

**Nationwide Automatic Identification System
Increment 2, Phase 1
Monday, January 28, 2008
Batch No. 2**

Tracking ID: 12

Subject: General Contractual Requirements

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/11/2008

Section: Section J - Attachments

Specific Paragraph: J.25

Proprietary: No

Comment: Will the USCG provide an updated PEM to cover FCCOM?

RESPONSE: No, please refer to the response provided to Tracking ID Number 139.

Tracking ID: 35

Subject: PSS and SCC Site Specific Design and Implementation

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/14/2008

Section: Section J – Attachments

Specific

Paragraph: J-5 Inland River Coverage

Proprietary: No

Comment: Please supply information and legends cropped from page information. Examples are Bristol Bay page and the 1st page of Sector New York.

RESPONSE: A revised Attachment J.5 addressing this issue will be provided as an Amendment to the RFP.

Tracking ID: 37

Subject: Core System Implementation

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/14/2008

Section: Attachment 1 – SOW

Specific Paragraph: 3.1.1.7.1.4

Proprietary: No

Comment: Two PSSs are required at C2CEN. Are tower/structures required for these PSSs? If so, what are the coverage requirements?

RESPONSE: Adequate structure(s) will be available (Government furnished) at C2CEN to accommodate installation of the Physical Shore Stations required. There are no operational coverage requirements for these sites (primary purpose of these installations is testing). However, the PSSs are expected to achieve AIS coverage commensurate with the lab design projections and the actual antenna height and conditions for the site.

Tracking ID: 50

Subject: Performance Specification Requirements

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/14/2008

Section: Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.9.3.0-4 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: Are the SAR patterns received from another system through the SOA interface or another interface? Please update the SCC design constraints.

RESPONSE: The system shall be capable of importing NMEA 0183 Waypoint Files (.wpl) from Coast Guard applications for use in transmitting SAR patterns via AIS.

Tracking ID: 59

Subject: General Contractual Requirements

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/14/2008

Section: Section H - Special Requirements

Specific

Paragraph: H.10.3

Proprietary: No

Comment: Offeror is not clear as to the interpretation of the undefined term "Estimated Cost/Savings under Contract"? Is Offeror correct in assuming that "Estimated Cost/Savings" phrase means that an Offeror can submit an ECP that may result in a Cost Increase/Cost Savings. RECOMMENDATION: Request further clarification as to the definitions of "Estimated Cost/Savings."

RESPONSE: The USCG cannot respond to your question as posed Please clarify the question and resubmit via the NAIS website. Please reference the Tracking ID Number assigned.

Tracking ID: 60

Subject: Other

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/14/2008

Section: Section L - Instructions

Specific

Paragraph: L.4.4 & L.6.1.2 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: Paragraph L.4.4 directs that the PAGE LIMIT for the Executive Summary is 5 pages. Paragraph L.6 indicates that the Executive Summary consists of 2 subsections: Narrative Summary and Master Table of Contents of the entire proposal. The issue is that the Master Table of Contents will likely be well over 5 pages in length by itself. RECOMMENDATION: Provide clarification that the Executive Summary 5 page limit is for the narrative ONLY and that the Master Table of Contents is not counted against the 5 page limit and has no page limit.

RESPONSE: The page limit for the Executive Summary is five (5) pages. This does not include the Master Table of Contents.

Tracking ID: 61

Subject: Technical Design

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/14/2008

Section: Attachment 9 - DESIGN CONSTRAINTS

Specific

Paragraph: r21sites.zip, r21 site locations **Proprietary:** No

Comment: The R21sites data base file provides R21 site information; however, the column headers are not readily understood. Examples are: Columns "HEIGHT_OF" through "VHF_RECE_1". Please provide correlation of titles with Receive Antenna Height and Transmit Antenna Height.

RESPONSE: Attachment J.9 has been revised to address the issue noted and will be provided as an Amendment to the RFP.

Tracking ID: 62

Subject: Technical Design

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/14/2008

Section: Attachment 8 - TECH LIBRARY

Specific

Paragraph: VTS-R21-NAIS-1_Site_Information.pdf, r21 and NAIS-1 Site Locations **Proprietary:** No

Comment: SCC Delaware Bay lists NAIS 1-1 recv antenna on tower at 48.3 feet yet tower height listed is only 33 feet. Please resolve this inconsistency.

RESPONSE: The NAIS Increment 1 (I-1) site at SCC Delaware Bay is located on the SCC building. Thus, the tower height provided is actually the height of the building. The NAIS I-1 antenna is mounted to the top of the building with an extension bracket. Thus the antenna height is higher than the building height as noted. Please refer to the technical library (Enclosure 9) for pictures of this installation.

Tracking ID: 67

Subject: General Contractual Requirements

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/15/2008

Section: Section L - Instructions **Specific Paragraph:** L.8.2.1 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: Section L.8.2.1, Project Management Approach, pg L-29: "Describe the project management approach, organization and methodologies to meet or exceed the solicitation requirements, to include, at a minimum: staffing (including information requested in L.3.1.8),." Please note that the cited section L.3.1.8 does not exist. If this is incorrect, what is the section we need to reference back to?

RESPONSE: The parenthetical should read (including information requested in L.8.2.2). The cited section should be L.8.2.2 instead of L.3.1.8. An amendment will be issued to update the cite reference.

Tracking ID: 68

Subject: General Contractual Requirements

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

Section: Section L - Instructions **Specific Paragraph:** L.8.3.3 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: Section L.8.3.3, Format, pg L-30: "i. List of Key Personnel from L.10.3 that worked on the program and their roles" Please note that the cited section L.10.3 does not exist. If this is incorrect, what is the reference we need to reference back to?

RESPONSE: The cited section should be L.8.2.2. An amendment will be issued to update the cite reference.

Tracking ID: 69

Subject: General Contractual Requirements

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

Section: Section L - Instructions **Specific Paragraph:** L.8.4.4 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: Section L.8.4.4, pg L-33: Item d: "...A sample table (note: check for form to attach vice table) is provided below:" Should Offerors assume that the parenthetical is an artifact of the process used to develop Section L (i.e., an internal working note not intended as an explicit instruction to Offerors) and ignore the parenthetical and present their data in the sample table format?

RESPONSE: The last sentence of L.8.4.4. paragraph d should read as follows: "A sample table is provided below." Offerors should ignore the parenthetical and present their data in the sample table format. An amendment will be issued to update the text.

Tracking ID: 70

Subject: Systems Engineering

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.5.3.0-6 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: Please clarify what is meant by ". . . NAIS data source management, NAIS data client management".

RESPONSE: A "data source" is a provider of AIS (and other) data to the NAIS. A "data client" is a consumer (receiver) of AIS and other NAIS data.

Tracking ID: 71

Subject: Systems Engineering

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.2.5.0-2 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: Does the USCG expect the contractor to deliver a CDS or MLS solution as part of the system? If the USCG already has cross-domain or MLS capabilities in place, can the USCG provide interface specifications?

RESPONSE: No, the Government will provide the Cross Domain Solution (CDS) or Multi-Level Security (MSL) solution. Details of the CDS or MSL solution will be provided after contract award. The Contractor shall ensure that the NAIS delivers data in a manner that can be accepted by the Government provided CDS or MLS solution.

Tracking ID: 73

Subject: Concept of Operations

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 2 – PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 1.1 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: Please confirm that encrypted BFT and EAIS traffic is encrypted and decrypted via a service that is external to NAIS. Confirm that NAIS is NOT to provide a BFT encryption/decryption cryptographic function, or the associated key management of such a function.

RESPONSE: Encryption and decryption of AIS messages will be accomplished external to NAIS. NAIS is not to provide an encryption/decryption cryptographic function, or the associated key management of such a function.

Tracking ID: 77

Subject: Sector Survey and Coverage Design

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.3.3.0-1 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: Table 3.3 - Formal definition of "Baseline" does not appear to be referenced. This is problematic for coverage requirements related to bays and inlets.

RESPONSE: The word “Baseline” is defined in the glossary of the Statement of Work, taken from National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), National Ocean Service, Office of Coast Survey (http://www.csc.noaa.gov/mbwg/htm/cad_mar.htm#TSB), as the low-water line along the coast.

Tracking ID: 78

Subject: Sector Survey and Coverage Design

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.3.3.0-1 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: PSPEC Table 3.3, 2nd coverage column. Please identify the reference for the "24 nm" (assumed coastal baseline - need formal definition.)

RESPONSE: The 24 nautical miles in the 2nd column of PSPEC Table 3.3 refers to the distance seaward from the "baseline". Please see answer to Tracking ID # 77 for the definition of "baseline".

Tracking ID: 79

Subject: Sector Survey and Coverage Design

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.3.3.0-4 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: PSPEC Table 3.6. Distance to sea is not specified for coverage areas.

RESPONSE: The minimum coverage requirements from the baseline (see response to Tracking ID #77 for definition of "baseline") out to sea are provided in Table 3.3. The distances seaward from the baseline are 24 nm for transmit coverage and 50 nm for receive coverage. Table 3.6 of the PSPEC provides performance exceptions for specific areas within the coverage areas defined by Tables 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5.

Tracking ID: 80

Subject: Sector Survey and Coverage Design

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.3.3.0-1 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: PSPEC Table 3.3 references table 3.5 for the second set of coverage requirements. This could be interpreted in either of two ways; coverage is all of the US coast to 24 nm AND the areas in table 3.5, or that table 3.5 completely defines the coverage areas.

RESPONSE: The coverage requirements for the NAIS include the entire U.S. coast from a shoreward boundary defined by the information in Table 3.5 to a seaward boundary defined by the information in Table 3.3.

Tracking ID: 81

Subject: Design Constraints

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.2.6.0-1 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: In Table 3.2, the VDL throughput at FOC is called out to be 100% VDL saturation for each PSS. Does the Coast Guard want this 100% VDL saturation to be used to size the just the required backhaul bandwidth from the PSS to the EDC, or is it used to size/dimension the backhaul AND the maximum processing and storage infrastructure at the EDC?

RESPONSE: As indicated by Section 3.2.6.0-3 of the PSPEC, Storage, Enterprise Services and AIS Service Management shall be scalable to meet the service needs dependencies of the Components in Table 3.2. Thus, 100% VDL saturation shall be used when sizing backhaul, processing/storage, Enterprise Services and AIS Service Management components for Full Operational Capability (FOC).

Tracking ID: 84

Subject: Logistics Planning and Design

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 3 - CDRLs **Specific Paragraph:** Various **Proprietary:** No

Comment: "Some due dates on the CDRL Index in the front of the section do not agree with the first submission date on the DD Form 1423-1. The following CDRLs are shown with Index and 1423 in the following format: CDRL/Index/1423 (dual separators appear between different CDRLs //) 1.5.1.8 / 30 DB SDR / 30 DB CDR // 1.5.2.11.7 / 30 DB SDR / 30 DB CDR // 1.5.7.2 / 30 DB SDR / 30 DB CDR // 1.5.7.3 / 30 DB SDR / 30 DB CDR // 1.5.12.1 / 30 DB SDR / 30 DB PDR We respectfully request the Government to identify the correct date."

RESPONSE: The CDRL Index page in Attachment J.3 should read:

CDRL Number	Name	Date Due
CDRL 1.5.1.8:	Integrated Support Plan	30 DB PDR
CDRL 1.5.2.11.7:	Maintenance Transition Plan	30 DB CDR
CDRL 1.5.7.2:	Training/Performance Intervention Plan	30 DB CDR
CDRL 1.5.7.3:	Training Program Materials and Tools	30 DB CDR

In addition, the last paragraph in Block 16 of CDRL 1.5.12.1 (LMI Summaries) should read: "Blocks 12 and 13: Initial submission is due 30 DB SDR."

An amendment will be issued to make these corrections.

Tracking ID: 85

Subject: Logistics Planning and Design

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 3 - CDRLs **Specific Paragraph:** 1.5.5.5 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: CDRL title is IETM however, to content only requires a Technical Data Index (TDI). There is no CDRL for actual IETM (Technical Manual) delivery. Is this the Government's intent?

RESPONSE: It is the Government's intent to have a CDRL for IETM delivery. A revised CDRL 1.5.5.5 will be provided by amendment to the RFP.

Tracking ID: 86

Subject: Technical Design

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 5 - INLAND RIVERS **Specific**

Paragraph: Table 3.3 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: Table 3.3 in J-5 appears to actually be the same as table 3.5 in the PSPEC. Since this defines coverage requirements, may we assume this should be labeled 3.5?

RESPONSE: The information provided in Table 3.3 of Attachment J-5 and Table 3.5 of the PSPEC is the same. The Table in Attachment J-5 will be changed to read Table 1 (Table 3.5 of the PSPEC) in an amendment to the RFP.

Tracking ID: 87

Subject: Sector Survey and Coverage Design

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 5 - INLAND RIVERS **Specific**

Paragraph: Bristol Bay **Proprietary:** No

Comment: Sheet 5 shows all of Bristol Bay. Bristol bay is explicitly identified in table 3.5, which defines coverage requirements for coastal areas out to 24 NM. Is coverage required to 24 NM, or are the coverage requirements for Bristol Bay actually an exception.

RESPONSE: The map of Bristol Bay, page 5 in Attachment J.5 was provided to clearly define the entire extent of the bay and shoreward boundaries graphically. The seaward coverage boundary and AIS coverage performance requirements for this area are defined by maps 8 and 10 in the revised Attachment J.5.

Tracking ID: 88

Subject: Sector Survey and Coverage Design

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 5 - INLAND RIVERS

Specific

Paragraph: Sector Anchorage Level of Service Requirements

Proprietary:

No

Comment: Sector Anchorage Level of Service Requirements - Maps refer to "Level of Service" II-V. Also, "Class of Service" IV. These do not appear to be defined anywhere. Also, if one were to assume they were based on the channel performance criterion set forth in tables 3.3 and 3.6 of the PSPEC, there would be inconsistency in the definitions as areas which match in Table 3.6 differ on the maps.

RESPONSE: Please refer to the revised Attachment J.5 provided as a part of an Amendment to the RFP, which addresses the inconsistencies noted and also provides the coverage boundaries for Inland River Vessel Movement Center Reporting Points.

Tracking ID: 89

Subject: General System Performance Requirements

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 5 - INLAND RIVERS

Specific

Paragraph: Sector Juneau Level of Service Requirements

Proprietary:

No

Comment: Sector Juneau Level of Service Requirements - Maps refer to "Level of Service" II-V. Also, "Class of Service" IV. These do not appear to be defined anywhere. Also, if one were to assume they were based on the channel performance criterion set forth in tables 3.3 and 3.6 of the PSPEC, there would be inconsistency in the definitions as areas which match in Table 3.6 differ on the maps.

RESPONSE: Please see the response provided for Tracking ID Number 88.

Tracking ID: 91

Subject: General Contractual Requirements

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

Section: Section L – Instructions **Specific Paragraph:** L.8.4.2 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: Is the amount of small business utilization at second tier to be included in the prime contractor's calculation of subcontractor use for purposes of goal reporting and evaluation?

RESPONSE: Yes.

Tracking ID: 93

Subject: General Contractual Requirements

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/15/2008

Section: Section H - Special Requirements

Specific Paragraph:

H.6.2

Proprietary: No

Comment: Can you provide a copy of DHS MD 11050.2?

RESPONSE: A link to DHS MD 11050.2 is provided as reference number 2.1.35 in the SOW.

Tracking ID: 94

Subject: General Contractual Requirements

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/15/2008

Section: Section H - Special Requirements

Specific Paragraph: H.6

Proprietary: No

Comment: Is a Security Classification Guide available to the prospective offerors during the period of proposal preparation (i.e., prior to the 6 Mar 08 submission deadline)?

RESPONSE: Department of Homeland Security Management Directive (DHS MD) 11042.1, SAFEGUARDING SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED (FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY) INFORMATION, may be found at the following location:
http://www.naisproject.net/NAIS_External/NAISdiscussion/rfp2/sections/Section_J/MD_11042-1_Safeguarding_Sensitive_But_Unclassified_Information.pdf.

An amendment will be issued to incorporate the updated reference into Section H.6.1 of the RFP.

Tracking ID: 96

Subject: Project Management

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/15/2008

Section: Section L - Instructions **Specific Paragraph:** L8.2.1 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: "The following section refers to a Section L3.1.8 that is not in the RFP. ""Section L.8.2.1 Project Management Approach - Describe the project management approach, organization and methodologies to meet or exceed the solicitation requirements to include at a minimum, staffing (including information requested in L3.1.8) roles and responsibilities, teaming, subcontractor management and project planning, monitoring control and execution (eg WBS, project scheduling, risk management and project performance metrics).""

RESPONSE: See response to Tracking ID Number 67.

Tracking ID: 98

Subject: Logistics Planning and Design

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 1 - SOW

3.1.1.5.2.4.1; 3.1.1.5.2.4.2 ; 3.1.1.5.2.7

Specific Paragraph:

Proprietary: No

Comment: Three sections - 3.1.1.5.2.4.1, 3.1.1.5.2.4.2, and 3.1.1.5.2.7, have the same incorrect CDRL reference: is "1.5.2.1.4.1", should be "1.5.2.4.1"

RESPONSE: Please refer to the response provided to Tracking ID Number 66.

Tracking ID: 99

Subject: Performance Specification Requirements

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 1 - SOW

Specific

Paragraph: 3.1.1.5.7.1 and 2 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: Section 3.1.1.5.7.2 lists 4 distinct communities requiring training. Section 3.1.1.5.7.1 also includes generic users/subscribers. Could the Government confirm if training for generic users/subscribers is required?

RESPONSE: Sections 3.1.1.5.7.2 and 3.1.1.5.7.3 of the SOW should read as follows (please note that the Government has deleted the requirement that the Training/Performance Intervention Plan be reviewed at each design review):

3.1.1.5.7.2. Training/Performance Intervention Plan (CDRL 1.5.7.2). The Contractor shall maintain and provide a detailed NAIS Training/Performance Intervention Plan. The Contractor shall conduct an analysis and recommend the optimal form of training/intervention. The plan shall include the type of training/performance intervention to be provided, content and style of training and/or intervention tool, instructor qualifications as appropriate, and details on training and non-training interventions implementation. In order to determine the appropriate intervention, design and deployment method(s), the Contractor shall conduct a review of the existing Coast Guard training and performance tools in place for related or inter-dependent systems. The plan shall address, at a minimum, five distinct communities for the NAIS: 1) Operators (e.g., SCC Operators); 2) System Administrators (SOC, OSC, and C2CEN); 3) System Maintainers (the MLCs and ESUs for PSS-related and any distributed architecture equipment and the EDC for hosted equipment/software at the EDC); 4) System Trainers (for Coast Guard Training Centers), and 5) generic users of (or subscribers to) NAIS services. As part of this plan, the Contractor shall evaluate and recommend how, where and when training for those functions and personnel, as determined by analysis, should be provided.

3.1.1.5.7.3. Training Program Materials and Tools (CDRL 1.5.7.3). The Contractor shall develop, maintain and provide training materials such as instructor

and student guides, job aids and any tools or special fixtures required to train or instruct the NAIS operators, system administrators, maintainers, system trainers and generic users of (or subscribers to) NAIS services in accordance with the approved Training/Performance Intervention Plan.

These changes to the SOW will be provided through an Amendment to the RFP.

Tracking ID: 101

Subject: Other

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 1 - SOW **Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.3.7.2.1 **Proprietary:**
No

Comment: Can the USCG provide the NAIS Increment 1 Draft SSP to bidders?

RESPONSE: The NAIS Increment-1 System Security Plan and other Certification and Accreditation artifacts will not be available to bidders. These documents will be made available to the successful Offeror after contract award.

Tracking ID: 103

Subject: Performance Specification Requirements

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/15/2008

Section: Attachment 1 - SOW **Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.8.2.3.3.3 **Proprietary:**
No

Comment: Service Level I, II, and III. These do not appear to be defined.

RESPONSE: Subparagraph b. of SOW Section 3.1.1.8.2.3.3.3 should read as follows:

b. Coverage test – The purpose of this test is to verify and demonstrate the coverage requirements using data collection from and to AIS Class A and Class B on a vessel traveling various courses and speeds on an area pre-selected by the Government. In addition, during the execution of this test the Contractor shall verify AIS Class A and B position reporting time and transmit performance (i.e., onboard AIS elements will successfully receive messages transmitted from a shore-based NAIS transmitter with a Packet Error Rate that meets or exceeds the requirements in the PSPEC) as well as data transfer latency from the NAIS PSS to the NAIS message server and SCC that meets or exceeds the requirements in the PSPEC.

The SOW will be modified to reflect this revised language in an amendment to the RFP.

Tracking ID: 105

Subject: General Contractual Requirements

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/16/2008

Section: Other **Specific Paragraph:** Standard Form 33 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: No DPAS rating was included in the Standard Form 33. What is the DPAS rating for this procurement?

RESPONSE: The Nationwide Automatic Identification System was not assigned a DPAS rating.

Tracking ID: 106

Subject: General Contractual Requirements

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/16/2008

Section: Section H - Special Requirements **Specific**

Paragraph: H.6.2, H.6.3 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: H.6.2 states prior to being granted access to the NAIS or being provided NAIS information, each person shall have completed a favorable adjudicated background investigation as defined in DHS MD 11050.2. , and H.6.3 states all personnel accessing NAIS data shall have an "appropriate background investigation and a valid need to know in order to access the system". What level Security clearance is required for the Contractor and Subcontractor?

RESPONSE: Anyone (Prime Contractor or Subcontractor personnel) that will be accessing NAIS is required to have the appropriate background investigation as specified. In addition, anyone needing access to a Sector Command Center (SCC) or other Secure Processing Center for site surveys, installations, etc. shall have a clearance commensurate with the required level of that facility (currently Secret for SCC). This applies to certain lab facilities at C2Cen as well. Currently, it is anticipated that the NAIS lab at C2CEN will be Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU).

Tracking ID: 109

Subject: Testing and Evaluation

Question Number: 0 **Comment Date:** 1/16/2008

Section: Attachment 1 - SOW

Paragraph: SOW 3.1.1.8.2.3.3.3. b. Coverage test

Specific

Proprietary: No

Comment: The purpose of this test is to verify and demonstrate the coverage REQUIREMENTS using data collection from and to AIS Class A and Class B on a vessel traveling various courses and speeds on an area pre-selected by the Government. Can the government clarify its intent regarding having the contractor provide a test vessel meeting the above requirement at a level of detail to allow cost/pricing?

RESPONSE: The Government intends to provide the test vessel for coverage testing. SOW Sections 3.1.1.8.2.3.3.3. and 3.1.1.8.2.3.3.4. should read as follows:

“3.1.1.8.2.3.3.3. Test Vessel. The Contractor shall include provisions for outfitting a Government provided test vessel for the execution of transmit and receive coverage, reporting rate, and latency verification. The Contractor shall define the planning, preparations, scheduling information, test methodology and identify/outline the various organizational entities involved in these test and evaluation activities for timely and effective completion of:

a. Vessel’s AIS equipment installation and inspection test – The purpose of these activities is to ensure proper AIS equipment (one AIS Class A, one AIS Class B, AIS display, and, if needed, AIS receivers connected to an AIS data collection tool) and document the setting and configuration of the AIS elements onboard of the test vessel. The display is necessary to demonstrate the performance of NAIS transmit capability, such as display of safety related messages, data transmitted using binary applications and telecommands (e.g., change to report rate).

b. Coverage test – The purpose of this test is to verify and demonstrate the coverage requirements using data collection from and to AIS Class A and Class B on a vessel traveling various courses and speeds on an area pre-selected by the Government. In addition, during the execution of this test the AIS Class A and B position reporting time and transmit requirements (i.e., that messages transmitted from a shore-based NAIS transmitter will be successfully received by the onboard AIS elements meeting or exceeding the Packet Error Rates specified in the PSPEC) as well as data transfer latency from the NAIS PSS to the NAIS message server and SCC shall be verified.”

“3.1.1.8.2.3.3.4 Government Assets. The Government will provide the test vessel for the receive and transmit coverage field testing. The Contractor shall coordinate with and support the Government provided asset to execute the required testing.”

The SOW will be modified to reflect this revised language in an amendment to the RFP.

Tracking ID: 114

Subject: General Contractual Requirements

Question Number: 0

Comment Date: 1/16/2008

Section: Section L - Instructions **Specific Paragraph:** L.1 **Proprietary:** No

Comment: The Facilities Capital Cost of Money clause (52.215-16) appears in Section L, but not in A through K. If an Offeror proposes this cost element, do you want the clause to be part of Section H or I?

RESPONSE: If an Offeror proposes facilities capital cost of money in its proposal, it will be incorporated in Section H at contract award. If the successful Offeror does not propose this cost, then FAR 52.215-17 Waiver of Facilities Capital Cost of Money will be added to contract upon contract award.