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This amendment is raised to address the following:

- To respond to questions received during the solicitation period; and
- To revise the solicitation accordingly, as applicable.

Questions and Answers

Q59 In regards to the subject Solicitation, Section 4.1.1.2 “Bidder Experience”, #3 indicates that in order to use the experience of the Bidder’s subcontractors the Bidder must include a copy of the teaming agreement. What if the subcontractor is an existing subcontractor on another program, can the Bidder provide a (partial) copy of a signed subcontract as evidence of an existing relationship with that subcontractor?

A59 No. A (partial) copy of a signed subcontract as evidence of an existing relationship with that subcontractor does not meet the requirement outlined in Section 4.1.1.2 of the RFP.

Q60 Re: Amendment # 4 response from PWGSC – Response to question 30 (Q30) - Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA): In question Q30 reference is made to “…However there are several data items to be submitted as part of the tender bid process that are dependent on the FMEA analysis that is only due at CDR…?” The response, A30, was limited to the criteria for R12 through R16 and allowed bidders to assume that the equipment used is available 100% of the time. As part of the information to be provided in response to ATTACHMENT 3 -SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION, part 6, the Bidder is required to submit with their proposal a written analysis that demonstrates that life-cycle management has been considered in the design of the Ground Segment solution, such as forecasting the need for spares and repair parts; sourcing parts with particular attention to parts obsolescence, counterfeit parts and long lead time items. Among other things, part 6 requires the identification of failure modes of the proposed solution.

- The response to part 6 in its entirety is also in advance of the CDR submission of the FMEA. How does the Crown reconcile the requirement to respond to this section with the statement in Answer 30 that “… An FMEA is not required as part of the bid submissions…”?
- Similarly the mandatory requirement M11 requires demonstrate through engineering design analysis that the proposed Ground Segment solution meets the required availability performance in section 6.9.7 of the ISS SOW. This also requires that an FMEA be carried out prior to the submission of the proposal. How does the Crown reconcile the requirement to respond to this mandatory requirement with the statement in Answer 30 that “… An FMEA is not required as part of the bid submissions…”?

A60 The wording in ATTACHMENT 3 SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION paragraph 6 states that “The Bidder’s proposal should include a written analysis that demonstrates that life-cycle management has been considered in the design […].” It is thus not mandatory for the proposal to include an FMEA. However, sufficient information regarding the life-cycle management of the proposed system should be included in order to support and document the assumptions used in the availability and performance analyses included in the proposal.

If an FMEA is not provided, the Bidder’s assumptions with regards to the system’s maintainability (i.e. mean time between failure and mean time to repair) will have to be documented in the proposal. The engineering design analysis also needs to be linked to the sparing and maintenance concept (i.e. preventative and corrective) at each site to demonstrate that the availability and performance requirements can be achieved.
Q61  Is the Crown able to provide the topographic survey data with ground contours for the River Bend and Happy Valley sites in order for the bidders to complete preliminary site grading plans and determine the extent of the earthworks required for the project?

A61  Canada does not have such data and will not be providing it to the Bidders as part of the solicitation.

Q62  As per Section 3.1 Bid Preparation Instructions – Could you confirm Section I Technical Bid and Section IV Supplemental are to be provided separately bound.

A62  Section 1 Technical Bid and Section IV Supplemental Information could be provided either: bound together; or separately bound.

Q63  Can you please explain the changes made to mandatory criterion M6 in amendment 004 to the solicitation?

A63  In Amendment 004 to the solicitation, the mandatory criterion M6 was amended to remove the terms “in standalone mode” and “for Canada’s Area of Responsibility” because these terms conflicted, in some cases, with the conditions specified in associated sections of the DBAC SOW (i.e. 6.4.2.3 to 6.4.2.10). For example, the coverage area specified in section 6.4.2.6 is less than Canada’s Area of Responsibility. Similarly, the requirements in section 6.4.2.7 are not intended to be met in standalone mode. The changes made to M6 remove any ambiguity but they do not change the underlying system requirements, which remain unchanged.

Q64  Please confirm DND will procure all spares required for Corrective Maintenance based on the DND approved RSPL for the in-service support period of performance.

A64  The cost of all initial spares must be included in the firm all inclusive price and the initial spares must be delivered in accordance with paragraphs 7.4.1.3 and 7.4.2.2 of the DBAC SOW. The quantities and types of initial spares must be documented in the RSPL that must be submitted and approved at the CDR. The initial spares delivered must be sufficient to support the system for 2 years after commissioning based on the system’s Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA). Beyond this initial 2-year period, the procurement of spares, including the replenishment of spares to be used during the initial 2-year period, will be performed by Canada using the data provided in the RSPL and is not to be included as part of the firm all inclusive price proposal. For the purposes of this solicitation, Bidders can assume that Canada will procure all items included in the approved RSPL.

Q65  Could you please confirm the Quality Plan should be included with Section I Technical Bid.

A65  This question was already answered as part of Amendment 004 Q29. To re-iterate: the Bidder must submit a Quality Plan with the bid and the Quality Plan will be reviewed at the kick-off meeting.

Solicitation Revisions

1.  At Attachment 1 – Technical Evaluation Plan, Appendix B – Mandatory Criteria, Mandatory criteria M11, MEOLUT Equipment Availability:

   DELETE:

   The Bidder must demonstrate through engineering design analysis that its proposed Ground Segment solution meets the required availability performance in section 6.9.7 of the ISS SOW:
a) 98% or greater for each MEOLUT.
b) 99% or greater for each Network Location Processor.

INSERT:

The Bidder must demonstrate through engineering design analysis that its proposed Ground Segment solution meets the required availability performance in section 6.7.9 of the ISS SOW:

a) 98% or greater for each MEOLUT.
b) 99% or greater for each Network Location Processor.

______________________________

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME