

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT
MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

Comments - Commentaires

Vendor/Firm Name and Address
Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Electronics, Simulators and Defence Systems Div.
/Division des systèmes électroniques et des systèmes de
simulation et de défense
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
8C2, Place du Portage
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Naval Remote Weapon Station (NRWS)	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W8472-125389/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8472-125389	Date 2012-02-27
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$QF-101-21857	
File No. - N° de dossier 101qf.W8472-125389	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2012-04-30	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Specified Herein - Précisé dans les présentes Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Michael Rancourt	
Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 101qf	
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-3930 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-0767
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée
Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)	
Signature	Date

Question on Annex A to Letter of Interest

- (1) **Question:** Table of Contents for Annex A is not consistent. Suggest that major sub-paras for section A-6 in particular be included as in other sub-paras for consistency. Also, Appendix 1 to Annex A is not listed in the Table of Contents.

Answer: The entire document will be reviewed and where necessary, corrected prior to re-release. This point will be considered.

- (2) **Question:** A-1.3 Overview, pg 4/25, last sentence: Typo; replace "mange" by "manage".

Answer: The entire document will be reviewed and where necessary, corrected prior to re-release. This point will be considered.

Question: A-1.5 List of Acronyms & Abbreviations, pg 5/25: Several acronyms are missing (FAT, IMS, VCRM, ICD-C, SDWP, LRA, LRR, LLTIL, etc.).
Additionally, inclusion of a list of definitions for any project-specific terms would ensure clarity where similar terms may be in common use elsewhere.

- (3) **Answer:** *Should an RFP be released. Missing acronym definitions will be provided. Inclusion of a list of definitions of project specific terms is a good suggestion.*

- (4) **Question:** A-2.2 References, pg 6/25-8/25: Is it the intention of the GoC to provide suppliers with electronic copies of, or links to, these documents during the response period to this LOI as a matter of course or only upon specific request? It is suggested that the intent regarding accessibility to these references be included in the draft LOI.

Answer: Should an RFP be released in the future, Canadian Government owned documents may be provided upon request. Acquiring MIL or commercial standard or any other publicly available documents will be the responsibility of individual companies.

- (5) **Question:** A-3.1 Project Management Program, pg 8/25: The second para beginning "The Contractor shall,..." is unclear as written. Suggest word "include" replace "including" in this sentence. Additionally, the same acronym used for both Project Mgt Program and Project Mgt Plan in para A-3.2. Suggest PMP be restricted for use as Project Mgt "Plan" and reconsider the requirement for the use of an acronym for Project Mgt Program.

Answer: The entire document will be reviewed and where necessary, corrected prior to re-release. This point will be considered.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W8472-125389/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

002

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

101qf

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

W8472-125389

File No. - N° du dossier

101qfW8472-125389

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

(6) Question: A-3.2 Project Management Plan, pg 8/25, second line: "including" is used twice. Delete one.

Answer: Agreed, Thank you for pointing out.

- (7) **Question:** A-3.8 Integrated Logistics Support (ILS) Meetings, pg 10/25: First sentence as written is unclear. Suggest, "This meeting shall" be deleted and replaced with "to".

Answer: The entire document will be reviewed and where necessary, corrected prior to re-release. This point will be considered.

- (8) **Question:** A-3.10, Environmental, Health and Safety Management, Page 10/25: Notes that ILS in Annex D of this LOI. No Annex D is included with LOI, and in the LOI itself on pg 3/12, it states that Annex D will be the Ship installation "Green" and Red" zones. According to the document, Annex B contains ILS information. Request clarification.

Answer: It should be Annex B and will be corrected.

- (9) **Question:** A-4.3, A-4.4, A-4.5, pg 11/25: NWRS is used several times rather than NRWS. Suggest replace with NRWS for clarity and consistency.

Answer: Typo, thanks for pointing that out.

- (10) **Question:** A-4.5 Acceptance, pg 11/25: What objective evidence of compliance does the Crown intend to request for the RFP?

Answer: As described and detailed on pages 12/25 - 13/25 in section A-4.5.

- (11) **Question:** A-4.6 Technical Data Package, pg 13/25: While it is recognized that this is an early draft, this section requires significantly more details before it is released as part of the RFP. Items such as ILS conferences, DID and CDRLs will need to be specified along with the standards for data, drawings etc DND requires. Suggest it be carefully reviewed and refined.

Answer: CANADA is actually working through the detailed definition and wording of these documents, even at this early stage in the process. The major goal of mentioning it here was only to highlight to industry that, if there is an RFP, CANADA may request these deliverables, meetings and conferences.

- (12) **Question:** A-6 NRWS Weapon System, pg 15/25: Para A-6.2 (Ability to Mount Other Weapons) speaks only to being able to mount other weapons currently held in DND's inventory. This would seem to preclude a requirement to be adaptable for weapon advances and modernization which is contrary stated intent of App. 1 to Annex A, para 2.4 Concept of Operations. The sentence states "It is intended that the Remote Weapon System will be to mount the current M2 .50 Cal HMG in addition to the 7.62mm general purpose machine gun, the 5.56 machine gun, a 40mm grenade launcher and weapons." Suggest that A-6.2 be modified to recognize that the ability to mount other current and future weapons is a requirement.

Answer: *Clarification: Should an RFP be released, we would be seeking only to mount the .50 cal HMG and 7.62mm with a minimum of hardware change, as well as the option to mount 5.56 mm weapons and 40 mm grenade launcher. As of today, it is not in the project mandate to introduce a new weapon, new ammunition or increase existing ammunition allocation (for example for a gun that is compatible with Phalanx ammunition) onboard ship, but creativity and creative propositions welcome.*

- (13) **Question:** A-7 Human Engineering/ Health & Safety, pg 25/25: There seems to be considerable information missing from this section such as Assessment requirements and standards such as ISO Environment 14001 and DND Environmental assessment manuals, etc. It is also recommended to add the Environmental, Health and Safety Impact Report (EHSIR) as part of deliverables. Furthermore, there does not appear to be a defined link between 4.6 Environmental sustainability and 4.7 Safety and Health, and SOW A-6.4.20. Recommend that this area be reviewed and reconciled for clarity and consistency.

Answer: *Section A-7, A-4.6, A-4.7 and A-6.4 .20 are being reviewed and re-written to provide for clarity and consistency. Although most documents and Standards that CANADA will reference and request compliance with are listed; it is recognized that there may be inadvertent omissions that need to be included.*

Appendix 1 to Annex A to Letter of Interest

- (14) **Question:** 2.4 Concept of Operations, pg 9/30: First para states that "...the operator will be on the bridge." While recognizing that this section is speaking conceptually, is it the GoC's intent that there be a single operator's and that there would not be secondary or tertiary consoles in the event battle damage or multi-angle swarm attacks which may overwhelm a operator?
- console
of
single

Answer: *The current requirement is one console per weapon mount and one operator per console, with the capacity of each console to operate any mount (with a selectable switch for example). The preferred location for the consoles is the bridge, subject space availability. There is no requirement to provide redundant consoles. battle damage be such that none of the consoles remain operational, it is unlikely that the mounts would be functional either. In any event, there option of manually operating them.*

to
Should
highly
remains the

- (15) **Question:** 2.5 Concept of Support, pg 10/30: The final RFP should be more definitive regarding the requirement for an R&O contract and sparing. It is understood that current DND policy requires that an ISS contract (ISSC) for each CF platform is established with the platform supplier concurrently with the establishment of the platform acquisition contract. Additionally, manuals (maintenance, overhaul, etc) are mentioned as part of the initial program but are not included under relevant parts of Annex B ILS.

Answer: *Annex B ILS to be more precise and specific regarding manuals. There is no Guarantee Canada will commit to any R&O contract as a result of a future potential RFP.*

- (16) **Question:** 3.1 Government Furnished Equipment, pg 12/30: First para, second sentence states "The 40mm grenade launcher will be included with the selected mount." This sentence is unclear. Is it intended that the Contractor provide the mounts including a 40mm grenade launcher? If so this should be taken out of this section and explicitly stated elsewhere.

Answer: *All weapons mentioned in this document, including the 40mm grenade launcher, in DND inventory and will be supplied by the GoC. This will be made clear in the documents final version should an RFP be released in the future.*

are

- (17) **Question:** 4.2.2 Crew Stations and Interface Design, pg 16/30: Fourth para (of section 4.2.2) that starts with "The mounting structure and enclosures shall provide:", sub para b is unclear. It states: "Reliable and effective Remote Weapon System function when mounted in an environmentally controlled shipboard space, during year-round, worldwide maritime operations up to State 5 conditions; and" It is assumed that the mounting structure referred to is the Crew station operator console and associated components; not the weapon mounting itself. To remove ambiguity it is suggested that the mounting structure being referred to be made more specific.

Answer: *Clarification will be provided.*

- (18) **Question:** 4.2.4 User Acceptance, pg 17/30 first para: Clearly this section deals with Contract Award contractual and Operational Test and Evaluation (OT&E). last sentence states "...this project will not be responsible for ship at sea costs for the SAT and OT&E trials." Obviously, there are other costs involved in the conduct of these tests (ammunition, targets, data collection equipment set-up/tear down, pre & post firing preps, etc). As written, there is some ambiguity whether the project (and ergo the Contractor) will have some responsibility for covering these associated test costs. Suggest that the final SOW clearly outline contractor responsibilities in this regard.

Answer: *Agree. The costs alluded to in this paragraph do not refer to the Contractor, they are internal to DND. The Paragraph will be re-written to remove ambiguity. At this stage of the project, Canada has not defined the evaluation criteria and methods that would be used in any potential future RFP.*

(19) Question: The following observations deal specifically with para 7. TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE TABLE (TPT). Note the 'document text' referred to is primarily included in Appendix 1 to Annex A to Letter of Interest:

- that
- intended
immediate
provide perspectives
1. It is assumed that this table is a "first cut" for a compliance matrix for the eventual RFP. As such, the comments provided herein are both to identify conflicts and ambiguities requiring resolution for the purpose of this LOI, but also to for the eventual and final RFP.
 - a. Ser 4: Text article does not refer to night vision goggles as is included in TPR 2.2.2. Suggest TPR be written to be more reflective of text in the document.
 - b. Ser 11 thru 16 inclusive: TPR reference numbers reflect only section heading number and not sub-section numbers. For consistency within the table it is recommended that the specific subsection from the text be identified as in other serials.
 - c. Ser 12: TPR notes a specific speed (125 knots) which is not specified in the document text in art 2.3.1.b. Suggest this be added to document text.
 - d. Ser 17: Section 2.4 Concept of Operations in the document is largely conceptual. Although the document text does refer to the requirement for being ready for immediate use for 90 days, there are also other requirements stated which are not reflected in the TPT. It is suggested that this 90-day TPR would be better listed under the section dealing with Availability.
 - e. Ser 23 TPR 3: Requirement for ASTM F 1337 is not mentioned in the document text. Suggest that it be included in the document text.
 - f. Ser 35: TPR 4.2.1.2 includes 7.62mm GPMG, 5.56mm MG & 40mm GL. Document text at article 4.2.1.2 specifies only the .50 M2 HMG. Suggest the TPR and document text be

calibre
reconciled.
 - g. Ser 45: TPR 4.2.1.4 notes firing continuously "to limit of magazine" which is not included in the document text at

4.2.1.4.b.

Suggest the wording be reconciled.
 - h. Ser 46 & 47: Both deal with TPR 4.2.1.4, however, are not presented in the same order as that listed in the document text (adjustable cut-outs are listed in sub-para d while 360 degree coverage is noted in sub-para c). Additionally, sub paras e, f & g in the document text are not included in the TPT. Suggest these items be reconciled for consistency.

- reconciled
- a
- the
- should
- i. **Ser 50: TPR 4.2.1.6 notes 1000 meters while document text states 2000 meters for tracking acquisition. Suggest this be for clarity.**
 - j. **Ser 59 TPR 4.2.1.7: Requirement for manual operation without power precludes electrically fired systems which may have alternative power sources. Suggest that this should be noted as desirable requirement vice mandatory.**
 - k. **Ser 61: TPR 4.2.2 notes that control is exercised from a specific remote station which is contrary to the document text which states "Control of the Remote Weapon System components shall be exercised from a specific Remote Station or Stations." Suggest this be reconciled.**
 - l. **Ser 62 thru 65: The TPRs listed in the TPT do not include all of specific requirements listed in the document text in section 4.2.2. Suggest all requirements be included in the TPT.**
 - m. **The TPT lists Section 4.3 as Survivability vice Maintainability as written in the document text. It's inclusion in the TPT affects all subsequent TPR numbering. Suggest this be removed from the TPT and the numbering corrected or that a section on survivability be included in the document text.**
 - n. **Ser 67 TPR 4.3: Specific survivability requirements for HALIFAX, IROQUOIS and JSS class ships are not noted in the document text.**
 - o. **Ser 67 thru 89: TPR numbering requires correction.**
 - p. **Ser 68 & 69: TPR 4.4.1 & 4.4.2 are not specified in section 4.3 or 4.4 in the document text. Suggest they be removed from the TPT or an appropriate location for these requirements be identified.**
 - q. **Ser 70: TPR 4.4.2 should be included under the section on Availability as the wording in the document text more accurately reflects the wording of the TPR than does that in Maintainability.**
 - r. **Ser 74 Safety and Health: In the document text this is listed as section title 4.7. For consistency, it should not have a serial number in the TPT and its font should be identical to the other section titles. Suggest that Ser numbers for Ser 75 thru 79 be renumbered and that all listed requirements in the document text be reflected in the TPT.**
 - s. **Ser 81: In the document text, section 4.8.1 Quantity, does not specify the number of systems required for training. Indeed, the three systems noted in TPR 4.9.1, contradicts LOI Para 3 Project**

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W8472-125389/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

002

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

101qf

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

W8472-125389

File No. - N° du dossier

101qfW8472-125389

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

Scope which notes that there will be 4 shore-based training systems.

t. Ser 89: TPR 7.2.2(vice document text 6.2.2) notes the requirement for third line maintenance and overhaul manuals. This is not listed in the document text for 6.2.2 Maintenance Training.

Answer: *These criticisms are all extremely helpful. All comments will be fully considered.*

Annex B to Letter of Interest

(20) Question: B-5.1, ILS Master Plan, pg 6/18: Need to clarify terminology re program plan versus project plan as per recommendation for reconciliation of SOW para 3.1 & 3.2.

Answer: *The entire document will be reviewed and where necessary, corrected prior to re-release. The correct term is "PROJECT" and will be inserted as required.*

(21) Question: B-7.1, Meetings, pg 6/18: As per above, reconcile 'program' or 'project' review meetings.

Answer: *The word "PROJECT" should be used throughout and not "Program."*

(22) Question B-16.4, Interim Spares List, pg12/18: What is LRR? This is not defined anywhere in the document.

Answer: *LRR(s) is Logistics Requirement Review. It is one of the ILS meetings.*

(23) Question: B-18.1, RSERL, pg 13/18: Is the tool kit mentioned in SOW 6.4.6 included in the RSERL? This should be reconciled.

Answer: *To be reconciled.*

(24) Question: B-21.3, Technical Publications pg 14/18: This para should be reconciled with the SOW para A-4.6 Technical Data Package.

Answer: *To be .*

(25) Question: 24.3-e, Training, pg 17/18: This para is incomplete "The First second and third..."??

Answer: *"Training session." Documentation to be amended.*