not included in the final RFP release. | See Amendment 0002. |
| 3 | RFP | 2 & 11 | CLIN 0001 & 5252.216-9203 | | Share Ratio for CLIN 0001, CPIF, is stated as "Government pays 40% cost over target/Contractor pays 60% over target". Minimum, Target and Maximum Fees are identified as 0%, 7% and 12% respectively. However, the Share Ratio Below Target is not specified. | Please specify the Share Ratio Below Target. | The designation of a Maximum Fee (12%) implies a range of incentive effectiveness that would result in some level of fee adjustment when actual costs are below target costs. | The Government has reconsidered the share ratio. The share ratio below target (underrun) is 40/60 (Government/contractor). The maximum fee shall not be greater than 12% percent. See Amendment 0002. |
| 4 | RFP | 98 | | | Page 98 of 103 Cost Proposal Analysis - 3rd sentence of first paragraph "Each contractor's evaluated cost (to include any subcontract effort) shall be computed by adding all Cost Reimbursable CLINs with base and award fee added as applicable and considering, among other things" Please clarify base and award fee. We do not see any award fee defined. | Please clarify what is meant by "base and award fee". | Clarification | See Amendment 0002. |
| 5 | RFP | 75 | L317.7 | | In response to comment 20 in the Industry Comments to Draft RFP II May 2015, the Govt stated that the page count for Subfactor 2.1 was being increased to 13 pages. However, in the final RFP the page count is stated as 10 pages. | It is assumed that the Government intended to increase the page count from 10 pages to 13 pages for Subfactor 2.2, Integrated Master Schedule, vice Subfactor 2.1 as the original question was targeted towards the IMS. Recommend increasing the page count from 10 pages to 13 pages for Subfactor 2.2, IMS. | Enable Offerors to include a complete IMS within Subfactor 2.2 | Government reconsidered the page count and the current page count is adequate. |
| 6 | RFP | 75 | L317.7 | | Section L317.7 does not include an Executive Summary within the contents of the Volumes. | Recommend that the Government include a 5 page Executive Summary in each Volume. | The executive summary provides a high level description of each Offerors approach, providing context for Government Reviewers. | No. An executive summary is not required. |
| 7 | SPS | | | | Wind and Ice testing as defined in section 4.3.11.9 and 4.3.11.10 state are subject to simulation and analysis. In VCRM table, these sections have a Method of Validation (MOV) as Test. | Revise the VCRM table to match the words in sections 4.3.11.9 and 4.3.11.10 | Clarification | VCRM has been revised to Analysis for 4.3.11.9 and 4.3.11.10. See Amendment 0002. |

| # | Doc | Pg | Para # | Line# | Comment | Recommendation | Rationale | Response |
|----|---|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| 8 | SPS | | 3.9.1 | | In SPS dated 9/14/2015 section 3.9.1 calls out an RCS requirement. Section 4.3.9.1 states an RCS range test. VCRM entry for RCS 3.9.1 states Analysis for Method of Verification. Section 4.3.9.1 seems to contradict the VCRM entry of Analysis for RCS. | Recommend both references state that verification be by analysis | Analysis provides sufficient confidence that the requirement has been met. Also reduces government program cost. | VCRM has been revised to include test for 4.3.9.1. See Amendment 0002. |
| 9 | SPS | 32 | 3.3.2 | 627 | The SPS calls out an On-Deck Link Subsystems (ODS). Please clarify how many (ODS) are to be bid for EDM and how many for LRIP? | Specify in EDM and LRIP CLINS the quantity requested | Clarification will result in clear understanding of required qtls and CLINS to be bid for ODS for bidders | The EDM is required to have at least one On-Deck Link Subsystem. The LRIP is required to have at least one On-Deck Link Subsystem. EDMs and LRIPs should have identical capabilities. Per NTCDL SPS 3.3.2: NTCDL [shall] provide one [T], two [O] On-deck links. |
| 10 | SPS | 15 | 3.2.1.1 | 180 | Table 3-3 provides the number and type of links for Variant A only. Please provide the equivalent table for Variant B. Specifically we would like to know how many simultaneous KU band links are required. | Add additional table for Variant B. | Current specification is unclear. | Table 3-3, Link Performance Requirements, in the SPS has been updated to clarify link quantity by variant type. See Amendment 0002. |
| 11 | SPS | | 3.2..2.2 | | In the previous version of the SPS the following requirement was listed: "High gain Ku-Band and X-Band links will not be used simultaneously; shared antenna solutions may be used." Was the deletion of this requirement intentional and the Government now wants simultaneous operation Ku and X band? | Revert back to original specification. | A simpler more efficient solution would result. | Yes, the deletion was intentional. The system is required to support simultaneous X and Ku-Band operations. The system is not required to support simultaneous max range/max data-rate X and Ku-band link operations. |
| 12 | SPS | | 3.2.2.2, attachment 9 use case 7, RFP | Section M, page 93 | Use Case 7 when combined with the 2 dB link margin specification and throughput requirement of 274 Mbps has a significant impact on recurring cost. The resulting EIRP is approximately 5 dB greater than previous requirements. Please verify that the Government's CONOPS requires 274Mbps at 240 mile range to an airborne vehicle? | Reduce 2 dB margin requirement to 0 for this Use Case since this is a worst case Use Case. Reduce throughput to 137 Mps at 240 NM for this Use Case. | The specification as stated is accumulating several worst case requirements on top of each other which will result a higher cost than necessary solution. | The Government has verified that the CONOPS requires 274Mbps at 240 nmi range to an airborne vehicle. There will be no reduction in the link margin of 2 dB. Use case 7 is Ku-band FL, 274mbps, @110nmi, not 240 nmi. Use case 8 is Ku-band RL, 274mbps @240 nmi. |
| 13 | 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 | [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. | The Government provided a fixed dollar amount NTE which should be bid by all vendors. The vendor is required to provide hours and labor categories not to exceed the NTE dollar figure. |

| # | Doc | Pg | Para # | Line# | Comment | Recommendation | Rationale | Response |
|----|---|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| 14 | 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 | [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. | See Industry Day Q&A 1 October 2015, answer to Q11. |
| 15 | SOW | 70 | 3.2.14 | | Per paragraph 3.2.14 "Each EDM system will be delivered with one each INCO kit and OBRP kit." Paragraph 3.2.13 includes an option for a third EDM system. Is it the Navy's intention to purchase two or three total sets of Installation and Checkout (INCO) spares? A cost effective alternative may be to consider a smaller number of INCO spare sets depending on the installation schedule. This same question would then be applicable to future production orders. Every EDM and Production system would receive one set of On Board Repair Parts (OBRP). | The Contractor should bid the number of INCO kits required to support EDM and Production installations. | May provide an opportunity to lower the overall acquisition cost | The Government will order one INCO kit for each EDM ordered. The minimum is two INCO kits for CLIN 0001 and one INCO kit should the optional CLIN 0002 be executed. |
| 16 | SOW | 29 | 3.1.10 | | Reference to DD Form 252 | Reference DD Form 254 | Clarification | Correction made to SOW. See Amendment 0002. |
| 17 | SOW | 71 | 3.3.2 3.3.3 | N/A | 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 period? | 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. | 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). Production units for Variant B and C have been removed from this solicitation. |
| 18 | SOW | | 3.2.8.3.5 & 3.2.1 | | 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. | See Industry Day brief slide 10. Shock testing occurs between 31 - 36 MACA. See Amendment 0002 of RFP Section F and amended SOW Section 3.2.1. |
| 19 | | SOW Pg 68 and Pg 70 | 3.2.11 Developmental Testing/Operational Assessment | SOW Pg 68 last paragraph, Pg 70 last paragraph | What is the difference between SOW para 3.2.11 Developmental Testing/Operational Assessment and SOW para 3.2.15 DT/OA Support. Is the Contractor to assume that SOW para 3.2.11 is part of the EDM effort and should be priced into CLIN 0001 (CPIF Design, Develop and Deliver 2 EDM Systems) and SOW para 3.2.15 is to be included in CLIN 0005 (CPFF DT/OA Support Services)?. | Recommend the Government clarify. | Need clarification for pricing purposes | SOW section 3.2.11 has been deleted. See Amendment 0002. |

| # | Doc | Pg | Para # | Line# | Comment | Recommendation | Rationale | Response |
|----|--|----|---------------|--------|---|--|--|--|
| 20 | Question 6 of Oct 01 Industry Day questions | | | | The Government confirmed that the share ratio below target (underrun) is 100/0 (Government/contractor). Is the response to be interpreted that the target fee is increased by 100 cents for every dollar that the total allowable cost is less than the target cost and that in no event shall the fee be greater than 12% percent? | Insert FAR 52.216-10 Incentive Fee | Clarify share ratio language that incentive fee is per FAR 52.216-10 | See answer to Q3. |
| 21 | Question 12 of Oct 01 Industry Day questions | | | | The Government has stated in the written responses that the contractor will require a cost breakout of the rates and hours, direct rates, indirect rates in MS Excel for Prime contractor's subcontractor(s) FFP proposal(s) who were selected based upon a competitive analysis. And that this information is needed to satisfy the requirements of Section L, page 85 (1) cost selection. Why is there a need for subcontractor(s) rates used on their FFP proposal(s) when this is a competitive bid? And if this is the requirement does the Government expect the Prime contractor's subcontractors to send their proprietary rates directly to the Government? | Remove Subcontractors FFP cost breakout requirements when selection is made by the Prime contractor based upon a competitive analysis and that analysis is provided in the Prime's proposal. | This is a competitive bid. | The question was regarding proposing a FFP proposal for its subcontractor. The Government will allow that if vendor still provides its breakout of direct and indirect rates. It is fully understood that this is competitive proposal; however, it a vendor is not going to provide detailed direct and indirect rates when the Government has stated the CLINs are cost reimbursable, than the Government cannot fully evaluate for award. |
| 22 | _Main | 11 | 5252.216-9203 | Line 5 | SHARE RATIO: Government pays 40% cost over target/Contractor pays 60% over target. Please clarify the Cost Plus Incentive Fee share ratio term for CLIN 0001 (CPIF Design, Develop, & Delivery 2 EDM NTCDL). Is the contractor responsible for 60% cost over target, according to the share ratio, once the incentive fee has been exhausted? | Recommend the Government clarify. | Based upon "Share Ratio" wording interpretation could be that once minimum fee is reached the Government will pay contractor all cost incurred consistent with FAR 52.216-10 | See Answer to Q3. |
| 23 | _Main | 11 | 5252.216-9203 | Line 6 | "The allowable cost and incentive fee hereunder shall be paid in accordance with the clauses of the contract entitled "Allowable Cost and Payment" and "Incentive Fee", however, FAR 52.216-7 "Allowable Cost and Payment " is not incorporated into the RFP. | Incorporate FAR Clause | Per FAR 16.307 (a) (1) The contracting officer shall insert the clause at 52.216-7, Allowable Cost and Payment, in solicitations and contracts when a cost-reimbursement contract or a time-and-materials contract (other than a contract for a commercial item) is contemplated | See Amendment 0002. |
| 24 | _Main | 11 | 5252.216-9203 | Line 9 | The Government shall make payment on account of the target fee of 7 percent (%) of the amounts payable under each invoice for the work performed, subject however, to the withholding provisions of paragraph (c) of the "Incentive Fee" clause of this contract. There is no "Incentive Fee" clause in the RFP. | Insert Incentive Fee Clause FAR 52.216-10 in RFP which includes paragraph (c) as referenced | No Incentive Fee clause with paragraph (c) has been included in the RFP | See Amendment 0002. |

| # | Doc | Pg | Para # | Line# | Comment | Recommendation | Rationale | Response |
|----|-------|----|--|--------|--|--|---|--|
| 25 | _Main | 10 | B-2 Pricing Tables – NTCDL LRIP System, Subsystems, Spares and LRUs (CLINs 1001, and 2001) | Line 2 | "The Government will have the right to order quantities of those items so long as the total quantity does not exceed the total quantity specified in the quantity column per CLIN. The maximum quantity is 10 ". However the CLIN reference states "B-2a NTCDL System (including antenna and radome) CLINs 1001, and 1002 (5 max. per CLIN) " | Clarify maximum CLIN quantity, five (5) or ten (10) | Is this quantity reference an error whereby CLIN 1001 /2001 states "B-2a NTCDL System (including antenna and radome) CLINs 1001, and 1002 (5 max. per CLIN)"? | It should be 5 max. See Amendment 0001. |
| 26 | _Main | | n/a | n/a | There are no fixed fee payment instructions in Section B. Clause 5252.216-9200 PAYMENT OF FIXED FEE (COMPLETION TYPE) (JAN 1989) was deleted in the final version of the RFP and not replaced. | Please advise required terms for fixed fee (completion type) payment | No further Fixed Fee clause was incorporated. Please advise required terms for fixed fee payment | See Amendment 0002. |
| 27 | _Main | | Attachment 8 WBS | n/a | Please clarify which WBS in Attachment 8 (NTCDL Cost Spreadsheet_WBS Rev 2) the costs for the following CLINs are to be entered: CLIN 0004 (Engineering Services), CLIN 0005 (CPFF DT/OA Support Services), CLIN 1003 (Field Engineering Services) and CLIN 2003 (Field Engineering Services). | Pricing clarification requested | Pricing clarification | Enter cost data under the phase summary tab and cost CLINs tab. |
| 28 | _Main | | n/a | n/a | No "Ship To" address for EDMs deliverable on CLIN 0001. Optional EDM deliverable on CLIN 0002 and LRIP systems deliverable on CLINs 1001 and 2001 is proved in RFP. | Provide address for transportation cost pricing | Allow cost to be calculated to support transportation efforts | Destination address is TBD. Assume furthest distance is from CONUS coast to coast. |
| 29 | RFP | 1A | n/a | n/a | Please confirm the period of performance for CLIN 0001 | | The RFP Section F, Required Delivery Schedule, states CLIN 0001 delivery at 30 MACA. Government Response to Industry Day Questions #2 says that CLIN 0001 EDM Delivery is at 36 MACA. Government Response to Industry Day Questions #62 says that CLIN 0001 is 48 months. | See Amendment 0002. |
| 30 | SOW | 1B | n/a | n/a | Please clarify if Shock and FAT are part of CLIN 0001. | | The SOW statements in Section 3.2 clearly state a sequencing of testing, in paragraph 3.2.1, that puts Shock testing in the six months following month 30. The Industry Day Slides state "Shock testing, qualification and environmental testing" are in months 31 - 36. Section F of the RFP has CLIN 0001 delivered in month 30. CLIN 0004 and 0005 are the only CLINs that cover the period of performance for months 31-36. | Yes. Shock and FAT are part of CLIN 0001. See Amendment 0002. The reference to "environmental testing" on Industry Day slide 10 refers to environmental tests conducted by the Government. |

| # | Doc | Pg | Para # | Line# | Comment | Recommendation | Rationale | Response |
|----|-----|----|----------------|-------|--|---|--|---|
| 31 | RFP | 11 | 5252.216-9203 | | <p>The Government Released answers to Industry Day questions, Question #6 indicates that the below target share on CLIN 0001 is 100/0 (Government/Contractor). Amendment 0001 did not update the reference paragraph to match the answer to the question.</p> <p>Additionally, with a 100/0 share on underrun, the max fee dollar amount should equal the target fee \$ amount.</p> <p>Assuming a negotiated contract for \$100,000 of cost and \$7000 of target fee. does the statement that contractor max fee is 12% mean that should the contractor complete all work for \$50,000 of cost, the government only intends to pay \$6000 total fee instead of \$7000?</p> | Provide an amendment that states the share for an underrun in the reference paragraph. | Completeness of the model contract. | <p>The Government has reconsidered the share ratio. The share ratio below target (underrun) is 40/60 (Government/contractor). The maximum fee shall not be greater than 12% percent. See Amendment 0002.</p> <p>The Final Fee (profit of the contractor) is expressed as follows: Final Fee = Target Fee + (Target Cost - Actual Cost) * Contractor Share</p> <p>The Final Price of the contract is expressed as follows: Final Price = Actual Cost + Final Fee</p> |
| 32 | RFP | 24 | PGI 245.103-70 | | <p>The GFP table under paragraph A states that 48 NTCDL LRIP Mini form factor Cryptographic Core Module will be supplied 30 days After LRIP Option Exercised. Is the number supplied a function of the number of LRIP units ordered?</p> | Modify the table to have a unique ROW for each LRIP option and indicate the quantity available for each as a function of the quantity of systems ordered. | CLINS 1001 and 2001 enable the government to order up to 10 LRIP units., Industry will need to know the quantity of Mini form factor Cryptographic Core Modules supplied for each option as a function of the number of systems ordered. | <p>The CCM quantities listed in RFP section 245.103-70 reflect the Government's estimate of 12 CCMs per NTCDL system. See Industry Day slide 11. Additional CCMs can be requested if the offeror's design supports greater than threshold requirements. Offeror shall submit a request in their proposal to the Government for an increase to GFP quantities to include the date by when the unit(s) will be required.</p> |
| 33 | RFP | 24 | PGI 245.103-70 | | <p>The GFE table does not include the Key and Certificate Management Architecture, Key and Certificate Management plan, or Keys (e.g. maintenance and test keys)</p> | Include these items in the table | <p>Similar to the Mini form factor Cryptographic Core Module, keys are items that Industry can not procure independently. The plan and architecture documents are not on the CDRL list</p> | <p>The GFP table has been updated to reflect that KEYMAT (Qty 1, key type TBD), cable fill (Qty 1, type TBD) and key fill device (Qty 1, type TBD) will be provided. See Amendment 0002. Certificate Management Architecture and Key and Certificate Management Plan are outside the scope of this program and were deleted as part of Amendment 0001.</p> |

| # | Doc | Pg | Para # | Line# | Comment | Recommendation | Rationale | Response |
|----|--------------|----------------|--|-------|---|---|--|--|
| 34 | SPS | 69 | 3.5.2 | 1589 | SWAP - The SWAP allocation for Variant B (max weight 2060 lbs) is less than 2/5 of the Variant A allocation. Is this intended to reflect the difference in threshold beams required (2 on B vs. 5 on A)? This allocation seems to be inconsistent with the fact that the number of bands required on Variant B and C is the same as Variant A (4 bands) and that links specified in Table 3-3 do not support reduced antenna sizes on Variants B and C. This constraint potentially makes Variant B the driving concern in industry designs relative to SWAP which seems inconsistent with the primary focus of the RFP which is LRIP of Variant A. | Increase the Max Weight for Variant B to 3240 lbs (or 3/5 of the Variant A max weight). | Opens up the trade space on Variant B to allow for maximum commonality between Variants A, B and C as desired. | Table 3-12, Maximum NTCDL Antenna Subsystem SWaP, provides NTE SWaP for each variant, this table will not be updated. The reduction in SWaP for the different variants does reflect the reduced link quantity requirements. Table 3-3, Link Performance Requirements, in the SPS has been updated to clarify link quantity by variant type. See Amendment 0002. |
| 35 | RFP | | Section I clause 52.209-3 ALT II | | Section I clause 52.209-3 First Article Approval is prescribed when fixed-price efforts are contemplated. | Remove this clause. | Prescribed for fixed price efforts. | The Government will not remove this clause. In FAR 9.308-1(b)(2) states "The contracting officer shall insert a clause substantially the same as the clause at 52.209-3, First Article Approval - Contractor Testing, in solicitations and contracts when a cost-reimbursement contract is contemplated...." |
| 36 | RFP | | 5252.216-9203 Payment of Incentive Fee | | This paragraph references "the withholding provisions of paragraph (c) of the 'Incentive Fee' clause of this contract." However, FAR 52.216-10 Incentive Fee, does not appear to be included in this RFP. | Add the clause that the Government intends to reference. | Clarity and Completeness | See answer to Q24. |
| 37 | Attachment 8 | Cost CLINS tab | | | Please confirm that this tab only applies to the Cost CLINS 0004, 0005, 1003 and 2003. If this tab also applies to CLIN 0001, where do we enter the material as there is no line for it in the file? | Please confirm Cost CLINS tab only applies to CLIN 0004, 0005, 1003 and 2003. | Format provided does not include line to enter material. | Cost CLINS Tab includes all cost reimbursable CLINS to include CLIN 0001. Travel and material would go under ODCs section within the spreadsheet. |
| 38 | RFP | | | | Can industry subcontract Government facilities in support of proposal (e.g. flight tests)? | | | No. It is the vendor's responsibility to acquire services, facilities, and/or capabilities to meet the Government's requirements. |
| 39 | RFP | | | | Are prime/major vendors authorized to flow the proposal DD254, the attachments, and the Classified Spec to potential sub-contractors (supplies)? We can confirm that these subcontractors have been vetted through our Security Department as meeting the requirements as outlined in the DD254 (i.e. authorized to receive classified material, COMSEC, and NATO). | | | No, each vendor must request access to the NESI and sign a NDA. A prime vendor cannot flow down documents to subcontractor citing the DD254 for a RFP. When a contract has been awarded to a vendor then the DD254 will reflect that vendor, which will provide the authorization to flow down documents to its subcontractors. At this time the Government controls the Distro D documents (i.e. SPS, reference documents, Attachment 9). |

| # | Doc | Pg | Para # | Line# | Comment | Recommendation | Rationale | Response |
|---|-----|----|--------|-------|---------|----------------|-----------|----------|
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |