

**N00039-09-R-0027**  
**CANES CCE**  
**Question and Answer Set #2**

Question #	RFP Reference	Question	Answer	Amendment 0004 changes to RFP
1	E-Commerce Website	Would it be possible for the USN to post the Attachments or any document related to the CANES RFP in a format other than the Enterprise Architect EA format. We have successfully downloaded the RFP but there are many doc's that are in the format for which there is no conversion tool or alternate ways to open.	The Enterprise Architect (EA) format relates to the Government architecture model project files. The architecture model project files were provided in the EA format and in a more standard format such as XML Metadata Interchange (XMI) format. Both formats are on the Distribution D Website under the folder Functional Specification Reference Documents - Distribution D. The EA format is under the filename CANES Architecture200904010, and the XMI format is under the filename CANES Architecture200904020.	No change to the RFP
2	DID: DI-NDTI-80566A Prototype Demo	The DID Participation section states: "Identifies the government and contractor roles and responsibilities." Request the government provide the number of government representatives and their specific role during the two day prototype demonstration? This will allow the Systems Developer to better map the proper personnel to ensure a successful demonstration.	The Government anticipates two Government witnesses at the two day event.	No change to the RFP
3	SOW / RFP	<p>Net-Ready KPP CJCIS 3170.01F defines the requirement, as follows:</p> <p>The NR-KPP consists of measurable and testable characteristics and/or performance metrics required for timely, accurate, and complete exchange and use of information to satisfy information needs for a given capability. The NR-KPP is comprised of the following elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Compliance with the Net-Centric Operations and Warfare Reference Model.</li> <li>b. Compliance with applicable Global Information Grid key interface profiles.</li> <li>c. Verification of compliance with DOD information assurance requirements.</li> <li>d. Supporting integrated architecture products required to assess information exchange and use for a given capability.</li> </ol> <p>Request clarification - no Information Support Plan is listed, either as GFI or a CDRL. What is PMW160's approach to verification of the Net Ready-KPP?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is an NCOV compliance statement in the CDD. Is this sufficient evidence of compliance to part A of NR-KPP compliance?</li> <li>2. KIPs for the Computing Infrastructure Family are still TBD in the CDD; please advise</li> <li>3. There are no requirements to generate additional DoDAF products.</li> </ol> <p>The only integrated architecture products are those contained in the CDD.  These elements only partially trace to the Architecture and Functional Specs.</p>	The NR-KPP has been decomposed into the Functional Spec RTM. Continuation of the RTM within the Functional Specification and the RTM CDRL will ensure the NR-KPP is verified throughout the system design phase of the program.	No change to the RFP
4	C-6, 6.12, Para 2, Page 102	"The Contractor shall support these objectives by providing a collaboration electronic environment capability which shall be available to CANES Program participants – an Integrated Digital Environment (IDE) – to include integration and utilization with the existing CANES IDE." What is the existing IDE? Can we get access to it?	NSERC is the CANES IDE. Access to the existing Government IDE will be provided post award.	No change to the RFP
5	SOW 3.1.10, Line 389, Page 19	What document describes the scope and content of the IAC Review Strategy mentioned in section 3.1.10?	IAW SOW 3.1.10, the IAC Review Strategy is described in the DoDI 8510.01, DoD Information Assurance Certification and Accreditation Process (DIACAP).	No change to the RFP
6	SOW - 3.5.1.2, 3.5.1.4, 3.7.1.3, 3.7.1.5	<p>ITEM: EVALUATION OF INSTALLATIONS UNDER ENGINEERING SERVICES CLIN</p> <p>The RFP provides for the contractor, under SOW items 3.5.1.2, 3.5.1.4, 3.7.1.3 and 3.7.1.5, to perform integration and installation support, as well as installation, of the CANES system. These are noted as Engineering Support Services, and as such are to be priced using the labor category/labor hours mix provided in Section L. Offeror recognizes that this is one approach to evaluation of installation capability. However, this methodology does not allow for the offeror to identify any cost efficiencies in the installation process that have been proven in previous similar installations; nor, more importantly, does it allow the Government to evaluate efficiencies in the offeror's CANES design that may allow for reduced installation costs. We have included an Installation Sample Task as enclosure (3) as one method for the Government to address these concerns and we recommend inclusion of this sample task as a proposal submittal requirement.</p> <p>Lastly, as a lesser-detailed alternative to this item, Offeror recommends the addition of ship type and ship quantity by year to Engineering Services rate table in Section L, "Section 2: Cost Proposal, RFP page 156" to allow offerors to accurately estimate installation labor and costs for each ship type. See sample table provided.</p>	The installation and integration tasks will be detailed within each individual Task Order the Government issues for Engineering Support Services.	No change to the RFP

**N00039-09-R-0027**  
**CANES CCE**  
**Question and Answer Set #2**

Question #	RFP Reference	Question	Answer	Amendment 0004 changes to RFP
7	RFP - Sec L	<p>ITEM: PAGE COUNT FOR TECHNICAL VOLUME</p> <p>The current allowable page count allocated to the Technical Volume submittal for the proposal response is 50 pages. This limited page count does not allow the offeror to adequately address the myriad design decisions and risk reduction efforts undertaken on behalf of the CANES program, and does not afford the Government a detailed view into the risks of each offeror's solution. Offeror recommends that the page count for the technical volume be increased to 100 pages to provide better insight for the Government evaluation team.</p>	The 50 page limitation is considered adequate to address the offeror's engineering analysis.	No change to the RFP
8	RFP - Sec E-2	<p>ITEM: DELIVERY AND ACCEPTANCE OF LRIP AND FRP ITEMS</p> <p>Section E-2 provides for Government Inspection of LRIP and FRP production items at origin, and acceptance of these items at destination. In order to reduce risk to the offeror and provide for accurate pricing of LRIP and FRP CLINs, request that the Government explicitly clarify, for each "Destination" listed in E-2 and F-2, the manner of acceptance leading to the DD250, transfer of ownership and liability, and ultimately the contractor's ability to invoice? Specifically, we recommend that the acceptance by the Government is by Factory Acceptance Test at point of production.</p>	Inspection and acceptance will be conducted in accordance with RFP Section E-2.	No change to the RFP
9	SOW, 3.2.1.6.3, Page 25	What is the expected level of detail of the threat assessment study based and the Crown Jewel Report? What is the composition of the Technical Report and the expected delivery date? Is there a unclassified, industry standard threat assessment methodology that the Navy is looking for that we can use to estimate the level of effort for this study?	The Crown Jewel report shall be written to the Secret or Top Secret level as specified in the SOW. The Government does not have an unclassified industry threat assessment.	No change to the RFP
10	Appendix D, UID03093, Page D-104	No other hosting application, memory or storage has been specified for SCI COMP. Please clarify.	Functional Specification, UID03093 contains the minimum Internal CCE Force Level SCI Compartmental server performance required to host the Force Level SCI Compartmental services as specified in the Functional Specification. Memory and storage requirements are at the discretion of the offeror.	No change to the RFP
11	Appendix D, UID03105, Page D-105	No other hosting application, memory or storage has been specified for SCI COMP. Please clarify.	Functional Specification, UID03105 contains the minimum Internal CCE Submarine SCI Compartmental server performance required to host the Internal CCE Submarine SCI Compartmental services as specified in the Functional Specification. Memory and storage requirements are at the discretion of the offeror.	No change to the RFP
12	Appendix D, UID03106, Page D-105	No processing, memory or storage has been specified for TS enclave. please clarify.	Functional Specification, UID03106 contains the minimum Internal CCE Submarine TS server performance required to host the Internal CCE Submarine TS services as specified in the Functional Specification. Memory and storage requirements are at the discretion of offeror.	No change to the RFP
13	CDRL A011	The Data Item Description (DID) DI-MGMT-8055A that supports Contract Data Requirement List (CDRL) A011- Program Progress Report ( Program Cost Report) on line 358 within the CANES Statement of Work does not comply with typically understood cost reporting requirements. The requirements on this DID seem to define those requirements associated with CDRL A001. Could the government please validate the DID associated with CDRL Item A011?	CDRL A001 provides the monthly Program Report information. Per block 16 of A001, the cost reporting portions, paragraphs 10.3.f-10.3.h, are to be deleted. It is in the intent of the Government to capture the program status and schedule information in CDRL A001. CDRL A011 reports quarterly cost information. Per block 16, of A011 the non-cost related, paragraphs 3.3-3.8, are to be deleted. It is the intent of the Government to only capture cost related information in CDRL A011. Therefore, A011 replaces the deleted A001 monthly cost reporting sections with A011's quarterly cost reporting.	No change to the RFP
14	RFP, L-17	The offeror shall conduct a CANES prototype demonstration at the offeror's facility to be witnessed by the Government on 17 and 18 June 2009. To enable the Contractor to properly size the Demonstration space, how many witnesses are expected for the Government team?	The Government anticipates two Government witnesses at the two day event.	No change to the RFP
15	SOW, 3.1.10	#1 Section 3.1.10 of the SOW (pages 19-20, lines 377-392) requires the Contractor to provide a C&A package during the Program Management stage of the SDD Phase. Many of the C&A documents specified in this section, including the DIACAP Implementation Plan, DIACAP Scorecard, and the IT Security Plan of Action and Milestones (POA&M), cannot be completed until the hardware and software architectures are locked down and an actual CANES network is available for vulnerability testing and validation. A production-ready CANES network will not be available by SDD. In view of this, does the Government expect delivery of a complete Certification and Accreditation Package during SDD, as indicated by CDRL A017 including self-testing and validation, or does the Government expect delivery of CDRL A017 documents?	During the SDD phase the C&A package, as stated in SOW 3.1.10, shall be completed, validated and delivered IAW CDRL A017.	No change to the RFP

N00039-09-R-0027  
CANES CCE  
Question and Answer Set #2

Question #	RFP Reference	Question	Answer	Amendment 0004 changes to RFP
16	RFP, Table H-9, Page 74-75	Table H-9, GOVERNMENT FURNISHED INFORMATION (GFI) on page 74 and 75 of the RFP lists three (3) software baselines (GCCS-M, DCGS-N, and NTSS) to be provided by the Government. The deliveries include installation instructions 30 days prior to EDR, the software 30 days prior to CDR, and test procedures 60 days prior to TRR. In order to mitigate risk is it possible to receive the instructions, software, and test procedures for all three baselines 30 days prior to first EDR?	The Government will not provide the software and test procedures for all three baselines 30 days prior to the first EDR. The GFI applications being provided are a sample set of applications to be used by the contractor to demonstrate the level of effort necessary to host applications. Prior to the dates the software and test procedures are provided by the Government, the offeror may use any application in order to demonstrate/test its capability to host applications.	No change to the RFP
17	RFP, Attachment L-11, 197-198	Section L-11 WBS Dictionary , page 197/8 -- Section 1.4.1 Development Test and Evaluation (DT&E) states "This effort is planned, conducted, and monitored by the developing agency or the DOD component." based upon this statement there doesn't appear to be any effort within this contract to be bid in section 1.4. Instead, test activities identified in the SOW will be added to the System's Engineering CWBS. Is this a compliant solution?	Support for Government run DT&E events are part of the SDD and LRIP Engineering Services.	No change to the RFP
18	Clause I-11	Solicitation Clause I-11 specifically allocates ten (10) calendar days for the notification of changes as defined by FAR 52.243-7. Because of the breadth and potential complexity of changes that might occur, especially during the SDD phase, would the Government consider modifying this period to thirty (30) days? Such extension would ensure completeness and accuracy of the information required by items (1) through (5) of Clause I-11 (solicitation p. 109), to be provided to the Government with the notification.	The Government considers fifteen (15) calendar days sufficient to initially address the six notification items required by FAR 52.243-7.	Section I, Clause I-11 "Notification of Changes", Paragraph (b) has been modified to allow the contractor fifteen (15) calendar days to notify the Government.
19	Section I, page 101	With regard to DFARS Provision 252.225-7014, Preference for Domestic Specialty Metals: Specialty Metals exemptions have been broadened with release of Class Deviation 2008-O0002 on 29 Jan 2008 for contracts awarded after 26 July 2008. Recommend Section I DFARS 252.225-7014 be updated to reflect DFARS 252.225-7014 Class Deviation 2008-O0002	DFARS 252.225-7014 has been modified.	Section I, DFARS 252.225-7014 has been modified to include Class Deviation 2008-O0002.
20	Cost Guidance paragraph on page 151. Summary Cost Breakouts on page 153. Contractor Rates on page 155 and Proposal submittal directions on pages 138 and 139	Per Cost Guidance contained on pages 151 and 153, Major Subcontractors must complete Attachments L-1 through L-10. Direction contained in the Contractor Rates paragraph on page 155 allows Major Subcontractors to submit Attachments L-9 and L-10 directly to the Government. Does the Government expect Major Subcontractors to submit these Attachments directly to SPAWAR assuming the same requirements as if submitting a Prime proposal (i.e., (1) submitted electronically by the subcontractor in accordance with provision L-349, (2) submitted by the subcontractor via 4 CD-ROMs and (3) submitted by the subcontractor via 4 hard copies)? Please provide guidance / clarification.	Subcontractors that choose to submit their cost proposal information directly to the Government are subject to the proposal requirements of L-16 and L-17. This includes electronic submission to the SPAWAR E-Commerce website, CD-ROM and hard copy requirements. Subcontractors must be registered on the SPAWAR E-Commerce website in order to upload a proposal. The proposal submittal webpage allows the submitter to indicate if they are a Prime or Subcontractor. The proposal submittal WebPages also contains a 'comments' field to allow the Subcontractor to indicate the Prime contractor.	No change to the RFP
21	Contractor Rates on page 155	Direction contained in the Contractor Rates paragraph on page 155 allows Major Subcontractors to submit Attachments L-9 and L-10 directly to the Government. Specific direction for submitting L-9 and L-10 requires the Offeror to submit the attachment (L-9 and L-10) for the Offeror, each major subcontractor and a Summary. If the Major Subcontractors submit these attachments directly to the Government, a "Summary" of Offeror and Subcontractor cannot be provided. Please provide guidance / clarification.	The requirement to provide a summary of Prime and Subcontractor indirect rates has been deleted.	Page 155, Indirect Rates: Attachment (L-9) has been modified to delete "and a summary".
22	Indirect Rates (L-9) and Direct Rates (L-10) page 155	The instructions on page 155 require the Contractor to provide Indirect / Direct Rate development information to the Government if the contractor uses "composite rates". Under paragraph "Direct Rates: Attachment (L-10)", a definition is provided for "composite rates" that is somewhat broad. Whether a contractor has composite rates could be open to interpretation. Recommend that submittal of Indirect / Direct Rate development information be waived if the contractor has approved CAS disclosures, onsite DCAA supervision, and regularly submits Forward Pricing Rates to the DACO for review / government rate recommendations.	Submittal of Indirect / Direct Rate development information may be substituted with documentation that demonstrates if the offeror, and/or major subcontractor, has approved CAS disclosures, onsite DCAA supervision, and regularly submits Forward Pricing Rates to the DACO for review / Government rate recommendations.	Page 155, Indirect Rates: Attachment (L-9) and Direct Rates: Attachment (L-10) are modified to incorporate the following: "If the offeror and/or major subcontractor has approved Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) disclosures, onsite DCAA supervision and regularly submits Forward Pricing Rates to the DCAO for review / Government rate recommendations, the offeror and/or major subcontractor shall provide supporting documentation demonstrating the CAS approval, DCAA supervision and regular submission of Forward Pricing Rates in lieu of submitting the Indirect / Direct development information."
23	Summary Cost Breakouts page 153	Per direction in the Summary Cost Breakouts paragraph, Major Subcontractors are required to complete Attachments L-1 through L-10. On page 155, it's acknowledged that Subcontractors may submit Attachments L-9 and L-10 directly to the Government due to the proprietary nature of company rates. Labor, Material, and Overhead rate data can also be derived from combinations of Attachments L-1 through L-8. For example, Attachments L-3 (Labor Hours) and L-4 (Labor Dollars) can be used to establish a contractor's labor rates by calendar year and type of effort (the WBS is split by function / task). Attachment L-8 (Bill of Material) discloses material overhead rates. G&A rates can be derived in Attachment L-2. Recommend that Major Subcontractors submit Attachments L-1 through L-10 directly to the Government and not to the Prime. A Major Subcontractor's proprietary and business sensitive rate data is compromised by releasing Attachments L-1 through L-10 to a Prime.	It is up to the Prime and Subcontractor to determine what cost proposal information they share with each other and whether they choose to submit this information separately. Separate submittal of Subcontractor cost proposal information directly to the Government, to include any information contained in Attachments L-1 through L-10, is acceptable. Subcontractors that choose to submit their cost proposal information directly to the Government are subject to the proposal requirements of L-16 and L-17. This includes the requirements for electronic submission to the SPAWAR E-Commerce website, CD-ROM and hard copy requirements. Subcontractors must be registered on the SPAWAR E-Commerce website in order to upload a proposal. The proposal submittal webpage allows the submitter to indicate if they are a Prime or Subcontractor. The proposal submittal webpages also contains a 'comments' field to allow the Subcontractor to indicate the Prime contractor.	No change to the RFP

**N00039-09-R-0027**  
**CANES CCE**  
**Question and Answer Set #2**

Question #	RFP Reference	Question	Answer	Amendment 0004 changes to RFP
24	RFP Section L, 2.3.1, Page 156	What burdens are included in "direct labor rates"? Does this include Overhead, G&A, Fee? Provide clarification as to what burdens are expected.	Page 155, Section (2) Cost Proposal has been modified to clarify the cost proposal requirements for Labor and ODCs for the Engineering Services CLINs.	Page 155, Section (2): Cost Proposal - Engineering Services CLINs has been modified to include cost proposal formats for Labor and ODCs SLINs. Attachments L-14, L-15, L-16 and L-17 are incorporated.
25	RFP Section B & SOW 3.3	SOW Section 3.3 contains a variety of taskings that are not directly correlated to the unit being produced - Program Mgmt, Configuration Mgmt, Cost Reporting, Security and multiple Logistics activities. Pricing schedules are limited to 1 first article unit for each of 9 ship-class variants. How should the price for these activities be included in the Section B pricing schedules? Recommend move the costs not specifically related to a first article unit to Engineering Services or provide guidance as to how to allocate these costs.	SOW Section 3.3 is directly related to the First Article units produced. SOW 3.3 is to be performed for each First Article unit ordered by the Government. The price of SOW 3.3 activities shall be included in the NTE / FFP proposed for each First Article unit. See RFP Attachment (10) - CLIN-SOW Matrix that provides CLINs with the associated SOW paragraphs.	No change to the RFP
26	E-Commerce Website	Can this site be utilized to send a test file to verify system compatibility prior to actually submitting the proposal?	Offerors registered with SPAWAR E-Commerce Central may submit a test file under RFP N00039-09-R-0027 to verify system compatibility prior to submitting the final proposal documents. Offerors shall override and remove any test file submittals when submitting final proposal documents. All test file submittals shall be named with "TEST" in the file name. Offerors shall state in the "Comments" section that the files submitted are for system compatibility test purposes only and are not part of the offeror's response to the RFP.	No change to the RFP
27	RFP, Attachment L-13	Box fifteen (15) in Attachment L-13 states "Provide a summary description of the contract work not to exceed two pages in length"... Does this mean that we complete Boxes 1 - 15 in Attachment L-13 and IN ADDITION to that information, we can include up to two (2) ADDITIONAL PAGES of written text? This would make a total of up to three (3) pages (not including CPARS) for the Past Performance write-ups where L-13 is required.	Yes. Box 15 of Attachment L-13 states that a summary description of contract work, not to exceed two pages in length, may be attached to the form.	No change to the RFP
28	Attachments L-9 and L-10	The instructions for Attachments L-9 and L-10 request rates by Calendar Year quarter, however, the attachments themselves have column titles "Government Fiscal Year Quarter". Please clarify which year term should be used.	Amendment 0003 modified the instructions for attachment L-9 and L-10 to be by "Government Fiscal Year Quarter."	No change to the RFP
29	Section L-17, Section 2.1.2 and 2.2.1.3	Section L-17 Page 137 denotes in Section 3.4 that the offeror is required to submit a Small Business Commitment that does not exceed five (5) pages. However, page 147 Section 3.4, subparagraph 3 requires evidence of commitment including copies of the binding agreements which cannot be accomplished in the five page limit.  Recommendation: The government re-evaluate the Page limit and extend to allow for inclusion of the copies of binding agreements as required.	Amendment 0003 modified Page 137, Section 1.2, Data Rights to Ten (10) Pages Maximum (Exclusive of Section K Provisions and Commercial or Open Source License Agreements)	No change to the RFP
30	Attachment L-9	Attachment L-9 "Indirect Rates" from the RFP has "S" signs in the first three cells. Is this an indication that discrete dollar values are expected to be shown in this table? Indirect burden rates are typically expressed in percentage format. Please clarify.	Attachment L-9 has been modified to show percentages (%) for indirect burden rates.	Attachment L-9 has been modified to show percentages (%) for indirect burden rates.
31	Section L-17, 2.1.2	Offeror intends to provide an executive summary document for the government's optional consideration, not to exceed 5 pages total, in the front of each proposal volume. It is expected that this document shall not count against any page limitations for the respective volumes. Could the government please confirm the offeror's expectations are accurate?	Page limitations for Volumes I, II and III are by Section and provided in Section L, L-17, 2.1.2. Proposal pages that exceed the page limitations for each Section will not be reviewed or evaluated by the Government. Proposal requirements for each Volume are as stated in L-17. Additional proposal documentation provided in a Volume that is not required by L-17 will not be reviewed or evaluated by the Government.	No change to the RFP