

Q1. Please advise if there is a designated font size/style that must be used for caption labels.

A1. The formatting instructions in Section L, Clause L-317, (b)(1)(C) and (D) apply to all text submitted for evaluation, including caption labels.

Q2. Please advise if there is a designated font size/style for any text that is part of a graphic.

A2. The formatting instructions in Section L, Clause L-317, (b)(1)(C) and (D) apply to all text submitted for evaluation, including text that is part of a graphic.

Q3. Please advise if there are specific dimensions for headers and footers.

A3. Offerors shall propose in accordance with the formatting instructions in Section L, Clause L-317, (b)(1). There are no specified dimension requirements for headers and footers, only for margins.

Q4. Please confirm if the government has either Unrestricted or Government Purpose Rights to the Link 22 Data Link Processing (DLP) Segment source code that was previously developed for NGC2P in FY 2006. Will this source code be made available as Government Furnished Property (GFP)?

A4. No, the Government does not intend to provide this source code as it is not considered necessary to fulfill the requirements of this solicitation.

Q5. Are there any special formatting requirements for the CWBS/IMP/IMS required by Section L such as page size, font size/style, etc.?

A5. Per Section L, Clause L-317, "The Offeror shall provide a CWBS, IMP and IMS in accordance with CDRLs A003, A004 and A007." Offerors shall refer to the CDRLs for specific formatting information.

Q6. Please clarify if the CWBS/IMP/IMS should be bound within Technical Volume for factors 1 & 2 or submitted as separate documents.

A6. Per Section L, Clause L-317, (b)(3)(A), 2., the CWBS/IMP/IMS for Factors 2 and 3 shall be submitted with the Technical Volume for each factor.

Q7. Please clarify what units (ie, %, \$, other) the offeror should use in completing each cell of the tables in Section B.

A7. In completing the Section B CLIN cells, offerors shall propose all Cost and Fee values in dollars and all Share Ratio values in percentages.

Q8. In reference to the incentive fees and share ratios, are offerors required to propose a minimum fee of \$0 and share ratio of 50/50 (as noted on pg 6 of the Solicitation), or can alternate values be proposed / deemed acceptable?

A8. Per Section B, Clause 5252.216-9203 PAYMENT OF INCENTIVE FEE, offerors are required to propose a minimum fee of \$0 and share ratio of 50/50 in response to this solicitation.

Q9. Will SPAWAR consider extending the proposal submittal deadline for Solicitation No. N00039-12-R-0110: Next Generation Command and Control Processor (NGC2P) Tech Refresh and Link 22 to July 26, 2012?

A9. Considering the length of time draft RFP documents were available to potential offerors and the extensive pre-solicitation exchanges conducted, the request for a proposal submission deadline extension of two weeks seems excessive. However, the Government will extend the deadline by one week, to 19 July 2012. See Amendment 0001.

Q10. Request to meet to discuss this requirement.

A10. The Government is not accepting meetings with interested vendors at this time. Please submit any questions via email and the Government will post all questions and answers on the eCommerce website.

Q11. Regarding the past performance questionnaire, do we send the questionnaire directly to the past performance customer requesting that they complete it and return it completed directly to your office? Or, are we supposed to provide you with the names and POC information of our customer, and then your office will submit the questionnaire to the past performance customer and ask that they fill it out?

A11. For Factor 1, Past Performance, if CPARS evaluations are unavailable, Offerors shall provide one Past Performance Questionnaire to each of the customers cited on the Relevant Experience Form, and request that the customer complete and email the form directly to Lindsay Taelman at lindsay.taelman@navy.mil, by the proposal due date.

Q12. RFP Section L-317(b) states: The font used shall be no smaller than 12-point. Does this refer only to textual pages of the proposal? May the Offeror use 8 point fonts in figures (“graphics”) and 10 point fonts in tables?

A12. The formatting instructions in Section L, Clause L-317, (b)(1)(C) and (D) apply to all text submitted for evaluation, including figures, graphics and tables.

Q13. The customer questionnaire form (Attachment 6) requests that customer responses be sent directly to SPAWAR however Section L of the RFP requires past performance data to be include/bound in the Technical Volume as part of responses to Factor 1. Customers may be reluctant to provide data directly to suppliers in contradiction to the direction contained in the questionnaire. Will SPAWAR provide written direction that can accompany the questionnaire to permit customers to cc; suppliers with their response?

A13. See A11. Customer questionnaires (Attachment 6) are not expected to be included in the Technical Volume. CPARS, to the extent available, are expected to be included in the Technical Volume per Section L, Clause L-317, (b)(3)(A), Factor 1.

Q14. Section L-335, page 55, states; “For bidding/proposal purposes the estimated effective date of contract award is 1 March 2013.” Please clarify if this is the estimated award date for the overarching IDIQ, Task Order 1, Task Order 2, some or all of these elements. If 1 March 2013 is not the award date for both Task Order 1 & 2 please provide the target date for these awards.

A14. The estimated award date includes the contract, TO 1 and TO 2.

Q15. The program schedule provided at Industry Day indicated milestones based on a Q1 FY2013 award date. Final RFP indicated award date as 1 March 2013 (or Q2 FY2013). Are the milestones referenced in the Industry Day schedule (ie: SRR, PDR, CDR, etc) to be adjusted to coincide with the new award date or are they fixed?

A15. The milestones referenced in the Industry Day schedule were notional at the time and not prescriptive. Vendors should prepare PTO 0001 and PTO 0002 proposals based on the final RFP indicated award date and propose milestones appropriate to your technical approach.

Q16. Are there specific dates SPAWAR is targeting for Task Order 1 CDR and Task Order 2 PDR?

A16. See A15

Q17. Are both Task Orders to be proposed as fully independent programs with no consideration to overlaps, efficiencies, concurrent reviews?

A17. While the Govt's intention is to award PTO 1 and PTO 2 concurrently and leverage efficiencies, concurrent reviews, etc., there is no guarantee that they will be awarded concurrently. Also note that PTO 2 concludes at PDR vice CDR.

Q18. Technical Readiness Assessment (TRA) for Task Order 1 – is the intent to have a single TRA prior to TO 1 CDR or is the expectation to also have a TRA prior to PDR?

A18. It is the Govt's expectation that a single TRA will be conducted for PTO 0001 post-PDR.

Q19. In Section L instructions for (A) Volume 1, Technical, under #2 for Factors 2 & 3 it states "CWBS/IMP/IMS. The Offeror's approach shall be reflected throughout the CWBS, the IMP and the IMS. The Offeror shall provide a Contract Work Breakdown Structure, an Integrated Master Plan (IMP), and an Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) in accordance with CDRLs A003, A004 and A007." Per the Block 12 of each of these CDRLs, it states initial submittal of these CDRLs is "...12 business days after the end of the contractor's first full accounting period following contract award." Please confirm that no CWBS/IMP/IMS are required to be submitted with the proposals.

A19. CWBS/IMP/IMS ARE required to be submitted with the proposals. CDRL Block 12 submission instructions refer to post contract award delivery periodicities and do not negate the need to comply with Sections L & M of the RFP.

Q20. Proposal Submission Clarification: Page 55 of the Final RFP has a section entitled 'Submission of Electronic Proposals [. . .] – Alternate I'.

This section provides guidelines on submitting the proposal documents to SPAWAR. However, the title includes the word 'Alternate'. Is this the only way to submit the proposal to SPAWAR? We are interpreting this to the recommended way to submit the proposal documents as opposed to an alternate method. Are we misunderstanding the proposal submission process?

A20. Yes. The 'Alternate I' signifies an alternate to the basic 'Submission of Electronic Proposals' provision. This provision is not a recommendation. Offerors shall submit proposals in accordance with the L-349 Alternate I provision included the RFP.

Q21. Additional documentation: Is the following documentation available? If so, when will it be made available?

- a. WS 21290/7 – 5 February 2009: When available
- b. WS 21356 – 2 September 2009: When available
- c. C2P-SOM-V3-R03C02 – 30 May 2007
- d. C2P-SOM-V1/V2-R05C00 – 30 Oct 1998
- e. CDE(IDS)84-19/REV11/C0 – 15 Dec 2009
- f. SPAWAR-C-7521 – 1 Aug 2009
- g. C2P-PPS-V0/V6+Addendum R02C0 – 21 Dec 2005
- h. C2P-DX BATCH FORMAT 04C0 – 1 Feb 2003
- i. CDLMS-DX BATCH FORMAT-C – 31 Aug 2006

A21. The non-WS documents (c-i) are available now and may be requested per the process outlined in the GFI listing Note 1, para 3. The WS document (a,b) are expected to be available shortly.

Q22. Attachment 5 Clarification: Section 13 of Attachment 5 states ‘Describe the extent to which your team members (subcontractors) on the instant solicitation contributed to the effort described in Block 12. Describe the extent to which the employees from your company who performed the effort described in Block 12 will be performing under this solicitation.’

Would you consider a paragraph on each team member whereby all paragraphs combined would add up to one additional page so we can adequately describe their benefit to this solicitation?

A22. Offerors shall submit four pages max for each relevant experience; form plus three pages. The content of the three pages are up to the offeror’s discretion. The Government does not intend to increase the page limitation for Attachment 5.

Q23. Past Performance Clarification: Page 50 of the Final RFP states ‘(See Attachment 5; four page max for each experience; form plus three).

- a. Upon reviewing Attachment 5, Section 12 is the only section that discusses additional pages and it only mentions one additional page. So we interpret this to mean that Attachment 5 allows for a two page max for each experience, form plus one. Are we interpreting this incorrectly?
- b. For the additional pages that are allowed with Attachment 5, would you consider us just adding more pages to the Relevant Experience Form as opposed to creating an additional file?

A23. a. See A22. Offerors may submit up to three pages in additional to the Form, to total four pages. Offerors may disregard the instructions on Attachment 5, Block 13 that state “...not to exceed one page in length.” The Government will revise and repost this Form in Amendment 0001.

b. Yes, Offerors can add additional pages to the Attachment 5 Form in accordance with the page limitations.

Q24. Format, Organization, Content clarification: Page 50 of the Final RFP states ‘Table of Contents, Cross-Reference Matrix, and Acronym Listing does not count towards page limits.’

- a. Does this also include the List of Figures and List of Tables, if applicable?
- b. Is the Cross-Reference Matrix an index that maps the Performance Work Statement sections for both Task Orders #1 and #2 to the respective sections in the offeror’s technical, cost, and contractual proposals?

A24. a. Yes.

b. That is one example of a Cross-Reference Matrix. The Matrix provided, if any, is up to the Offeror’s discretion.

Q25. Does the government plan to have multiple awards for the initial contract or will it be a single award?

A25. Per Section M, Clause M-302 Evaluation of Offers, the Government intends to make a single award.