

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE	OF	PAGES
	1		4

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0002	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 08/30/2002	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. 53-1092-02	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY CONTRACTING OFFICER NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY 4555 OVERLOOK AVENUE SW WASHINGTON, DC 20375-5326 ATTN: CODE 3220.AT		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6)	CODE

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code) TO ALL OFFERORS	(X)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N00173-02-R-AT04
	X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 02 AUG 2002
		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)
N/A

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.)

SEE PAGE 2

Any questions concerning this amendment should be directed to:
Evangalina R. Toledo, Contract Specialist (202) 767-2021

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	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)		(Signature of Contracting Officer)	

This amendment is issued to revise Sections B-1 and L-11, extend the closing date and to answer questions raised by potential offerors.

1. Block 9 of the SF 33, and Section L-2 is changed to read 10 September 2002, 4:00 p.m. local time
2. B-1 – The nomenclature for CLIN 0006 is revised to read as follows:

“List of Spares as described in Exhibit A, DD 1423.”
3. L-11 – Any questions concerning the RFP must be submitted in writing to the Contracting Officer at the location noted in blocks 7 and 9 of the Standard Form 33, “Solicitation, Offer and Award, by 4:00 p.m. (local time) on 4 September 2002. The Government will not consider questions received after this date. Offerors are cautioned against directing any questions concerning this RFP to technical personnel at the Naval Research Laboratory.

4. Questions and Answers:

- (1) Section 3.5 of the SOW refers to SUN CPU-50 as the system host. However, SUN Microsystems does not have this model (CPU-50) in their catalog. Are alternatives to the CPU-50 acceptable? How much capacity should the host hard drive contain?

Answer: The CPU-50 is a Force CPU-50 which is a compact 6U VME board. It offers UltraSPARC Ili processor. Alternatives are acceptable as long as the specifications are equivalent or better than the Force CPU-50.

- (2) SOW 3.3 (b) stated “NRL will supply all the logic that will go into this Field Programmable Gate Array (FPGA), however the contractor shall provide a complete list of all required tools to develop this logic and download this logic into the FPGA.” Please restate or clarify what is actually required, and if it is really optional?

Answer: This item is listed as an option because it is unclear whether the tools to load the FPGAs with NRL’s logic are included with the purchase price of the receiver boards. NRL currently has its own development tools for the FPGA logic.

- (3) SOW Ref: 3.2 (h): The stated 3dB passband is "60 KHz." Shouldn't the 300 MHz value actually be 30.0 MHz?

Answer: No. The required 3db passband of the receiver is 60 KHz to 300 Mhz to accommodate the radar systems design

- (4) Section 2 presupposes the use of a given vendor's hardware for this application. Is that fair open competition? There are other competitors to Mercury Computers and constraining a system today by the selection of a future possibility of a single vendor's product is probably not in the best interest of the Government itself. After all current state of the art Radar system implementation practice, including new programs being run by the US Navy, is starting to show that the Mercury computer type embedded Power PC may not be the best approach to Radar Signal Processing. And even if such a path (embedded Power PC) were to be chosen why would a product from a Company such as SKY Computers not be acceptable? After all The SKY Merlin card arguably has higher performance than the Mercury board and SKY channel (an ANSI/VITA standard bus) has higher bandwidth than Race plus plus.

Answer: The response to question 1 of amendment 0001 called out the use of a Mercury product as a typical VME based processor. We will use boards that we currently own, which include both Mercury and SKY products, for the real time processing.

- (5) Assuming that the above can be legitimately done, how does the specified recording system interact with the future processing system? Again, there may be a number of ways in which this can occur and all either they must be specified and justified or we should be allowed to propose any foreseen interaction?

Answer: This question refers to future processing and future requirements. Currently, NRL plans on using VME bus to transfer data from the acquisition system to the real-time processors.

- (6) If the current system is not supposed to directly interact with the Signal Processors then how does the form factor of the recording system matter?

Answer: The recording system will directly interact with the processing boards but these are processing boards that we currently have on-hand. This is why a VME based system is specified in the SOW.

- (7) Does the fact that the proposed system may include future Signal Processing board affect the specifications of the VME chassis required?

Answer: Since the future processing capability utilizes existing boards, that are VME based, the specification calls for a VME system.

- (8) Once again, in Section 9 the Government spells out a particular vendors product. Given the Technical specifications mentioned in the RFP and the Amendment, this company can in fact design a system that meets or exceeds all requirements, using COTS products. However, our solution may not use a Pentek 7131 card. Why would such a system not be acceptable to the Government? Other equally reputable Data Acquisition companies could build Receiver boards with Analog Devices 6645 ADCS, Tuners, FPGAs etc.

Answer: The requirements listed are minimum. The Pentek 7131 is listed as a reference and equivalent or better is understood.