

**Nationwide Automatic Identification System  
Increment 2, Phase 1  
Friday, February 08, 2008  
Batch No. 3**

**Tracking ID:** 14

**Subject:** Other

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/11/2008

**Section:** Other Specific Paragraph: Proprietary: No

**Comment:** US Department of State recently released its DDTC Case CJ 290-07 ruling stating that the NAIS Systems for Maritime Defense Awareness falls under the International Traffic and Arms Regulation (22 CFR 120-130) on the assessment that “while based on commercial function, the system has been adapted and configured for military application – maritime defense awareness.” It is designated as a defense article under category XI(b) of United States Munition List (USML). Offeror is requesting the USCG provide clarification as to application of this decision to the current NAIS Increment 2 RFP as the RFP does not require ITAR controls. **RECOMMENDATION:** Offeror recommends that the USCG evaluate the ruling and provide guidance on its applicability to the NAIS Increment 2 RFP, and if deemed applicable, amend the RFP accordingly to allow bidders the opportunity to assess the impact and adapt the ruling to their proposals as time is of the essence.

**Response: It is the responsibility of each offeror to determine for itself how the ITAR impacts its proposal or would impact its contract with the Coast Guard. The ITAR may impact one offeror differently than it impacts another offeror, and so each offeror must carefully assess whether it needs to seek licensing. Applicability of the ITAR to any offeror’s proposal or contract and the determination of commodity jurisdiction is within the competence of the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Directorate of Defense Trade Controls, U.S. Department of State. Offerors are reminded that NAIS will provide functionality to support the five mission areas of the Coast Guard: Maritime Safety, Maritime Security (including Maritime Domain Awareness and Port Security), Maritime Mobility, National Defense, and Protection of National Resources as described in Subsection 1.1 of Section J.2 Performance Specification. Offerors should not rely solely upon the representation set out in the comment referring to “Maritime Defense Awareness” or upon the particular referenced ruling.**

**Tracking ID:** 22

**Subject:** Other

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/11/2008

**Section:** Section L - Instructions **Specific Paragraph:** L.4.15 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Does the Coast Guard contemplate release of the redacted proposals beyond that required by the Freedom of Information Act (as limited by FAR 24.202)?

**RESPONSE:** We decline to speculate about what form a public disclosure request would take or about how the Coast Guard would address such request, except to say that the Coast Guard anticipates that it would act in compliance with existing laws and regulations. Offerors should redact only what is necessary and sufficient to protect information that is proprietary or is a trade secret. Undisciplined, excessive or blanket redactions increase the Coast Guard's administrative burden of complying with laws and regulations governing public disclosure.

---

**Tracking ID:** 23

**Subject:** Other

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/11/2008

**Section:** Section L - Instructions **Specific Paragraph:** L.4.15 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Will redacted proposals of non-successful bidders be made available to the public?

**Response:** Please see response provided for Tracking ID Number 22.

---

**Tracking ID:** 42

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/14/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.6.1.0-1 and -2

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Is the 100 msec latency stated in J.9-Encl\_3 and Encl\_4 the average or maximum end-to-end latency?

**Response:** The 100 msec latency stated in J.9-Encl\_3 and Encl\_4 is the maximum latency between CGDN+ routers. This does not include latency associated with the LAN and other infrastructure beyond the routers.

---

**Tracking ID:** 44

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

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

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC   **Specific Paragraph:** 3.7.3.0-2   **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Can the government supply a use case example to clarify the requirement in Attachment 2-PSPEC, paragraph 3.7.3.0-2?

**Response: Every AIS Message received will be maintained uncorrupted as it is transported through the network from the moment an NAIS base station receives a message until it is stored and archived. The purpose of requirement 3.7.3.0-2 is to ensure the data integrity of all NAIS data once it is stored. Specifically, the NAIS shall alert database and system administrators of any modification or deletion of an AIS Message once it has been received or transmitted by the system.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 45

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

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

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC   **Specific Paragraph:** 3.8.2.0-19 b.   **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please clarify that NAIS is required to transmit messages to vessels in VTS areas.

**Response: Yes, NAIS must be able to transmit messages to vessels in VTS areas.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 47

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

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

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC   **Specific Paragraph:** 3.8.3.0-3   **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please clarify that the interface standards of the a. through g. systems are IEC standard or that they will supply their data to the standard defined in 3.8.3.0-1.

**Response: NAIS should be able to receive data that complies with IEC 62320-1. Other interfaces that do not comply with this standard will be adapted by the Government to meet the interface provided by the Contractor.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 51

**Subject:** General System Performance Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/14/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.2.5.0-7 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Will the USCG PSS network router and CGDN+ be configured to support IPv6 at time of installation of the Delaware PSS for core delivery?

**Response:** The CGDN+ PSS network router may not be "configured" to support IPv6 at the time of installation of the Delaware Bay PSS for core delivery. However, the CGDN+ (or OneNet) PSS network router will be IPv6 "compatible/capable" by the time of Delaware Bay PSS core delivery.

---

**Tracking ID:** 57

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/14/2008

**Section:** Section H - Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:**

H.10

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offeror noted that within H.10 clause there are FAR Clauses that appear to incorrectly cite the "Changes Clause. Some sections as H.4 and H.6 cite the CHANGES-COST-REIMBURSEMENT clause as FAR 52.243-1. The correct citation is FAR 52.243-2. The improper citings of FAR clauses creates confusion in the applicability of H.10 clause as a whole. RECOMMENDATION: Offeror recommends that the citations and or Titles be corrected to reflect the correct applicable FAR clauses.

**Response:** The correct citation for the CHANGES-COST-REIMBURSEMENT clause is FAR 52.243-2. An amendment will be issued to make this correction to the RFP.

---

**Tracking ID:** 66

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 - SOW

**Specific**

**Paragraph:** 3.1.1.5.2.4.2, 3.1.1.5.4.4.3, and 3.1.1.5.2.7

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** CDRL 1.5.2.1.4.1 referenced in Paragraphs 3.1.1.5.2.4.2, 3.1.1.5.4.4.3, and 3.1.1.5.2.7 of the SOW is not on the CDRL listing or contained in the SOW. Is this a misprint and should read CDRL 1.5.2.4.1 Maintenance Requirements Package - Reliability Centered Maintenance?

**Response:** Paragraphs 3.1.1.5.2.4.2; 3.1.1.5.2.4.3; and 3.1.1.5.2.7 of the SOW should reference CDRL 1.5.2.4.1, not CDRL 1.5.2.1.4.1.

The CDRL references will be corrected within the SOW in an Amendment to the RFP.

**Tracking ID:** 72

**Subject:** Enterprise Services Performance Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.8.1.0-1 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** The Final PSPEC makes no mention of Internet connectivity. Is the USCG planning to enable/migrate all external access to CGDN and/or OneNet, or will NAIS continue to support external access over the Internet? If the latter, is this true for just business partners, or will USCG receiver sites continue to connect via the Internet?

**Response:** The Government expects that there will continue to be internet connectivity to the NAIS, either with existing Increment 1 sites or future Increment 3 feeds. As mentioned in attachment J.2 – PSPEC section 1 – Introduction, section 3.1 – Design Constraint, and section 3.1.3 – DHS OneNet & CGDN+, in order to minimize Total Life-Cycle cost (TLC) while meeting operational requirements for the NAIS Project, it is expected that the development of NAIS Increment 2 will leverage existing USCG and DHS IT infrastructure and capabilities (including CGDN+/OneNet). If a PSS without OneNet or CGDN+ connectivity is recommended, the contractor shall follow the procedure identified in attachment J.1 – SOW section 3.1.1.4.9.6 – Network Connectivity Agreements with reference to section 3.1.2.2.1 - Sector Survey and Coverage Design Deliverables and Services.

**Tracking ID:** 74

**Subject:** Enterprise Services Performance Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.8.1.0-1 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Is it required to allow unencrypted Internet access (no VPN) to NAIS services?

**Response:** No. The requirement is to allow controlled exchange of NAIS data with other systems, not unencrypted internet access to the data or services.

---

**Tracking ID:** 83

**Subject:** Design Constraints

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.2.1.0-4 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Services shall be discovered. Will the CG or DHS be providing a Service Registry for this function? If so what will its capabilities be?

**Response:** As described elsewhere in the PSPEC, the USCG SOA and the mechanism of service discovery is undetermined at this time. Both DHS and the USCG have SOA infrastructure development programs currently underway, but the architecture and application components for this infrastructure have not been defined. The Offeror should assume a service registry will be made available, but they should define their services in such a way as to also permit access to service components without a registry (e.g., direct calls, hard-coded interfaces).

---

**Tracking ID:** 90

**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:** The subcontractor goals identified in L.8.4.2 refer to a percentage of "total direct cost", and the table/template at L.8.4.4 refers to "percent of total subcontracted amount". Is it correct to assume that "total direct cost" is referring to the subcontracted portion of the total contract effort (including options and all sub-CLINs)?

**Response:** Yes.

**Tracking ID:** 92

**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:** Is "NAIS " and "NAIS information" used in this paragraph of the solicitation limited to government system contained NAIS and NAIS information? Or, is a background investigation (as defined in DHS MD 11050.2) required of any person who has access to NAIS or NAIS information on the contractor's systems? Can you clarify the scope of "NAIS" and "NAIS information" for this purpose?

**Response:** This requirement specifically targets contractors and sub-contractors working on the NAIS project. "NAIS" points to access to the system at whatever stage of development it may be in and "NAIS information" is any information related to the project (drawings, test data, etc). Personnel that are granted access to the system itself or other project documentation will need to be properly reviewed.

**Tracking ID:** 97

**Subject:** Technical Design

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 - SOW

**Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.4.9.

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** What are the ". . . additional component design requirements." mentioned in this requirement.

**Response:** The additional component design requirements refer to subparagraphs that follow paragraph 3.1.1.4.9 of the SOW, namely Sections 3.1.1.4.9.1 through 3.1.1.4.9.7, which are in addition to the performance requirements provided in the PSPEC.

**Tracking ID:** 104

**Subject:** Sector Survey and Coverage Design

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/15/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 - SOW

**Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.4.7.2

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** SOW 3.1.1.4.7.2 states that "worst tropospheric and weather conditions" are accounted for. Taken together with PSPEC 3.3.3 Coverage, implies that under no circumstance (ie, zero probability) will Channel Performance be less than PSPEC. Please define "worst" tropospheric and "worst" weather conditions.

**Response:** SOW Section 3.1.1.4.7.2 should read as follows: "The Contractor shall develop an analysis that clearly demonstrates to the Government that probable environmental conditions have been incorporated into the Contractor's design. RF propagation analysis shall not depend upon any tropospheric or weather conditions to extend the radio horizon, increase coverage or improve propagation in order to meet PSPEC coverage requirements. This analysis shall be included as an appendix to the SDD and shall be utilized in developing the Master Test Plan (see SOW Section 3.1.1.8.2.1)." An amendment will be issued to the RFP to reflect this wording.

**Tracking ID:** 112

**Subject:** Other

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/16/2008

**Section:** Section L - Instructions

**Specific**

**Paragraph:** L.4.10 PAGE SIZE AND FORMAT.

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** The RFP states, in para (1) that the standard text font shall be no smaller than 12 points Times Roman. In para (2) we read "...For tables, charts, graphs and figures, the text shall be no smaller than 8 point." In preparing schedules using MS Project we find line descriptors, milestones and so on often are often less than 8 points when we produce tables and graphs that fit the page size limits (i.e. 8.5 by 11; 11 by 17). when we produce MS Project materials. Will the government accept standard, legible MS Project descriptors less than 8 point when this occurs?

**Response:** Yes, the Government will accept standard, legible MS Project descriptors less than 8 point when this occurs.

**Tracking ID:** 113

**Subject:** Technical Design

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/16/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 - SOW

**Specific Paragraph:**

SOW 3.1.1.5.9. Facilities. **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Third Subparagraph (bold font added for emphasis) states: "The Contractor shall develop Sector PSS Site As-Built Documentation (CDRL 2.2.6) showing any construction required and installation for each site. The Sector PSS Site As-Built Documentation shall provide a detailed description on how the installation of NAIS will be implemented. This plan shall take into account the requirement that Increment 1 NAIS capability remain fully operational until the Increment 2 installation is fully operational and transitioned, as appropriate." This paragraph mixes As-built Documentation and "Planning" requirements. Design/Installation documents do not usually provide planning data as called for in this paragraph, and conflicts with the detailed requirements spelled out in SOW 3.1.1.7.2. Core System As-Built Documentation (CDRL 1.7.2). Would the government please clarify its expectations for the as-built drawings versus installation plans or transition plans?

Response: **The third paragraph of Section 3.1.1.5.9 of the SOW should read as follows: "The Contractor shall develop Sector PSS and SCC Site Specific Design (CDRL 2.2.2) showing any construction required and the installation plan for each site. The Sector PSS Site Installation Planning Documentation shall provide a detailed description of how the installation of NAIS will be implemented. This plan shall take into account the requirement that Increment 1 NAIS capability remain fully operational until the Increment 2 installation is fully operational and transitioned, as appropriate."**

**Additionally, the first sentence of the fourth paragraph of this section should read: "**

**Upon USCG approval of the Sector PSS and SCC Site Specific Design (CDRL 2.2.2), satisfaction of NEPA requirements, and completion of required real property actions the Contractor will be authorized to commence construction (as required) and installation work."**

**An amendment to the RFP will be issued to reflect this wording.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 142

**Subject:** Testing and Evaluation

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 - SOW

**Specific Paragraph:**

3.1.1.8.2.3.3.7

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** SOW Paragraph 3.1.1.8.2.3.3.7 states, "Prior to deployment or implementation at the IOC sectors, the Contractor shall complete the installation, configuration, and deployment of the NAIS core capability at the SOC, EDC and three AIS PSSs and two LSSs. Upon completion of the aforementioned activities, the Contractor shall perform DT&E in the presence of the Government to ensure that the Contractor's engineering design meets the PSPEC. Compliance with NAIS requirements at the completion of this DT&E is the precursor to deployment and testing of the IOC sectors." However, SOW Paragraph 3.1.1.8.2.3.3.2 states, "The Contractor shall plan, coordinate, and conduct DT&E activities in the IOC SCCs and their associated PSSs, LSSs, and NAIS installations." Does the Government intend to require DT&E at completion of Core and at completion of IOC (twice)?

**Response: Yes, the Government expects that DT&E would be conducted as required by the referenced sections of the SOW and per the approved Master Test Plan.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 143

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC

**Specific Paragraph:**

3.2.4 and 3.2.5

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** For cost estimating and interface design and development purposes, what company is the developer/manager of the Coast Guard's current Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) and Key Management Infrastructure (KMI)?

**Response: PKI and key management programs are managed by the Coast Guard Telecommunications and Information systems Command (TISCOM). These programs follow a combination of DHS and DOD policies.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 146

**Subject:** Site Equipment for Post-IOC Sectors

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section J - Attachments

**Specific Paragraph:**

Attachment J7

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** - I-1 EQUIPMENT OFFERED FOR POTENTIAL I-2 USE: Microsoft SQL Server Licenses are stated as available for potential use. However in reviewing the USCG IT standards both Microsoft and ORACLE are stated as preferred databases. Please advise if ORACLE is also available as part of the potential I-2 Use?

**Response: Please see response provided for Tracking ID Number 36.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 147

**Subject:** Site Equipment for Post-IOC Sectors

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section J - Attachments

**Specific**

**Paragraph:** In Attachment J7 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Attachment 7 lists a computer processor: Part Number Systems GS-LCD? Please provide the configuration of this device? 1. Mainboard 2. Memory 3. Hard Disk / Flash 4. Operating System.

**The following information is applicable to the GS-LCD Fanless Computers at Increment 1 sites:**

**Systems are equipped with:**

**1.5GHz processor**

**1GB RAM**

**80 GB hard drive**

**Windows XP Professional (Service Pack 2) O/S.**

**Additional information on this equipment is available in Enclosure 8 to the Technical Library (Attachment J.8) at the following location:**

**Directory: "Subsystem Documentation - Receiver - Vendor Documentation"**

**Document "SolidLogix GS-LCD Site Controller Rev 1[1].pdf"**

---

---

**Tracking ID:** 149

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section L - Instructions **Specific Paragraph:** L.8.4.1 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** : L.8.4 is the Small Business Utilization section and. FAR 19.7 is Small Business Subcontracting Program. L.8.4.1 is asking for a program subcontract plan to be delivered and references FAR 19.704. Is the USCG requesting a subcontracting plan or to ensure that the Small Business Plan address the topics in FAR 19.704 and 19.702?

**Response:** As stated in L.8.4 of the RFP, Offerors shall submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan in accordance with FAR 19.704, FAR 19.702 and FAR 52.219-9.

---

**Tracking ID:** 152

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section L - Instructions **Specific Paragraph:** L.2.3. **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** L.2.3. states that such salary and fringe benefits is required of the professional people who will be working the program. Offeror is not clear as to the level of "professional status" the USCG is looking for on the requirement and the format of the information that is requested. RECOMMENDATION – Offeror recommends that the USCG further clarify and define "professional" and whether "professional" relates to the list of Key Personnel requested elsewhere in the RFP and explain the USCG preferred format for the compilation of the

**Response:** L.2.3. restates the FAR clause, FAR 52.222-46 which requires the submittal of a compensation plan for professional employees. The term "professional employee" is defined within the clause by reference to 29 CFR 541, more specifically 29 CFR 541.300.

**Tracking ID:** 153

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0 **Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section L - Instructions **Specific Paragraph:** L.3.8 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** L.3.8 States that "Use of the E-Verify program for this purpose will be considered a strength under the Management Capability and Approach factor." Offeror is seeking clarification whether an alternative employment verification process is acceptable to meet this requirement.

**Response:** The Coast Guard encourages the use of E-Verify as an employment verification tool. That is why its use will be treated as a strength under the Management and Capability Approach Factor. Use of an alternative will not be considered a strength.

**Tracking ID:** 154

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section F - Deliveries or Performance

**Specific Paragraph:**

F.1.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offeror notes that in F.1.1 for FAR 52.242-17, USCG indicates the applicability of the FAR clause to a FFP Item. This designation will help further clarify the applications of these clause to the various contract Type efforts within the RFP. RECOMMENDATION: Offeror is requesting that such designation be considered for each of the other incorporated FAR clauses in the various RFP sections noting as "Applicable to FFP Items Only." or "Applicable to Cost Type Items Only."

**Response: If the FAR cite does not indicate a specific CLIN type, it's applicable to all, but please read each clause to determine its relationship to the RFP and your proposal.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 155

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section H - Special Requirements

**Specific**

**Paragraph:** H.2 and I.15

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offeror has noted that there is potential for an ambiguity between H.2 and I.15 (HSAR 3052.215-70) regarding replacement of Key Personnel.

RECOMMENDATION: Offeror recommends that H.2 and I.15 (HSAR 3052.215-70) be consolidated into one provision regarding replacement of Key Personnel.

**Response: Provision H.2 of Section H will be deleted from the RFP via an amendment. However, Offerors shall indicate the name of the person being proposed for each Key Personnel position in Section I.15. Additionally, Section I.15 will be amended to include the NAIS Project Resident Office as a Key Facility.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 160

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/18/2008

**Section:** Section H - Special Requirements  
H.12

**Specific Paragraph:**

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Offeror notes that Section H.12 may not clearly reflect the reference to “change order” as referenced by FAR Part 2 as we believe that the appropriate FAR clause as a clarifying Ref should be FAR 2.101 RECOMMENDATION: Offeror requests that Section H.12 as follows to be consistent with the definition of “change order” as defined in FAR Part 2: “1. a change made pursuant to a written order designated as a “change order” [as defined in FAR 2.101.]”

**Response: The term “change” provided in Section H.12 of the RFP will remain as written.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 164

**Subject:** Testing and Evaluation

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 - SOW

**Specific**

**Paragraph:** 3.1.1.8.2.3.3.3 and 3.1.1.8.2.3.3.4

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Given that the government may provide the test vessel as substitute, will the government provide costs for offeror’s use of a government test vessel?

**Response: Please see response to Tracking ID Number 109.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 165

**Subject:** Logistics Planning and Design

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 6 - WBS

**Specific Paragraph:** Diagram

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Should the callout of SOW paragraph 3.1.3.1.3 for Initial Logistics Support Deliverables & Services be SOW 3.1.3.2?

**Response: Yes, the block identifying Initial Logistics Support on the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) provided as Attachment J.6 should refer to SOW Section 3.1.3.2. Attachment J.6 will be revised to reflect this change in an amendment to the RFP.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 169

**Subject:** Core System Implementation

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 - SOW **Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.4.9.4.2 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Please state what existing system operation tool suites are currently implemented at the NAVCEN SOC for the required system operation tool suite integration.

**Response:** The SOC uses a web based thin client developed by OSC in addition to other applications found on the Coast Guard Standard Workstation including RDP to monitor and control I-1 sites, servers, and client connections. Additional information on the SOC monitoring tool is providing in the Technical Library, Attachment J.8.

---

**Tracking ID:** 171

**Subject:** Core System Implementation

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 9 - DESIGN CONSTRAINTS

**Specific**

**Paragraph:** J.9-Encl\_2 General

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** General How many workstations are provided at SOC for operator use? Workstations were not listed on the I-1 equipment list, J.7-Existing I-1 Equipment.

**Response:** Currently, there are two (2) Coast Guard standard workstations at NAVCEN for NAIS I-1 SOC use. However, these units were intentionally excluded from Attachment J.7.

---

**Tracking ID:** 172

**Subject:** Design Constraints

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC

**Specific Paragraph:** 3.2.5.0-2

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Does requirement 3.2.5.0-2 require the contractor to provide the message gateway to upgrade NAIS information?

**Response:** Please see response to Tracking ID Number 71.

---

**Tracking ID:** 176

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.9.3.0-3 b. **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Does the display of messages between two vessels in PSPEC Para 3.9.9.0-3b refer to only addressed messages?

**Response:** The requirement 3.9.3.0-3 covers display of all messages. The use case in question demonstrates the minimum robustness expected (ability to filter to show just the messages between two vessels) The primary purpose is so that an incident could be easily recovered and replayed. In this case, that implies that the messages are addressed. However, that does not negate the requirement that all messages are viewable.

---

**Tracking ID:** 179

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.2.7.0-2 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** For purposes of system design, the first paragraph, Receive and Transmit AIS Messages, states "...For instance, in the event where one of the physical shore stations (PSSs) becomes inoperable and some part of the required coverage is lost..." If the offeror's design allows one PSS to become inoperable, but no part of the required coverage is lost, is this situation still considered a loss of availability?

**Response:** If the loss of one Physical Shore Station (PSS) does not reduce AIS receive and transmit coverage area or performance levels below threshold levels defined by the PSPEC, it would not be considered a loss of operational availability.

---

**Tracking ID:** 181

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC

**Specific**

**Paragraph:** 3.3 also 3.8.2.0-12 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** With regard to receiving messages from SAR aircraft, what are the transmit and receive PER rates per geographic area?

**Response:** There are no threshold AIS receive and transmit coverage requirements associated with air-based platforms (e.g., SAR aircraft). The AIS transmit and receive requirements and coverage verification constraints are defined in Section 3.3.3 and 3.3.4 of the PSPEC, respectively.

---

**Tracking ID:** 185

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC

**Specific**

**Paragraph:** 3.2.3.0-3, Table 3.1, 3.2.2.0-10

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Table 3.1 calls for systems survivability max wind gusts of 140 knots and operable to 100 knots. Also, Para 3.2.2.0-10 calls for Towers and Supporting Structures to comply with ANSI/TIA-22-G-2005, which requires design velocities to be a function of location and can be lower. Please clarify.

**Response: Table 3.1 provides the threshold design requirements, which must be met in all cases. If, based on location, ANSI/TIA-22-G-2005 calls for greater design velocities, the higher design velocities shall be used.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 187

**Subject:** Logistics Planning and Design

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 - SOW

**Specific**

**Paragraph:** 3.1.1.5.6.2 Paras a. and b.

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Support Equipment Selection Criteria – We have been unable to identify the existence of any specific list of “Standard/Preferred USCG” or “Standard/Preferred DoD” support equipment items as identified in Paras a. and b. Please clarify.

**Response: The Coast Guard uses NAVSEA's Test Measurement and Diagnostic Equipment Index (TMDE) as its list of standard/preferred support equipment. The TMDE will be added to the tech library. Note: this database is updated frequently and this will only be posted once with the current version.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 188

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC Documents

**Specific Paragraph:** 2. Reference

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** We have been unable to locate Reference Document 2.1.4, MDA COI Fact Sheet: Maritime Domain Awareness Data Sharing Community of Interest. Please provide.

**Response: A new link to the Maritime Domain Awareness Data Sharing Community of Interest is available at the following link:**

[http://www.naisproject.net/NAIS\\_External/NAISdiscussion/rfp2/sections/Section\\_J/MDA-COI-Data.pdf](http://www.naisproject.net/NAIS_External/NAISdiscussion/rfp2/sections/Section_J/MDA-COI-Data.pdf). **The PSPEC will be updated to provide accurate link to reference in an amendment to the RFP.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 189

**Subject:** Testing and Evaluation

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 - SOW      **Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.8.2.5      **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Para a. references a "quality program plan." We cannot find any additional references to this plan. Please clarify.

**Response: The "Quality Program Plan" should read "Quality Assurance Plan". This Section of the SOW will be revised under an Amendment to the RFP.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 190

**Subject:** Project Management

**Question Number:** 0      **Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

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

**Comment:** The RFP requests staffing information "including information requested in L.3.1.8." Section L.3.1.8 does not exist. Please provide updated reference.

**Response: Please see response for Tracking ID Number 67.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 191

**Subject:** Project Management

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/21/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 - SOW **Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.1.1.4-8 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** The Government has allowed for degrees in multiple fields of study for some key personnel positions (i.e., Project Manager, Lead Logistician, and Environmental Manager). However, the degree requirement for the Lead Systems Engineer and Lead Software Engineer positions is strictly limited to one field of study. In light of the fact that systems engineering and software development is a skill more typically acquired through experience or certification and that multiple technical degree fields are available for software engineering (e.g., Computer Science), would the Government broaden the educational requirements to include B.S. degrees in related fields of study and/or equivalent specific experience or certification?

**Response: The SOW should read as follows:**

**“3.1.1.1.1.5 .....The Lead Systems Engineer shall hold a B.S. degree or higher in the field of systems engineering or related engineering discipline and have at least 5 years experience managing systems engineering projects of similar size and complexity.**

**3.1.1.1.1.6 .....The Lead Software Engineer shall hold a B.S. degree or higher in the field of software engineering, computer engineering, or computer science/applied computer science and have at least 5 years experience managing software development projects of similar size and complexity.”**

**The SOW will be revised in an amendment to the RFP.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 192

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/22/2008

**Section:** Section H - Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:**

H.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** In regard to the SAFETY Act, in the Coast Guard's Responses to Frequently Asked Questions, Question 8, updated August 23, 2007, the Coast Guard stated it was "currently preparing a Procurement Pre-Qualification Request to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to issue a Pre-Qualification Designation Notice." Please advise on status of this request.

**Response: The DHS SAFETY Act Office has completed its assessment of our Pre-Qualification Request and determined that the successful Offeror may participate in an abbreviated SAFETY Act application process.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 193

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/22/2008

**Section:** Section H - Special Requirements

**Specific**

**Paragraph:** H.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Will the Coast Guard amend the RFP to add SAFETY Act Pre-Qualification if it receives such notice from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS)?

**Response: No amendment is required. Please see response to Tracking ID Number 192. The provision provided in Section H.1 is applicable given DHS' review and determination.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 194

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/22/2008

**Section:** Section H - Special Requirements

**Specific Paragraph:**

H.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Does the Coast Guard plan to work with the DHS to expedite and streamline the SAFETY Act process for review of applications for NAIS technologies proposed by the successful offeror?

**Response: Pursuit of designation under the SAFETY Act is the successful offeror's responsibility; the Coast Guard will not intrude upon DHS implementation of the Act.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 195

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/22/2008

**Section:** Section L - Instructions

**Specific Paragraph:** L.8.3.1

**Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** For past performance, please verify that the total number of relevant contracts to be submitted is five (5). Otherwise, should we submit five (5) contracts for the Offeror and up to five (5) contracts each for each major subcontractor?

**Response: Please see response provided under Tracking ID Number 28.**

**Tracking ID:** 196

**Subject:** Other

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/22/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 - SOW **Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.2.7.3 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** For costing and development/design purposes, please provide the respective language and SLOC counts for the following Data Processing Subsystems (DPSS) modules: AISSource, AISMultiserver, AISUser, DPSS Parser, and SOC Web Tool.

**Response: Approximate SLOC counts are provided as follows:**

<b>Application:</b>	<b>Source Lines of Code:</b>	<b>High Level Language:</b>
<b>AISMultiserver V1.10</b>	<b>27,684</b>	<b>C++</b>
<b>AISSource V1.1.0</b>	<b>6,914</b>	<b>Java</b>
<b>AISUser V1.1.0</b>	<b>5,460</b>	<b>Java</b>
<b>DPSS Parser</b>	<b>10,356</b>	<b>Java</b>
<b>SOCV2 + (Data Access Layer)</b>	<b>21,410</b>	<b>C# and ASP.Net</b>
<b>MMS-Parser</b>	<b>5,349</b>	<b>Java</b>

---

**Tracking ID:** 198

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/22/2008

**Section:** Attachment 17- PAST PERF **Specific Paragraph:** **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** The sample Client Authorization Letter called out in Paragraph L.8.3.5.1 is missing from Attachment J.17. Will the Coast Guard provide a sample Client Authorization Letter as an update to the RFP. When will the update be released?

**Response: The sample Client Authorization Letter is page 6 of 6 of Attachment J.17. However, it is identified as “Transmittal Letter To Accompany Past Performance Questionnaire”.**

---

**Tracking ID:** 199

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/22/2008

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

**Comment:** Paragraph L.8.3.3.i refers to a list of Key Personnel from Paragraph L.10.3. Please clarify if the requirement is to list Key Personnel that performed the cited contracts or to identify if one or more of the five Key Personnel proposed for NAIS worked on the cited past performance contracts, or some other requirement.

**Response: Please see response provided under Tracking ID Number 68.**

**Tracking ID:** 200

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/22/2008

**Section:** Section L - Instructions **Specific Paragraph:** L.2.6 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Is it necessary to firewall all employees who have performed work on NAIS Increment 1 contracts or on contracts that involve information relevant to NAIS from the contractor's NAIS Increment 2 proposal teams in order to mitigate OCI? Has the Coast Guard determined it would be sufficient mitigation to do so?

**Response:** It is the responsibility of each offeror to determine for itself whether its work on a past or an existing Coast Guard contract creates an actual or potential OCI with regard to its proposal. Paragraph L.2.6 (c) calls for an offeror to disclose and address OCI issues in its proposal.

---

**Tracking ID:** 201

**Subject:** General Contractual Requirements

**Question Number:** 0

**Comment Date:** 1/23/2008

**Section:** Section L - Instructions **Specific Paragraph:** L.8.3.5.1 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** Customer's response to Question 17, states that "no more than five (5) past performance references shall be submitted for the Prime Contractor; and the same requirement is applicable to all major subcontractors." In accordance with Sec. L .8.3.5.1, please clarify in your answer whether the word "references" refers to a total of five (5) POCs questionnaires to be received from the Prime plus five (5) Total questionnaires from each of the major subs. For example: If Prime Contractor has 5 POC questionnaire references plus 2 major Subs (10) POC questionnaire references = a total of up to 15 past performance questionnaires to be submitted, or does it mean Prime Contractor with up to 5 contracts x 2 POCs questionnaires = 10 PP questionnaires for Prime Contractor plus the same for each of the major subs (2) which would equate to a total of up to 30 PP questionnaires to be submitted.

**Response:** Please see response provided under Tracking ID Number 28.

---

**Tracking ID:** 204

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0                      **Comment Date:** 1/24/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 - SOW **Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.1.3.7.2.4.3 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** If a Federal Agency has an existing connection to OneNet or CGDN, is approval required for NAIS to exchange information with that Agency indirectly over CGDN or OneNet?

**Response:** Permission to exchange AIS data is independent of whether an agency can connect to CGDN+/OneNet. While this capability would theoretically simplify the process, any potential consumer of AIS data from the system would have to demonstrate a bona fide need that would be vetted through the program sponsor (Commandant (CG-761)).

---

**Tracking ID:** 205

**Subject:** Performance Specification Requirements

**Question Number:** 0                      **Comment Date:** 1/24/2008

**Section:** Attachment 2 - PSPEC **Specific Paragraph:** 3.9.2.0.1 **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** The document referenced in the HSI section, IEC 62288, is still in CDV (draft format) and is therefore unavailable. Is the Coast Guard going to provide a copy of this document?

**Response:** Potential bidders from the US can obtain the document (80/492/CDV, International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) Committee Draft for Voting standard 62288 Ed.1) upon membership in the US National Committee Technical Advisory Group for IEC TC80. The website <http://www.navcen.uscg.gov/marcomms/iec.htm> provides information on how to join the USNC TC80 TAG. There is a small yearly individual membership TAG fee (approximately \$300) which will be invoiced by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), who manages the US national Committee and is the US representative to IEC. Upon membership, we will send the bidder a copy of that draft standard. Potential bidders from outside the US should contact their IEC member organizations for information concerning participation in TC80 and obtaining the document. See <http://www.iec.ch/cgi-bin/procgi.pl/www/iecwww.p?wwwlang=e&wwwprog=membrs3.p>.

**Tracking ID:** 206

**Subject:** Physical Shore Station Performance Requirements

**Question Number:** 0                      **Comment Date:** 1/24/2008

**Section:** Attachment 1 - SOW   **Specific Paragraph:** 3.1.2.2.3.2   **Proprietary:** No

**Comment:** It is unclear how the 7 PSS types are to be allocated across the two specified SOW categories 3.1.2.2.3.2, and 3.1.2.2.3.3. Does the Coast Guard have guidance for how to distribute the PSS's to existing USCG equipment/sites, and non-USCG equipment/sites?

**Response: SOW section 3.1.2.2.3 outlines the equipment site equipment requirements for the different site types. It is not intended to imply a distribution of site types. The government provided, in the tech library, information about existing Coast Guard infrastructure. The distribution is considered part of the design effort.**

---