N00024-26-C-5246 DRAFT RFP Q&A

#	QUESTION	PAGE	SECTION	ANSWER
1	Will PEO IWS 6.0 share the latest code base, development tools, and documentation prior to final RFP, upon final RFP release, or not until contract award?	General	General	Source Code will be provided at contract award
2	How many source lines of code compose ECDIS?	General	General	The Navy ECDIS baseline currently comprises approximately 1,670,038 source lines of code.
3	What language(s), framework(s), 3rd party libraries and platform(s) is the ECDIS program built on?	General	General	**Programming Languages:** • C#: Navy ECDIS core code base and majority of software functionality • C++: QPID bindings for communication over AMQP • Shell Scripting Language: installation scripts and other automation • Python: patching scripts • Java: CCD application to receive CCD current data **Frameworks:** • Mono/.NET 4.7.2: Navy ECDIS core code base and majority of software functionality • Java Framework: CCD integration **Third-Party Libraries** • Attached is our third-party library/licensing spreadsheet. See the Master List tab for a list of used libraries.
4	What programming languages are being used (C, C++, Java, Ada, others)?	General	General	•C#: Navy ECDIS core code base and majority of software functionality •C++: QPID bindings for communication over AMQP •Shell Scripting Language: installation scripts and other automation •Python: patching scripts •Java: CCD application to receive CCD current data
5	What frameworks are being used?	General	General	• Mono/.NET 4.7.2: Navy ECDIS core code base and majority of software functionality • Java Framework: CCD integration
6	What 3rd party libraries are being used?	General	General	The third party library list will be provided as part of the GFI for this RFP once access is provided to the Offeror's Library. Once provided see the Master List tab for a list of used libraries.
7	Is Firmware being used, if so what type and how many lines?	General	General	ECDIS does not use any of its own firmware. All functionality is implemented in software.
8	How many open defects are there?	General	General	There are currently 515 open defects
9	Can a copy of the open defects be shared prior to fRFP release?	General	General	No. The Government will provide the defect list at contract award as part of the source code delivery.
10	What is the ECDIS Defect Density?	General	General	Defects per LOC= 0.000308 Defects per KLOC = 0.31
11	How many configurations of ECDIS are there currently?	General	General	1 current baseline of code; 16 different configurations
12	What is the overall architecture (monolith, client-server, micro-services, etc.)?	General	General	ECDIS is architected as a monolithic system
13	Can a block diagram or diagrams that depict the overall existing ECDIS architecture, the different configurations, and different baselines/configurations be shared?	General	General	Yes. The Government will provide the requested architecture and configuration block diagrams.
14	Can a block diagram that depicts the hardware being used be provided?	General	General	Yes. The Government will provide the hardware block diagram.

N00024-26-C-5246 DRAFT RFP Q&A

#	QUESTION	PAGE	SECTION	ANSWER
15	Can the different external interfaces be shared?	General	General	The interface list will be provided in the SRD for this RFP once access is provided to the Offeror's Library.
16	Is the software build single purpose for a single ship configuration or is a software build supporting multiple ships but configured using a install configuration file/json file?	General	General	A single software baseline supports all ship configurations through configuration-specific installation parameters.
17	What databases are used (type, version, schema layout)?	General	General	ECDIS uses CouchDB and a Government-owned database responsible for electronic chart management.
18	In order to provide the most accurate pricing within the communicated RFP response timeline, it would be valuable to have a access to the Navy ECDIS Hardware BOM prior to RFP release. Will the Navy be making the Navy ECDIS detailed BOM / TDP availabe prior to RFP release?	General	General	All relevant attachments will be provided with final RFP.
19	Note K defines a number of SOW tasks that should be included in the Hardware and Software end item costs. SOW tasks 3.7 was not included in that list. Should it be?	7	Section B, Note K	3.7 will be added to Note K
20	Will the GFI necessary to appropriate scope out the testing effort, such as Acceptance Test Procedures, Safety Production Assurance Plan, Tech Review Manual, be provided with the RFP release?	48	5.3.4 - Testing	All GFI necessary to scope the testing effort—including Acceptance Test Procedures, Safety Production Assurance Plan, and the Technical Review Manual—will be provided with the RFP release.
21	SOW requires EQT testing in support of any tech refresh and obsolescence updates developed under the contract. Due to the unknowns of obsolescence and tech refresh requirements this is not an appropriate task to be included in a FFP CLIN (CLINs x003, x004, x005, x007, x008)	48	5.3.4.4 - Environmental Qualification Testing	The Government considered your recommendation; however, it believes the existing SOW structure appropriately assigns EQT testing for tech refresh and obsolescence updates outside the FFP hardware-delivery CLINs.
22	Are the 5.1.3 FCA and 5.1.4 PCA tasks intended to be included in the CLIN 0001 (first article unit) price?	45	5.1.3 - Functional Configuration Audit / 5.1.4 Physical Configuration Audit (PCA)	Yes, per the requirement in 5.1.2.1
23	The full intent of Table 2 is not clear. If the integrated peripheral pricing is included in Note B - Table 1 then why is there a need to separately call it out in this table.?	1	Note B - Table 2	This table shows how many of each item (e.g., racks, computers, displays, laptops/ENL) are required in Versions 1, 2, and 3, while Note B – Table 2 establishes the pricing structure when the Government orders additional peripherals, either as stand-alone items or integrated into a selected version.
24	CLINs x014 Hardware Repairs indicate a Price of 1 hour. Is this the correct level of effort that should be proposed?	7 thru 20	Section B table	This effort is by TI. Hours are assigned at the time of work assignment if exercised. This should be 1 Lot.
25	Will the System / Software / Hardware requirements be provided as GFI in database format such as DOORS upon contract award?	General	General	The Hardware TDP and source code will be provided via Government repositories at contract award.

N00024-26-C-5246 DRAFT RFP Q&A

#	QUESTION	PAGE	SECTION	ANSWER
26	There are several aspects of the current RFP structure that incentivize the contractor to assume unacceptable risk under the firm-fixed-price CLINs. As currently structured, the proposal is likely to result in less favorable unit pricing to the Government and increases the risk that the selected bidder may face financial hardship due to factors beyond their control—primarily which options the Government elects to exercise and prevailing market conditions. This outcome is inconsistent with the objectives of firm-fixed-price contracting and, in combination, places the Navy ECDIS program at risk. The following remarks provide specific recommendations related to this concern. - The computing equipment market, particularly for memory, has been highly volatile over the past year. Establishing fixed stepladder pricing for this equipment over a five-year period requires the contractor to incorporate anticipated market volatility into its pricing and assume the risk of further disruptions. We recommend that the terms of the fixed-price hardware CLINs include an annual material cost assessment to support accurate system pricing in the proposal and throughout execution. Without such a provision, the system prices in these proposals will reflect the contractor's individual risk tolerance rather than the underlying system cost. - A 90 day ordering window for additional quantities (systems and spares) will require the contractor to increase material escalation in the proposal and in some cases defer material procurement in execution, negatively impacting cost and schedule. Recommend	General	General	The Government acknowledges the concerns raised; however, the current FFP structure is intentional. Stepladder pricing, the 90-day ordering window, and the PM hour allocation are required to support fleet scheduling and traceable hardware-delivery pricing. The Government does not intend to add material-cost adjustment provisions, modify the ordering window, mandate simultaneous CLIN awards, or add a separate PM support CLIN. Offerors should propose pricing and PM staffing consistent with their technical approach and anticipated option-exercise scenarios.
27	Related to the forthcoming Evaluation Factors for Award (Section M). We recommend the Government's final RFP evaluation criteria explicitly recognize offerors' demonstrated experience and proven performance developing, producing, and integrating Navy ECDIS, including successful partnership with IWS 6, ownership of Navy ECDIS development and modernization, and ongoing CRADA-based alignment with NGA's future electronic charting products. We further recommend that the evaluation metrics prioritize offerors' ability to leverage existing adjacent Naval charting efforts, clearly define a multi-year roadmap to ECDIS modernization and virtualization within a Navigation as a Service architecture, and established labs, tools, personnel, and HW supplier relationships that mitigate schedule and cost risk. Emphasizing these criteria will ensure selection of a low-risk, best-value solution that can begin performance on day one and confidently deliver Navy ECDIS capabilities across all baselines.	General	General	The Government will take your reccomendation under consideration.
28	Note M states that integrated peripherals will be 'subsumed' within the AN/SYN-1 hardware. Please define 'subsumed'; what level of integration is required?	7	B Note M	In Note M, "subsumed" means that the price of any integrated peripheral identified in Note B – Tables 2A–2D is included within the associated AN/SYN-1 Hardware CLIN price and is not ordered as a separate deliverable. When the Navy selects an AN/SYN-1 version that incorporates an integrated peripheral, that peripheral is delivered as part of the fully integrated system configuration, with all required functional, physical, interface, and interoperability integration completed by the contractor

N00024-26-C-5246 DRAFT RFP Q&A

#	QUESTION	PAGE	SECTION	ANSWER
29	Notes L and N state "All tangible assets and residual material acquired, developed, fabricated, or otherwise generated in the performance of NON-RECURRING COSTS shall be delivered to the Government upon completion of the CLIN. The Contractor shall not retain, dispose of, repurpose, or otherwise use any such items without prior written authorization from the Government. Upon delivery, such items shall be recorded and administered as Government Furnished Property (GFP) in accordance with applicable property management requirements. Title to all such assets shall vest in the Government at the time of delivery." While this is appropriate for Cost type CLINs, the FFP CLINS (X0003, X0004, X0005, X0006, X0007, X0008, and X0012) are required to deliver only the specified end items and should not be beholden to this requirement.	7	B Note L & N	The Government has removed all references to these notes from the FFP CLINs (X003, X004, X005, X006, X007, X008, and X012)
30	Please clarify the system quantities included in the CLIN Qty Table beginning on Page 7. Is this the Govt's Best Estimated Quantity (BEQ)? If not, is a BEQ table available?	7	B CLIN Qty Table	The quantities shown in the CLIN Qty Table are the Government's estimated quantities for planning purposes. Hour-based CLINs (e.g., 16,000 hours; 6,350 hours) will be treated as Not-to-Exceed (NTE), and unit quantities (e.g., hardware "Each" quantities across CLINs 0003–4005) reflect the Government's current mission-need estimates.
31	"The contractor shall ensure all deliverables, processes, and artifacts comply with the most current versions of these documents." Is the contractor to comply with the versions of documents as dated in the RFP?	23	C 2	The Government will identify in the RFP the most current versions of the referenced documents that offerors are required to use for proposal development. During contract performance, if the Government determines that newer versions of Government-Furnished Information (GFI) or other referenced documents should apply, the Government will issue a contract modification to incorporate those updates. The contractor will then comply with the updated versions as directed in writing by the Government.
32	Many of the 3.x tasks are explicitly marked "Applicable to All CLINs" and are executed continuously (management, meetings, risk, CM, security, DMSMS, ILS coordination) regardless of where the program is in the production cycle. Further, many of these activates relate directly to software and hardware sustainment and would reasonably be conducted under the Engineering Support (x009, x010) CLINs. The inclusion of these continuous activities further escalate the pricing issues noted in Comment 1. Recommend these activities be excluded from the FFP CLIN pricing to ensure the Government realizes the lowest possible system price. Please clarify which CLIN should contain these costs.	26 - 33	C 3.x	The comment is noted. The Government will consider the recommendation regarding allocation of continuous activities across CLINs.
33	Many of the tasks described in section 3.x are non-recurring (e.g. Post Award Kickoff, numerous plan CDRLs (A001, 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 13, 16, 20, 21)). The inclusion of these non-recurring activities within optional production CLINs requires the contractor to include these costs in multiple CLINs further escalating the pricing issues noted in Comment 1. Recommend these activities be excluded from the FFP CLIN pricing to ensure the Government realizes the lowest possible system price. Please clarify which CLIN should contain these costs.	26 - 33	C 3.x	The comment is noted. The Government will consider the recommendation regarding non-recurring activity allocation.
34	Please clarify the intended role and scope of AUKUS partners in this effort. Which components, services, or phases are envisioned for AUKUS participation, and how should Offerors reflect this in teaming and export-control planning?	29	C 3.8	There is no direct AUKUS involvement in this effort as of the time of RFP

N00024-26-C-5246 DRAFT RFP Q&A

#	QUESTION	PAGE	SECTION	ANSWER
35	Please confirm under which CLIN(s) (e.g., hardware engineering support x010, repairs x014/x015, or separate NRE) the Government expects Offerors to propose resolution of obsolescence management issues.	32	C 3.11	Obsolesence applies to all CLINS, as part of the production CLINS and as part of the engineering services that support production clins.
36	Potential typo, item #5 appears to be a continuation of the sentence in Item #4 which was inadvertently captured as a separate deliverable.	35	C 4.3	This formatting error has been corrected
37	The scope and cost allocation of the EQT effort are unclear. "If faults or failures are discovered in the first article unit, the Contractor shall retest the repaired FAU at no additional cost to the Government, until all FAU acceptance criteria are met." Exit Criteria for FAU requires passing of EQT (in accordance with section 5.3.4.4.) and PCA. 5.3.4.4 does not appear to address EQT of the FAU design, only tech refresh and obsolescence updates. The TDP is Govt provided, and the EQT requirements of the baseline design are not explicitly stated. Please specify the EQT requirements and confirm under which CLIN(s) the Government expects Offerors to propose EQT testing costs and the cost of any redesign or system rework costs.	46 & 48	C 5.1.2, 5.1.2.1, 5.3.4.4	The SOW was al updated and EQT added in both FFP section and the Engineering SRVCS section with modified language.
38	Please confirm under which CLIN(s) (e.g., hardware engineering support x010, repairs x014/x015, or separate NRE) the Government expects Offerors to propose the non-recurring engineering and infrastructure required to establish the DSOR capability.	49	C 5.3.6	DSOR will be aligned to repairs
39	CDRL A044 is cited as both Item Control Drawing and Interface Control Document. Which is correct?	34 ,37 & 49	C 4.2, 4.9, 5.4	CDRL A044 is the Interface Control Document. Any citation referring to A044 as an Item Control Drawing is an error and will be updated to reflect that A044 corresponds to the ICD deliverable.
40	Identify the part numbers associated with the peripherals in table J-10	N/A	J-10	***Response will be provided at a future date.***
41	How should the Offerors reflect quantity discounts in the peripheral pricing?	N/A	J-10	The peripheral pricing table has been updated
42	Note E (Section B, ¶ following Note D) and SOW ¶3.1 - ("Exhibit A") Note E and SOW ¶3.1 reference "Exhibits A and B" for CDRL data requirements, but Section J's List of Exhibits only includes Exhibit A (DD Form 1423). Please confirm whether Exhibit B exists and should be added, or whether the reference to Exhibit B should be deleted.	6 & 26	Section B / Section C	Exhibit B does not exist. The references in Note E and SOW ¶3.1 to “Exhibits A and B” are incorrect and will have updated to read “Exhibit A and Supplement A1.”
43	Note M (CLIN X006 series) and Note B / Note B - Table 2 (Attachment J-10) - Note M states standalone peripherals are ordered under the CLIN X006 series priced per "Note B," with detailed pricing deferred to draft Attachment J-10 (Note B - Table 2). Unlike CLINs X003/X004/X005 (Note A/B Tables 1–3) and X007/X008 (Tables 4–5), Section B contains no consolidated pricing table for X006. Please confirm the intended pricing structure and whether a Section B table will be added.	8	Section B	Attachment J-10 has been revised to break out standalone peripheral pricing and integrated peripheral pricing. A consolidated Section B pricing table for CLIN X006 will not be added as X006 is located in Attachment J-10 rather than Section B.
44	Note H (CLINs 0009/0010/0014 area — Provisioned Item Orders) Note H states Offerors shall not propose pricing for Provisioned Item Orders (PIOs), yet also states the PIO profit rate is "to be completed at award based on the Offeror's proposal." Please clarify how a profit/fee rate is to be established if PIO pricing itself is not proposed (e.g., is a separate rate card or profit methodology to be submitted?).	6	Section B	Offerors shall not propose PIO pricing. The Government provides the Government Cost Estimate (GCE) for CLIN 9800. The PIO profit rate is established by the Offeror separately, as a single proposed profit percentage (not to exceed 6%), which will be incorporated at award and applied to all future PIOs.

N00024-26-C-5246 DRAFT RFP Q&A

#	QUESTION	PAGE	SECTION	ANSWER
45	Delivery Schedule table, CLIN 0001 series vs. CLIN 0003-0005 series - The delivery matrix shows FOB Destination as "Contractor" for CLIN 0001 series and "Government" for CLIN 0003–0005 series, with no stated rationale tied to CLIN type. Please confirm this distinction is intentional and explain the basis (risk of loss/title transfer implications differ by term).		Section F	The FAU under CLIN 0001 will be delivered to the Contractor's facility for Government inspection and First Article acceptance, so the correct term is FOB Destination (Contractor). Production units under CLINs 0003–0005 are delivered to Government custody, so FOB Destination (Government) applies.
46	CLIN 0009AA / 0010AA pricing lines; SOW ¶5.4 (Engineering Support) - CLIN 0009AA (Software Engineering Support) shows 16,000 hours vs. CLIN 0010AA (Hardware Engineering Support) at 6,350 hours, both CPFF, with no stated basis of estimate. Can the Government confirm or provide the basis/rationale for this hour allocation to support accurate proposal planning?	9 & 77	Section B / Section C	The labor hours associated with Engineering Support CLINs (0009AA and 0010AA) are Government-provided estimates. Offerors shall use these hours as stated and shall not propose alternative quantities. These hours reflect the Government's anticipated level of software and hardware engineering support required for evaluation and award purposes.
47	DFARS 252.204-7021 (CMMC clause); cf. Section J, Attachment J-1 (DD Form 254) - The draft cites CMMC Level 2 compliance across CLINs. Please confirm this scoping is consistent with the classification level identified in the DD Form 254 (Attachment J-1, SECRET) and the intended IT/CUI boundary for this effort.	124	Section H	CMMC Level 2 applies to the contractor's unclassified/CUI environment, while the DD254 governs SECRET-level classified work, and these represent separate, consistent security boundaries for this effort.
48	SOW ¶5.7, Technical Data Package (TDP) — "third-party integration Contractor" clause - The SOW's reference to a "third-party integration Contractor" (¶5.7, TDP paragraph) suggests a multi-party performance model. Please confirm whether this will be a single-award contract or a multiple-award/IDIQ construct (e.g., separate hardware producer and software sustainer), and clarify how responsibilities and interfaces will be divided.	51-52	Section C	This will be a single award
49	SOW ¶5.7, Technical Data Package (TDP) — GPR clause ("at a minimum GPR") - Section C, ¶5.7 states GPR "at a minimum" is required for both software and the TDP. Is the Government open to considering alternative data rights structures (e.g., negotiated GPR terms, tiered rights by component) as an evaluated discriminator, as in the 2017 solicitation's Subfactor 1, or is GPR now a fixed floor with no evaluation credit for exceeding it?	51-52	Section C	The Government is not considering alternative data-rights structures
50	Supplement A-1, TDP Option Selection Worksheet - Will the Government release the baseline TDP (Section J, Supplement A-1, TDP Option Selection Worksheet) prior to the Final RFP so Offerors can assess technical scope, existing configuration baseline, and GFE/GFI completeness ahead of proposal preparation?	N/A	Section J	The TDP will be in the Offeror's Library with the final RFP
51	SOW ¶5.7, Technical Data Package (TDP) — GPR/proprietary markings clause - Has the Government confirmed, through review of delivered data rights assertions (DFARS 252.227-7017) from the incumbent and any prior contractor(s), that the complete Navy ECDIS TDP is presently in the Government's possession with at least GPR and free of proprietary or restrictive markings? Please identify any portions of the TDP for which a prior contractor has asserted limited/restricted rights, or for which data has not yet been delivered.	51-52	Section C	The Government has secured the necessary data rights for the complete Navy AN/SYN-1 ECDIS TDP. No portions of the required TDP are encumbered by limited/restricted markings, and no outstanding data deliveries remain.
52	SOW ¶5.7, Technical Data Package (TDP) — GPR/proprietary markings clause - Section C, ¶5.7 states the TDP shall be maintained "without any proprietary markings" and with at least GPR. Is this a statement of the current, verified data rights status, or an intended future status the Government expects to achieve (via negotiation, license, or assertion challenge) prior to Final RFP release? If the latter, what is the timeline and mechanism for closing any gap?	51-52	Section C	The data-rights language in Section C ¶5.7 applies solely to the deliverables required under this solicitation. It is not a statement of future Government action. The Government already holds the data rights needed to compete this requirement, and no additional rights-acquisition steps are planned.

N00024-26-C-5246 DRAFT RFP Q&A

#	QUESTION	PAGE	SECTION	ANSWER
53	SOW ¶5.7, Technical Data Package (TDP) — GPR/proprietary markings clause - Can the Government confirm whether the incumbent, or any other prior Navy ECDIS software/hardware contractor, has asserted proprietary rights, restrictive legends, or limited/GPR-only markings on any technical data, source code, or hardware TDP elements now represented as part of this consolidated procurement's Government-furnished baseline? If such assertions exist or have existed, what is their current resolution status?	51-52	Section C	See the answer to question #51
54	SOW ¶5.7, Technical Data Package (TDP) — GPR/proprietary markings clause -Given that this draft newly consolidates hardware production (AN/SYN-1, S-IBS) into the same contract as software, has the Government validated that the hardware TDP — drawings, manufacturing process data, qualified-parts/source-control data — carries the same GPR baseline as the software TDP, or does any portion remain proprietary to a legacy contractor? If proprietary hardware data exists, will a new Contractor be required to independently reverse-engineer or re-develop it, and how will that risk/cost be allocated in the SOW and pricing structure?	51-52	Section C	The data-rights requirements in this RFP apply solely to the deliverables required under this solicitation. The Government has already secured the rights necessary to effectively compete both hardware and software production under the consolidated baseline.
55	Supplement A-1, TDP Option Selection Worksheet - Will the Government release the actual TDP inventory/index (not merely the Option Selection Worksheet) prior to the Final RFP so Offerors can assess, item by item, which technical data is confirmed Government-owned/GPR versus data that may still require license or negotiation with a third party?	N/A	Section J	The TDP will be released with the final RFP
56	DFARS 252.227-7037, Validation of Restrictive Markings (clause to be incorporated by reference) - Has the Government exercised, or does it intend to exercise, a challenge under DFARS 252.227-7037 (Validation of Restrictive Markings) against any assertions related to the ECDIS TDP, and if so, what is the current status or outcome of that challenge?	N/A	Section I	See the answer to question #51
57	Attachments J-2 (ECDIS Production GFE List) and J-3 (ECDIS Production GFI List) - The draft references Attachments J-2 (GFE List) and J-3 (GFI List) as governing the hardware and software baseline, but these were not included in this Draft RFP release. Can the Government release these lists (even in draft form) to allow Offerors to assess GFE/GFI completeness, condition, and delivery timing risk before the Final RFP?	N/A	Section J	GFE and GFI will be released with final RFP
58	Attachment J-4, Spares Price List - Will the Spares Price List (Attachment J-4) structure and quantities be shared in advance, given that spares pricing appears tied to the same stepladder methodology used for hardware CLINs?	N/A	Section J	Spares price list will be released with final RFP
59	Is there a ceiling or "not-to-exceed" total quantity across the life of the contract for each hardware configuration (the draft cites 160 units for AN/SYN-1 variants and 40 for SIBS Gen), and if so, is that ceiling expected to change between Draft and Final RFP?	N/A	Section B	See SECTION B NOTE A: Overall NTE for total AN/SYN-1 quantities for all configurations combined is 160. NTE for all SIBS configurations combined is 40.
60	SOW ¶5.7, Technical Data Package (TDP) — "third-party integration Contractor" clause - "Total Contract Quantities" table (following Note A tables) - Can the Government describe the anticipated role, scope, and contractual relationship of the "third-party integration Contractor" referenced in the TDP management paragraph? Specifically, will this be a separate prime contract, a Government integration function, or a subcontract relationship managed by the hardware/software producer?	51-52	Section C	This section will be revised prior to RFP release

N00024-26-C-5246 DRAFT RFP Q&A

#	QUESTION	PAGE	SECTION	ANSWER
61	Will Crane (or another Navy organic activity) retain any role in integration, assembly, or test under this consolidated contract, or is that function being fully transitioned to the awardee?	N/A	Not referenced in solicitation	
62				
63	What is the purpose of B-216-H0006 and how should a contractor fill this out		Section B	The B-216-H006 Fee Table establishes the fixed fee associated with each CPFF labor CLIN. The Offeror must complete all sections marked "Offeror to Complete." To do this, the Offeror divides its proposed cost for the CLIN by the Government-specified labor hours to calculate the Cost per Hour, and divides its total proposed fee by those same labor hours to calculate the Fee Rate per Hour. This table only sets the fixed fee and provides the Government with a normalized "loaded hourly rate" for planning purposes. It is not a billing rate table and does not cap actual allowable labor costs under CPFF. Contractors will still bill actual allowable cost in accordance with FAR Part 31. Although the table does not control billing, the Government uses it to establish funding for Technical Instructions, ensuring consistent application of cost and fee when adding hours to LOE CLINs.
64	Will Crane (or another Navy organic activity) retain any role in integration, assembly, or test under this consolidated contract, or is that function being fully transitioned to the awardee?	N/A	Not referenced in solicitation	Unanswered, However I (Tania) offer the following explanation:: NSWC Philadelphia is the ISEA and both NSWC Philadelphia and NIWC LANT are Navy ECDIS Partners.