

Questions (This file reflects questions received following release of Amendment 0009 to Solicitation N00024-00-R-6000. For earlier questions and answers, see q&a.doc at www.contracts.hq.navsea.navy.mil/nmci/ under the solicitation documents button.) The most recent questions and answers are posted at the end.

159. Question: Please advise what the Government's plans are regarding continuation of current contracts for hardware that is in scope to NMCI.

Government Answer: It is our intention that the contract resulting from this solicitation provide complete end-to-end information technology services for the DoN. The Government guarantees, subject to the availability of funds, that it will procure at least the minimum quantities specified in Tables 1 and 2 of the solicitation from the NMCI contractor.

160. Question: Regarding Attachment 18 (NMCI Demonstration): Please clarify if the Government personnel need to have hands-on access to any of our demonstrated infrastructures during the demonstration period.

Government Answer: The Government's intent is to observe the demonstrations. We do not require hands-on access to your infrastructure during the demonstration period.

161. Question: Regarding Attachment 18 (NMCI Demonstration): The revised Attachment 18 has removed all requirements for demonstration or discussion of classified network operations. Please confirm that this is the Governments' intent and wish.

Government Answer: The Government does not require demonstration or discussion of classified network operations.

162. Question: Regarding Attachment 18 (NMCI Demonstration): Please clarify the administrative support needs of the Government evaluation team during the demonstration. What level of telephone, email, fax, typing, or other services will the evaluation team require while attending the demonstration?

Government Answer: The Government does not require administrative support while attending the demonstration. However, the Government does request a separate conference room to hold private deliberations.

163. Question: Regarding Attachment 18 (NMCI Demonstration): Section 3.1. Please clarify your intent for actually measuring SLA data during the demonstration. While this paragraph indicates that SLA data should be captured, many of the SLAs of Attachment 2 require a longer measurement period than is available during the 2 days of the demonstration. For the SLAs that require a longer measurement period, can we substitute historic SLA data on the demonstrated infrastructures?

Government Answer: We want to witness how offerors measure and monitor SLAs in circumstances similar to NMCI activities. We also want to witness how offerors periodically roll-up and analyze these measurements and report them to customers. It isn't critical that offerors cover a particular duration. However, although submission of historic SLA data is encouraged, where appropriate, we'd like to see *how* live data is captured to the maximum extent possible rather than just looking at reports.

164. Question: Regarding Attachment 18 (NMCI Demonstration): Section 3.5. We do not understand your intent to demonstrate “correction procedures” as part of the Network Operations and Management. We request you clarify your intent for this phase of the demonstration.

Government Answer: In this phase, we are interested in observing how offerors correct problems. For example, if there is a configuration problem, we would like to see how you identify it, resolve it, and report it.

165. Question: Regarding Attachment 18 (NMCI Demonstration): Section 3.5. We do not understand your intent for offerors to demonstrate “hardware distribution” as part of Network Operations and Management. We request you clarify your intent for this phase of the demonstration.

Government Answer: We would be interested in any live demonstrations, videos, or websites which show how offerors accomplish hardware distribution. If these aren't available due to schedule or location constraints, at a minimum offerors should provide a discussion of how hardware is distributed.

166. Question: If the NMCI program is awarded in Fiscal Year 2000, will FY'00 count as a full program year, thereby effectively reducing five program years to less than sixty (60) months? If yes, can the government delay the program award to October 1st, thereby giving industry 5 full program years (60 months) to amortize costs?

Government Response: It was not the Government's intent to limit the contract base period to less than sixty (60) months. However, that would be the result if work were started in FY'00. Therefore, the Government intends to stipulate in the award that the period of performance will begin on 1 October 2000 (Fiscal Year 2001). This action will not delay contract award but may effect the Initial Operating Capability (IOC) date to no later than 30 September 2002.

167. Reference: Government Response to 166. Question: Should our final proposal price be based upon a 1 October 2000 start date?

Government Response: Yes

Question: Do you intend to amend the Part I, Pricing Table references to FY 2000 minimum quantities?

Government Response: Yes

Question: Do you still anticipate an 18-month interval between contract start and IOC?

Government Response: IOC and its schedule is redefined in Amendment 00012.

Question: Solicitation Part Two, Paragraph 5.3 (2) currently reads that the latest cancellation notification date for Program Year 2 (FY2001) will be 1 October 2001, with sequential subsequent Program Year notification dates. If you intend to stipulate a 1 October 2000 award, will you amend all of the latest notification dates currently cited therein?

Government Response: Yes

168. Question: Amendment 0010 deleted the minimum guaranteed quantities for voice and video seats. Does the Government intend to restore the guaranteed minimums for voice and video seats prior to final proposal submission?

Government Response: No. Because of high fixed costs that must be maintained by the government until all voice seats are transitioned to NMCI, voice phasing must be carefully coordinated across the Department to make the move affordable. Vendor pricing and transition planning will determine the timing and number of voice seats ordered. Vendor pricing will determine the minimum number of video seats ordered.

169. Question: In order to support the final proposal submission, when do you anticipate the release of the NMCI Phase-In Schedule?

Government Response: It will be released with Amendment 0012.

170. Question: *Solicitation, Part One, Continuation of SF 1449:* states "...the contractor shall provide the Government with possession of, and exclusive right to use, the equipment and infrastructure that the Contractor is using to provide NMCI services. However, *Solicitation, Part Two, Paragraph 6.23* states "...the Contractor agrees to provide the Government with the possession of, and the exclusive right to use all equipment and infrastructure dedicated solely to NMCI during the term of the contract. Does the Government intend to clarify this inconsistency?

Government Response: The language of Part One will be amended to be consistent with the language in Part Two.

Question: Since "the equipment and infrastructure that the contractor is using" includes pier points, telephone poles/lines, and other "common use" equipment and infrastructure, wouldn't the narrower definition, "dedicated solely to NMCI," or something similar be more appropriate and result in a more economical solution for NMCI?

Government Response: We agree; the language of Part One will be amended to be consistent with the language in Part Two.

171. Question: *Solicitation, Part One, CLIN Definition for Item 0036AA (and 0136AA):* makes reference to a number of named Japan/US Treaties/Agreements and further states "...other related agreements including the Special Measures Agreement and the Facilities Improvement Program." Can NAVSEA supply a list of "other related agreements?" Can NAVSEA post links to the referenced treaties/agreements on the NMCI Web Site or provide addresses to other Web Sites where offerors can readily access these documents?

Government Response: The NMCI OCONUS Action Collaboration Team has reviewed existing policy that applies to OCONUS implementation of NMCI in the country of Japan. US Forces Japan Policy Letter 70-2 dated 1 August 1985 is recommended as a consolidated view of applicable policies and procedures regarding United States Official Contractors and their employees. This document will be posted to the Information Documents button on the NCMI web site.

172. Question: *Attachment 4, Paragraph 1.1.2.11:* states: "The contractor shall provide IA training in accordance with OPNAVINST 5239.1B for all users and systems administrators." What is the scope of this IA training requirement?

Government Response: OSD set policy that required minimum IA training for all Information System users and system administrators. DoN then promulgated specific policy on same subject. Referenced document (para 9.b.2.f) mandates that all Information System users and system administrators shall receive Information Assurance (IA) awareness indoctrination and annual IA refresher training.

NMCI contractor will be required to provide training to satisfy these mandatory requirements for IA training. Please see SLA 17. The following website also provides information regarding this training:

<http://infosec.navy.mil/TEXT/TRAINING/index.html>

173. Question: Solicitation Document, 6.9.1 - The Contractor shall meet the small business requirement percentages *at contract award*. It is the contractor's interpretation that validation of this requirement is through the normal 294 and 295 reporting processes. Is this correct?

Government Response: It is the Government's intent to measure small business requirements at six months, in accordance with the 294/295 reporting processes.

174. Question: Attachment 2, SLA 1 - 4, Workstation System Performance - "Level of Service (3) : >= 90% relative capability" - Should the "Level of Service (3)" B-value for SLA 1 - 4 read the same as SLA 36C: "As Applicable"?

Government Response: Yes, you are correct. It will depend on whether the mission critical seat requires a basic machine or a high end machine. This will be amended in amendment 0012.

175. Question: Attachment 2, SLA 36C - 1, Technology Refreshment - This SLA essentially requires a refresh schedule for High-End PCs of 18 months and Standard PCs of 32 months based on Moore's Law, which predicts that chip density doubles every 18 months (a corollary for which applies to processor speed also). Both time periods are significantly shorter than the industry-standard refresh rate of 36 months. The shorter periods will have a significant impact on the cost. A 36-month refresh schedule has proven to be the most advantageous refresh period both economically and technologically. Will the Government consider changing this SLA to specify the industry-standard, 36-month, refresh rate?

Government Response: The SLA will be changed in Amendment 0012.

176. Question: SLA - 3, 5, 34 and Attachment 1, Paragraph 2.1 Data Seats - The Government defines the hardware makeup of a hybrid seat this way: "Client hardware is currently supplied in large part via PCs (owned by Reservists) or PCs at their private sector workplace (or school, library, church, etc.)" (Reference: DRM-Attachment 16). Will the Government mandate PKI smartcard readers on Basic and Enhanced hybrid workstations?

Government Response: Yes. The Government will mandate the use of Smart Card readers for hybrid seats in order to provide hardware-token based authentication.

Question: Will the Government allow the establishment of minimum acceptable configurations for hybrid workstation operating systems and hardware?

Government Response: Yes, the Government will allow the establishment of minimum acceptable configurations for hybrid workstation operating systems and hardware.

Question: If the Government does not mandate smartcard readers to hybrid seats, does the Government expect to modify its requirement for hard-token PKI integration with regard to hybrid seat login authentication to the NMCI, including file access, and specific applications such as e-mail?

Government Response: The Government will mandate the use of Smart Card readers for hybrid seats in order to provide hardware-token based authentication.

177. Question: Attachment 1, paragraph 2.1, Data Seats - "DoN will provide smartcards as GFE." Since it is now the Government's intent to provide as GFE the Medium Assurance Common Access Smartcards, and also to provide as GFE all Type 1 encryption devices, will the Government provide as GFE any High Assurance FORTEZZA tokens to be used for Classified Remote Access, DMS, or other requirements?

Government Response: Type 2 devices such as High Assurance FORTEZZA tokens shall be contractor provided as specified in Attachment 4, Para 1.2.1.8, "The Government will provide NMCI Type 1 encryption as government furnished equipment (GFE)." The offeror shall provide COTS Type 2 cryptographic products (e.g., firewalls, VPNs, IDS, etc.) and other COTS products that utilize Type 3 and 4 algorithms, in accordance with the security requirements in the solicitation. The Government will also provide classified keying material (Government Security Policy and Requirements allow dynamic generation of some keys). Government will not retain custodial responsibility for Type 1 encryption products or keying material provided as GFE. The offeror shall be held accountable for encryption products and keying material turned over to contractor's CMS custodians as GFE.

178. Question: Attachment 1, paragraph 3.1.17, change of scope to apply to All Data Seats. - Is it the Government's intent that Unclassified Remote Access Service apply to seat CLIN type 1 (Fixed Workstation Seat) and seat CLIN types 2, 3, and 4? If so, does this imply that the Government will allow Fixed Workstations connected to the network to have external modems, or that it will allow fixed workstations to be disconnected from the network and connected to external modems?

Government Response: It is the Government's intent that all data seats be provided unclassified remote access service as part of the basic service. This implies that every data seat user will be able to access the NMCI data network from remote locations via a local or toll-free call from their personal, home, or other computer. It does not imply that users will disconnect fixed workstations from the network, or that they will be connected to external modems.

179. Question: Attachment 1, paragraph 3.1.2, E-Mail Services & Foreign National Identification. "The contractor will ensure that foreign nationals are clearly identifiable in electronic communications in accordance with DoD directive 5230.20" Will the Government provide foreign national identification within the GFI-provided PKI user profile data for all Government foreign national employees?

Government Response: This data can be provided upon request per segment ordered. Some data may be sensitive or not available therefore not all data may be made available. The data will not be warranted.

180. Question: Attachment 4, paragraph 1.2.1.8, Bulk Encryption - Does the requirement for bulk encryption within the USCINCPAC AOR apply to transmissions occurring between the mainland United States and Hawaii? Will the Government continue to provide as GFE all Type 1 encryption products that may be required for the referenced bulk encryption requirements?

Government Response: Yes, the requirement does apply between the mainland U.S. and Hawaii. Yes, the Government will provide Type One encryption products for those requirements.

181. Question: Attachment 1 - Voice 2.2.3 - Billing & VTC - 2.3.1(k) – Billing - We understand the Government's desire to have local toll costs included in the contractor's price. The variable nature of the costs associated with this requirement are difficult to estimate for inclusion in a fixed seat price. To do so, would artificially raise the seat price. Will the Government please reconsider handling the local toll costs in the same manner as long distance charges?

Government Response: The Government has considered that option; however, we have decided that all local calls must be included in the basic price.

182. Question: Attachment 1 - Section 2.2.4 Voice Seats - Minimum Voice Mail Specifications. Integrated Voice Messaging System (IVMS) - Is it the intention to have the end user maintain individual call distribution lists?

Government Response: Yes.

183. Question: SLA - 21 and Attachment 1 - Section 2.3.1 Video Seats, Upgrades and Services - Please verify that SLA 21 is measured only from the DISN SDP to the desktop or VTC system for forward-deployed personnel. Our understanding is that it is not measured end-to-end from forward-deployed units, because they would use DISN communications for initial transport.

Government Response: You are correct.

184. Question: SLA 9 - Print Service - Performance Category 1: Availability - Performance Measure Description: The measurement is an aggregate and average availability by site of NMCI printers from valid trouble tickets at the Help Desk. Printers are assumed to be available unless there is a trouble ticket at the Help Desk. The computation assumes that printer warm-up time is up time, and that any powered down printer is by pre-agreed scheduled outage, unless due to a malfunction (e.g., toner outages and print medium outages). (Print cartridges and ink drums are considered pre-agreed scheduled outages). Toner cartridges and print media are considered consumables, which we understood to be the responsibility of the Government. The performance measure description appears to be in conflict with this understanding. Please clarify the responsible party for consumables.

Government Response: You are correct. Consumables are out of scope. Printer service outage related to consumables is the responsibility of the government. SLA 9 will be corrected in amendment 12. Toner cartridges have been added as a catalog item

which would allow the Government to acquire the cartridges through the catalog; the contractor is responsible for the installation.

185. Question: *Solicitation, Part Four (b), Instructions to Offerors, Para 2.0, Revised Proposals, Instructions for Completion of Alternate 1 and Alternate 2, Price Proposal, Section 3 - Sale/Exchange Credit:* states: "As the clause at DFARS 252.217-7002 will apply, offerors must clearly show the amount of credit applied towards the overall price for the USN and USMC, separately. With regard to the credit, offerors shall provide a list of credits per location visited during due diligence, and the methodology for determining the remainder of the credits." Do the Sale/Exchange credits contemplated in Section 3 of the Instruction include both: (a) credits or exchange allowances associated with existing property/infrastructure that will not be reused, but rather replaced with new property/infrastructure as contemplated in Part Two, Contract Clauses, Terms and Conditions, Section 6.23; and (b) credits associated with the value of existing property/infrastructure that is reusable at DoN sites?

Government Response: Yes. It is the Government's intent that the contractor take title to all of the Navy's existing infrastructure that will be either reused or replaced. The credit for the infrastructure should be utilized to develop a reduced seat price for each applicable CLIN. However, the solicitation also requires that the contractor keep a separate accounting for the amount of the credit derived from the Navy and Marine Corps.

Question: If Section 3 of the Instruction only refers to credits or exchange allowances associated with existing property/infrastructure that will not be reused, but rather replaced with new property/infrastructure, does the Government expect the offeror to include the value of existing property/infrastructure that is reusable at DoN sites in the per seat prices?

Government Response: It is the Government's intent that the contractor utilize all existing infrastructure in the calculation of the revised seat prices.

Question: If the credits in Section 3 are to be evaluated as part of the price evaluation, how will the Government conduct such an evaluation and comparison of offerors' overall prices given that not all offerors visited the same sites during the due diligence?

Government Response: The Government will not evaluate the individual credits but will evaluate the sum of the revised prices set out in Part Five.

186. Question: *Attachment 1, Para 3.1.15, User Training:* states: "User training shall be made available as a result of the following for any data, voice, or video seat including, as a minimum: ...Move/Add/Change." *Solicitation, Part One, Item 0026, Additional Moves, Adds, and Changes (MAC):* indicates that the user training is not required as a follow-on to this event (see cited references--"Attachment 1, Para 2.52; Attachment 2, SLA 15). Shouldn't "Move/Add/Change" be deleted from Attachment 1, Para 3.1.15?

Government Response: No. Basic seat MACs may require user training. However, the price for those MACs ordered under Item 0026 should include the price of user training.

187. Question: *Solicitation, Part One, Item 0016, Additional Shared File Services:* Amendment 10 deleted Attachment 2 references to basic data seat SLAs and now only invokes

SLA 5. However, it still contains Attachment 1 references to provide all basic data seat services as required for Items 0001-0004. Shouldn't the Attachment 1 reference to "Basic services as provided for applicable data seat" also be deleted?

Government Response: Yes you are correct. The SLA will be amended in amendment 0012.

188. Question: *Solicitation, Part One, Item 0024, Additional Non-classified Account, and Item 0025, Additional Classified Account:* add a third user account, beyond the two accounts to be provided with each data seat, to each data seat. However, there is no requirement to provide basic data seat services and SLA measuring to these additional Accounts. Shouldn't the listed Attachment 1 references include "Basic services as provided for data seat?"

Government Response: Yes you are correct. This will be corrected in amendment 0012.

Question: Shouldn't there be an Attachment 2 reference stating "Same as applicable data seat service levels?"

Government Response: Yes you are correct. This will be corrected in amendment 0012.

189. Question: *Solicitation, Part One, Item 0032, External Network Interface:* invokes Attachment 2, SLA 17 when there is no user training requirement (see Attachment 1 references). Why is SLA 17 included as a reference for this Item?

Government Response: It should be deleted. This will be corrected in amendment 0012.

190. Question: *Solicitation, Part One, Item 0006, Wall Plug Services:* Amendment 10 deleted Attachment 2 reference to SLA 17 but left the User Training requirement (Para 3.1.15) in the Attachment 1 references. Why was the reference to SLA 17 deleted?

Government Response: It should be deleted. This will be corrected in amendment 0012.

191. Question: *Attachment 2, SLA 17, Performance Category 1, Performance Measure Description:* "Formal training will consist of a minimum of 8 hours per user per year. Training execution measures the proportion of the population receiving required and PCO approved training relating to information security. It equals the number of people requiring training divided by the total population requiring training (excluding personnel specifically identified by the PCO)." Shouldn't the last sentence read "...It equals the number of people "receiving" training divided by....?"

Government Response: We fixed this one already; you are correct.

192. Question: *Attachment 2, SLA 17, Performance Category 2, User Training Availability:* "User training availability measures the proportion of population identified as requiring training (e.g. initial NMCI implementation, a change in technology or user interface, identification of user knowledge shortfall and upon contracting officer request) that have received the required training. It is intended that training to support change implementation will be provided prior to

implementation of that change. In this case, measurement occurs at time of change implementation, or five days after identification of training requirement. Is the reference to "5 days after identification of training requirement" intended to be timed from the date of "identification of user knowledge shortfall?" Please clarify.

Government Response: The intent here is to address a number of possible situations; the situations listed are all occurrences that should trigger a training requirement. A change in technology could be an occurrence separate from the identification of a training requirement; each would trigger the requirement for training.

193. Question: In what format do you expect to see revised proposals?

Government Response: The Government desires that revised proposals CLEARLY show what changed from the initial submission. Offerors may use the track changes function (underline, change bars, highlighted, etc.).

Part One: A description of what has changed (including all factors) as a result of discussions and due diligence

- For this part, the Government expects a narrative, or discussion of what has changed.

Part Two: Signed proposal cover sheet and Parts One, Two, Three, and Six of this Solicitation, with all changes (from the Government's baseline) clearly marked. Offerors shall not include prices in Part One.

- For this part, the Government desires that any changes be clearly marked (from the Government's baseline). Change pages, underlined text, or any other method which CLEARLY shows what changes the offeror is proposing are acceptable.

Part Three: Any proposed changes to Attachments 1-10 (i.e., if offeror is not proposing any changes to the attachments, it does not need to resubmit them)

- For this part, the Government desires that any changes be clearly marked (from the Government's baseline). Change pages, underlined text, or any other method which CLEARLY shows what changes the offeror is proposing are acceptable.

Part Four: Any proposed changes to the Small and Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Plan, Deferred Award Plan, Integrated Master Schedule, and Exit Transition Plan (i.e., if offeror is not proposing any changes to the plan, it does not need to resubmit them).

- For this part, the Government expects a narrative, or discussion of what has changed. If the offeror wishes to resubmit the whole plan, it may.

194. Question: We interpret the instructions in Part Two ("Offerors shall not include prices in Part One.") to mean that offerors should submit no prices in any of the parts, plans or attachments prior to the offerors submission of their Final Proposal Revision. Will the Navy confirm this interpretation?

Government Response: The Navy does not expect to see prices in the revised proposals in the solicitation document or any of its attachments or associated plans.

195. Question: Related to Pricing Tables One through Five: Will the Program years 2000 to 2008 be defined in Amendment 11? Will the Navy modify The Pricing Tables to add additional columns to allow for 60 months pricing for the Base Period and 36 months for the Option?

Government response: The Government intends to provide the implementation schedule with Amendment 0012, which should define the program years. We expect the price per service to remain constant over the five year base contract period; similarly we expect the price per service to remain constant over the three year option contract period, if the contract is awarded. For example, if the price for Item 0001 is \$1/month in Program Year One, it shall also be \$1/month in Program Year Five. Different tables are provided for each year to accommodate multi-year contract requirements.

196. Question: Would the Government consider providing a copy of the responses to the recently announced Data Call from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition regarding small business contracts (and specifically IT contracts/subcontracts) or others which may be impacted by implementing NMCI?)

Government Response: The results of the data call can be found on the [NMCI website](#) under Information Documents. It is understood and agreed that this data is being made available to offerors pursuant to their request and that the data is provided in "as is" condition, without any warranty, either express or implied, as to its accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose. Any offeror using this data hereby acknowledges its understanding of these conditions and agrees that the Government will not be liable for any damages resulting from the use of such data, including, without limitation, any claims, whether based upon mistake in bid, superior knowledge, or any other legal theory, for any adjustment in the price and/or delivery schedule on any contract awarded pursuant to this solicitation.

197. Question: Approximately how many communities of interest (COIs) does the Department of Navy have?

Government Response: The DoN has approximately 1,000 COIs. Please see Attachment 1, Paragraph 4.11 for more information regarding COIs.

198. Question: It is our understanding that the RFP does not allow contractors to propose a separate pricing table for CLIN's that will be procured by the three USMC Units located in Japan. Is our interpretation correct? If so, we propose a fixed percentage for CLIN 0036AA. Increasing every CLIN price by the proposed percentage will set the individual NTE prices.

Government Response: You may submit fixed percentages (by subclin) for Item 0036. For Item 0036AA, however, you must submit a not to exceed (NTE)– which must be traceable and derived from your proposed percentages. For evaluation purposes, the NTE for 0036AA will be evaluated, not the proposed price for 0036.

199. Question: Is it correct to assume that when a contractor takes over a claimant's infrastructure under DFARS 217.70, the contractor will be given clear title to the property? This is important when it comes to reselling any equipment not utilized at the time of assumption of responsibility.

Government Response: That is correct.

200. Question: It is our understanding that we are required to establish a separate credit for the Navy and Marine Corps current IT infrastructure. A separate credit for both the Navy and the Marine Corps will be aggregated into a single value and then applied across the appropriate

CLINs in Part 1 of the solicitation. Could you affirm or clarify our understanding of this requirement?

Government Response: As the clause at DFARS 252.217-7002 will apply, offerors must clearly show the amount of credit applied towards the overall price for the USN and USMC, separately. With regard to the credit, offerors shall provide a list of credits per location visited during due diligence, and the methodology for determining the remainder of the credits.

Question: It is our further understanding that the aggregate credits we identify will not be separately evaluated. Only the CLIN prices will be evaluated. Could you affirm or clarify our understanding of this requirement?

Government Response: As previously stated in question 185, the Government will not evaluate the individual credits but will evaluate the sum of the revised prices set out in Part Five.

Question: Lastly, it is our understanding that title for the infrastructure will pass to the contractor at the time of the delivery order and includes but not limited to network components currently titled/owned by the DoN (desktops, servers, printers, office automation software, hubs, routers, switches, voice seats, video seats and cable plant). Could you affirm or clarify our understanding of this requirement?

Government Response: As previously stated in question 185, it is the Government's intent that the contractor take title to all of the Navy's existing infrastructure. The credit for the infrastructure should be utilized to develop a reduced seat price for each applicable CLIN. However, the solicitation also requires that the contractor keep a separate accounting for the amount of the credit derived from the Navy and Marine Corps.

159. Question: Please advise what the Government's plans are regarding continuation of current contracts for hardware that is in scope to NMCI. (New Response)

Government Response: Those contracts that are in place providing an element of IT service that NMCI is to provide for any particular claimant will have expired or been terminated by the Government prior to issuance of the NMCI delivery order. In cases where termination of an existing contract would be required, the Government may provide the name of the contractor to the NMCI contractor in hopes that the NMCI contractor would be able to utilize the contractor's services thereby reducing the termination costs to the Government.