

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

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
THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY
REQUIREMENT

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Science Procurement Directorate/Direction de
l'acquisition de travaux scientifiques
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
11C1, Place du Portage
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Mercury Global Anchor Stations	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W8474-14MG25/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 007
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8474-14MG25	Date 2013-09-27
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ST-006-26331	
File No. - N° de dossier 006st.W8474-14MG25	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-10-31	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Thorsley, Mark	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 006st
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-1772 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 997-2229
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

This amendment is raised to address the following:

- To respond to questions received during the solicitation period.

Q51 Please take the following request under consideration:

The plans that are being requested and the distribution of points attributed to them seem unbalanced and redundant regarding EIRP and G/T. In addition, there are plans that are submission requirements but they are not being evaluated at all (content is not being evaluated as mandatory or rated - they are simply submission requirements of the bid response).

The plans that form part of the evaluation - both mandatory A3.1 and rated A4.1 pertain to:

- CDRL-DAB-SE-003 Availability and Analysis Report (which ties back to Attachment 1, Appendix 3, A3.1 DAB Mandatory Criteria - 2. Anchor Station Availability (pg. 28) and Appendix 4, A4.1 DAB Rated Evaluation Criteria, 4.2.1.1. Availability and Analysis, A. Anchor Station Availability (pg 31), and Appendix 8, 2. Instruction to Bidders, 2.2. DAB Rated Evaluation Criteria, 2.2.1 Availability Analysis Report (pg. 68)(M & R)
 - This plan results in 9 points being allocated to it
- CDRL-DAB-SE-002 Transmission Link Design Report (which ties back to Attachment 1, Appendix 3, A3.1 DAB Mandatory Criteria - items 3. RF Propagation Availability, 4. Anchor Station Maximum Transmit Linear EIRP and 5. Anchor Station Minimum Resultant Receive Gain-to-Noise Temperature (G/T) (pg. 28) and to Appendix 4, A4.1 DAB Rated Evaluation Criteria 4.2.1.1 B (x4), 4.2.1.2 Maximum Linear Transmit EIRP and 4.2.1.3 Receive Antenna Gain-to-Noise Temperature (G/T) (pg 31) and to Appendix 8, 2. Instruction to Bidders, 2.2. DAB Rated Evaluation Criteria, 2.2.2 Availability Transmission Link Design Report (pg. 68) (M & R)
 - This plan results in 41 points being allocated to it

Other points are awarded based on:

- Baseline Resource Allocation, Appendix 4, A4.1 DAB Rated Evaluation Criteria, 4.2.1.4 (pg. 31) and Appendix 7 Baseline Resource Allocation.
 - This response results in 15 points being allocated to it
- WGS Certification, Appendix 4, A4.1 DAB Rated Evaluation Criteria, 4.2.1.5 (pg. 31)
 - This response results in 10 points being allocated to it
- Risk Analysis, Appendix 4, A4.1 DAB Rated Evaluation Criteria, 4.2.1.6 (pg. 31)
 - This response results in 15 points being allocated to it
- Delivery Date, Appendix 4, A4.1 DAB Rated Evaluation Criteria, 4.2.2 (pg. 31)
 - This response results in 10 points being allocated to it

The CDRL Plans, Reports and Documents that must be submitted at Bid, that are not being evaluated as mandatory or rated (just that they are a submission requirement) are namely:

PLANS:

7. Project Management Plan (CDRL DAB-PP-001);
8. Systems Engineering Management Plan (CDRL DAB-PP-004);
9. Integrated Logistics Support (ILS) Management Plan (CDRL DAB-ILS-001);
10. WGS Certification Plan (CDRL DAB-SE-013).

REPORTS:

11. MG Anchor Segment Proposed Solution (CDRL DAB-SE-001);
12. Transmission Link Design Report (CDRL DAB-SE-002);
13. Availability, Analysis Report (CDRL DAB-SE-003);
14. WGS Certification Report - if available - (CDRL DAB-SE-011);
15. Reliability Data (CDRL DAB-ILS-006); and
16. Data Required for Certification and Accreditation (CDRL-DAB-SE-012)
17. Telecom Shelter Facility (CDRL-DAB-SE-015)

Why is one plan being so heavily point rated (41 points for the CDRL DAB-SE-002 TLDR), when other plans should bear some weight - specifically those plans cited as being submission requirements but having no point allocation attributed to them?

For instance, the DAB evaluation rated criteria are strongly biased to EIRP and G/T, since:

1. The BRA evaluation (15 pts) to be done by ARSTRAT using QPSK modulation at constant bit rate and coding is strictly a function of EIRP and G/T;
2. The RF link availability evaluation (16 pts) is primarily a function of EIRP and G/T (however, the links may be able to be successfully closed with acceptable availability using smaller antennas which will be downrated by the direct evaluation of EIRP and G/T) ;
3. and then EIRP and G/T are also rated independently

To that end we recommend the point allocation for CDRL DAB-SE-002 be revisited, since items 1 and 2 essentially determine the overall system functional performance and are themselves a function of EIRP and G/T. The bidder respectfully suggests that the individual evaluations for EIRP and G/T be discarded, and the 25 points currently allocated to them be redistributed to 'experience and capability requirements' not otherwise evaluated amongst the other Plans - Project Management Plan, Systems Engineering Plan, ILS Management Plan and WGS Certification Plan.

- A51 The point weighting balance was validated through an extensive Engagement with Industry and reflects the parameters considered important by Canada to ensure MG ground segment success. Certain plans and reports while not evaluated directly are required at bid to provide bid context, and to assist in eventual preparation of the DAB and ISS contracts.

_____]
ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME