

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

| | | | |
|---------------------|------|----|-------|
| 1. CONTRACT ID CODE | PAGE | OF | PAGES |
|---------------------|------|----|-------|

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. | 3. EFFECTIVE DATE | 4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. | 5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable) |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--|
| 6. ISSUED BY CODE | 7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) CODE |
|---|--|

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| 8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code) | (X) | 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. |
| | | 9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) |
| | | 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO. |
| | | 10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) |
| CODE | | FACILITY CODE |

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended, is not extended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

(a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment your desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

| | |
|-----------|---|
| CHECK ONE | A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A. |
| | B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b). |
| | C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF: |
| | D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority) |

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor is not, is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

| | |
|---|--|
| 15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print) | 16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) |
| 15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR | 16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA |
| (Signature of person authorized to sign) | (Signature of Contracting Officer) |
| 15C. DATE SIGNED | 16C. DATE SIGNED |

Q1: In reviewing the subject solicitation; section L-11 Proposal organization and specifically volume II (technical / management proposal) 60 page limit (ref page 76 of solicitation) we are concerned about the 60 page limit. Does the 60 page limit pertain to all three (3) items collectively or is the 60 page limit for each item individually? This volume needs to contain detailed compliance discussion keyed to the specification requirements for 3 different products, several required sections will need considerable detail and back-up data, experience, information, and detailed management discussions. We are concerned that 60 pages are insufficient to adequately cover the required information. We understand the need to make the data concise, but there needs to be adequate space to thoughtfully present the required information (as is stated in L-8 paragraph 4 on page 73 of the solicitation).

A1: Section L-11 of the solicitation has been modified to increase the page limit of the technical proposal.

Q2: My inquiry is associated with the Classification Rating that is affecting this solicitation, citing the requirement for the contractor facility to be Rated as Secret in order to perform the task in supporting design, fabrication and testing for this project. We have reviewed all information that is available for this project and have determined that we are fully capable of designing and fabricating the required systems from our COTS designs. Our feeling is that using local specialized suppliers like ourselves will allow US Government to achieve tremendous financial savings and not to restrict this project to a single unknown source. We are very familiar with the cross section of companies that could provide this type of equipment, and to the best of my knowledge not one of them has Facilities Rated as Secret.

With this in mind, we would like to ask you to confer with your end user in order to confirm if a company such as ours may be considered to be a part of the bidding process for this project. Is it possible that this solicitation could be split into two segments – whereby one contract is for manufacture of such equipment and the second is for maintenance and related activities?

A2: Installation, maintenance, and/or repair of the hardware is in a classified environment, hence the need for cleared personnel. A company cannot obtain security clearances for its personnel without first holding a facility clearance. Having a facility clearance does not necessarily mean that a company can or will perform classified work at its site—it's about being able to gain access to a government system that permits a company to obtain clearances for employees. A prime contract holder must have a facility clearance in order to ensure its subcontractors have the proper and necessary clearances.

It may be a viable option for an offeror or offerors to consider the possibility of subcontracting under a prime who has the necessary clearances. The prime contract holder would have to employ the cleared personnel who would install, service, etc., the equipment.

Q3: It was noted that the draft specification has two (2) limits for almost each requirement however. One limit is identified as the threshold and the second is the objective. It is our understanding that the threshold requirement must be met while the objective limit leads to a more favorable evaluation on the part of the Naval Research Laboratory (NRL). We would request that ample time be provided once the formal solicitation is released for quotation because the threshold and objective limits double the effort to prepare and submit the technical/pricing information.

A3: You are correct that many of the requirements have threshold and objective limits, and you are correct that meeting objective limits would lead to a more favorable evaluation. The government also requires a matrix that identifies any extra costs paid by the government when thresholds are exceeded.

Q4: Requirement 0A-1-013 in Table 7-9 describes the 9x8 RFSM SE as non-blocking (any input to any or all outputs). Can you clarify whether or not this SE is expected to support a configuration where an output can be a composite (sum) of more than one input (any number of inputs to any output)?

A4: The 9x8 RFSM SE is not expected to support a configuration where more than one input port is simultaneously connected to a single output port.

Q5: Requirement 0C-1-003 in Table 7-14 describes the 94x110 RFSM SE as non-blocking. Can you clarify whether or not this SE is expected to support a configuration where an output can be a composite (sum) of more than one input (any number of inputs to any output)?

A5: The 94x110 RFSM SE is not expected to support a configuration where more than one input port is simultaneously connected to a single output port.

Q6: By inference, we believe the Phase II Unit Type 1, 9x8 RFSM and the Phase II Unit Type 2 Ganged 2x1 switches to be of PIN diode design, and we agree with that approach. Further, we infer by the switching speed and other requirements that the Phase II Unit Type 3 Broadband RFSM is intended to be an electro-mechanical switch matrix. We may be able to propose a solid state diode based solution that will meet the specifications for Phase II Unit Type 3 Broadband RFSM. Such a solid state device will offer much faster speeds, smaller size/weight and higher reliability. Trade-off is potentially slightly higher cost. Questions are (a) Is faster speed, smaller size/weight and higher reliability a desire of the requesting agency at this time? (b) Is a solid state solution desirable as a next step (future) consideration?

A6: The specific underlying switch technology type (electromechanical, solid-state, other) is not specified in the requirements because the requirements are intended to be independent of any particular implementation/design. That is, as long as all of the requirements are met, the underlying switch technology does not matter. However, based on our understanding of switching times for state-of-art RF switches, it is unlikely that an electromechanical switch could meet the requirements for Unit Type 1 (9x8 RFSM). We are currently unaware of a requirement for Unit Type 2 (Ganged 2x1 Switches) that would necessitate a specific switch technology. Similarly, we believe that the requirements for Unit Type 3 (Broadband RFSM) would allow a variety of design options as far as the underlying switch type. We understand that, in general, solid-state matrices offer faster speeds, smaller size/weight and higher reliability as compared to electromechanical devices:

- a) Switching speeds exceeding the required threshold and/or objective requirements have minimal benefit. Smaller size/weight have minimal benefit. Higher reliability is desirable, but is not quantitatively captured as a requirement (it is qualitatively captured in common requirements 0X-412-001 and 0X-413-001. We recommend that offerors rationalize and articulate their design decisions. For example, describe that a while the proposed solid-state design costs X% more than an electromechanical design, the analysis shows that the mean time between failures of the Unit is improved from Y to Z.
- b) We do not envision an future opportunity to replace an entire switch matrix (or switch matrices) for the sole reason of “upgrading” from electromechanical to solid-state switches.

Q7: “The work required by this contract requires accessing information classified at the SECRET level. Contractor personnel shall have a current, valid, and final SECRET clearance granted by the Department of Defense by date of contract award.” We are not sure if contract personnel implies NRL people or the potential manufacturer to bid on this RFP?

A7: Installation, maintenance, repairs, etc., will take place in a classified environment. The contractor is required to have a secret level facility clearance so that its employees also have secret clearances.