

## RETURN BIDS TO:

## RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -  
TPSGC

11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier

Place du Portage, Phase III

Core 0A1 / Noyau 0A1

Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

## Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer

## Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes

National Master Standing Offer (NMSO)

Offre à commandes principale et nationale (OCPN)

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

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

## Comments - Commentaires

## Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du  
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

## Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Defence Communications Division. (QD)

11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier

Place du Portage, Phase III, 8C2

Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> 4.9 GHZ 5.9 GHZ RADIO POINT TO POIN		
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> M7594-131471/B		<b>Date</b> 2013-07-30
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> M7594-131471		<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 006
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 008qd.M7594-131471	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>	
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$QD-008-23820		
<b>Date of Original Request for Standing Offer</b> Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale		2013-06-12
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2013-08-06</b>		<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Van Dusen, Eric		<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 008qd
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-5816 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-0636	
<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>		
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>		
<b>Security - Sécurité</b> This revision does not change the security requirements of the Offer. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de la présente offre.		

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

<b>Acknowledgement copy required</b> <b>Accusé de réception requis</b>	<b>Yes - Oui</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No - Non</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer.</b> <b>Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.</b>		
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant. (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)		
<b>For the Minister - Pour le Ministre</b>		

**This amendment 005 is raised to answer question of bidders.**

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.**

**Question 25**

Can you confirm the power source for the required equipment? What is the current type, AC or DC, and what is the voltage level specification? Will this be standard for all locations?

**Answer 25**

Section 9.1 has been modified to include "power supply rated for nominal 120 VAC operation.

**Question 26**

SOR Section 4.3. Will the vendor be required to supply the GPS mapping tool? Will the RCMP supply manufacturer and model details on the Mapping Tool, if they are alternatively sourcing this item?

**Answer 26**

Section 4.3 has been modified for manual entry of GPS co-ordinate data.

Section 4.3.1 has been added to the SOR: this data must be remotely viewable in order to locate and manage the deployed PTP radio.

**Question 27**

In amendment 004 question 16 pertaining to Annex A-SOR Section 4.3 suggests the "only way" to meet this requirement is to outfit each radio with a GPS receiver and antenna. We would respectfully argue that when PTP radios are installed they don't move, therefore maintaining a GPS system on each radio would be unnecessarily costly and is also not the "only way" of providing the PTP radio GPS mapping data the Crown desires.

Normal Industry standard operating methodology typically allows for the GPS coordinates to be gathered using an inexpensive commonly available hand held tool then input within the operating configuration of each radio at time of installation. The data from each remote radio is then made available to export to mapping tools via system management software. This is a far more cost effective and practical manner of meeting the requirement, and thus we respectfully request that the crown also accept this method as a compliant response.

**Answer 27**

See answer 26.

**Question 28**

Please provide a clarification on the phrase, "must provide the functionality" since it will have an effect on some of the quoted prices. For instance, in Annex A, Section 10.14.1, functionality is required to be able to provide a T1 interface. In our product, the T1 interface is provided by connecting an external assembly to the Ethernet port on the wireless radio. The external assembly converts the Ethernet port to a T1 port. Thus a port is then available to accommodate a standard T1 interface as defined in the spec. In this case, the external assembly is only required when a T1 interface is desired and would add unnecessary cost to the radio if only an Ethernet interface will be used

Shall we quote the radio as having an optional capability to provide a T1 interface and then quote the optional external assembly separately?

#### Answer 28

Must provide the T1 functionality as originally specified.

#### Question 29

Annex A-SOR Section 4.1 refers to the security upgrade to FIPS 197 with AES 256 encryption.

Considering that RCMP is the country's national police organization, the security of data integrity is paramount to police operations and that any claims of security support is extremely hard to verify for networking products. Security certification almost always has different levels of compliancy. Would it be in the interest of the Government, in order to properly evaluate the various implementations of the standard, to require bidders to demonstrate the various levels of certifications through standard NIST Documentation? For example, referring to an approved list that can be found in the Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) Algorithm Validation List, (<http://csrc.nist.gov/groups/STM/cavp/documents/aes/aesval.html> ).

#### Answer 29

We do not require NIST documentation.

#### Question 30

Annex A-SOR Section 4.1 refers to the security upgrade to FIPS 197 with AES 256 encryption.

Considering the overall security requirement of the RFSO, would it also be to the advantage of the government to require FIPS 140-2 level certification or to demonstrate the commitment to achieve certification for products included in the RFSO responses? FIPS 140-2 is recognized as a de facto requirement for a large number of security agencies and government organizations both in Canada and abroad and providing this level of security would be in line with the requirement of the products to be used by the RCMP. FIPS 140-2 certification is a process that takes well over a year to complete and every stage is monitored on the publicly available NIST list.

a. Certified implementation:

<http://csrc.nist.gov/groups/STM/cmvp/documents/140-1/140val-all.htm>

b. In process of certification:

<http://csrc.nist.gov/groups/STM/cmvp/documents/140-1/140InProcess.pdf>

#### Answer 30

We do not require NIST documentation

#### Question 31

Annex A-SOR Section 10.14 requires Ethernet data rates up to 100 Mbps. For IP based networks, Ethernet data rates can fluctuate with packet size. So a network device that supports 100Mbps, may be able to transmit at wire-speed for large packet sizes (e.g. 1536 bytes), but could have challenges with smaller packet sizes. For example, voice and video metadata may require very small packet sizes. If a radio is capable of handling 12,000 packets per second, this will allow the device to deliver 100Mbps when using 1024 Byte packets while only delivering 6.15 Mbps with 64 byte packets. Given the above, would the government consider adding the requirement to specify the packet processing capability

---

(usually referenced as packets per seconds or pps value) for the proposed products that would be submitted in response to this RFSO?

**Answer 31**

No

**Question 32**

Annex A-SOR Section 10.16: For most radio systems, the Transmit (Tx) Power will vary based on the different modulation rates that are supported for the platform. This modulation rate will be determined based on the quality (or Signal-to-Noise value) for the radio transmission. Considering the requirement for low latency of this RFSO and the mandatory performance of 100Mbps, both of which are tied to the highest level modulation rate for any given radio, would the government consider modifying the requirement to require the inclusion of the transmit power at the highest level modulation for the proposed radio systems? This would be in line with the latency and performance requirements, and provide the government with a far more relevant comparison of performance between the solutions.

**Answer 32**

No

**Question 33**

Annex A-SOR Section 10.14.1; Does the crown require the T1 interface specified in requirement 10.11.1 to be available on all links supplied, or should it be included as an optional module?

**Answer 33**

T1 interface must be included in the bid. The item will be called up as required.