

**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

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Mercury Global Anchor Stations	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> W8474-14MG25/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 011
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> W8474-14MG25	<b>Date</b> 2013-10-07
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ST-006-26331	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 006st.W8474-14MG25	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2013-10-31</b>	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Thorsley, Mark	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 006st
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-1772 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 997-2229
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

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

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**

Q82 MIL-STD 188 -165 is the latest standard governing WGS communication standards. Please include it in the RFP and provide to us and others at your earliest convenience.

A82 Canada has identified the FDMA modems to be used. Accordingly, MIL-STD-188-165A 'Interoperability of SHF Satellite Communications PSK Modems (FDMA Operation)' is no longer an applicable document to the MGAS DAB SOW and will be removed from the list.

Q83 Refer to Attachment 1 Bid evaluation Plan, 1.4 Contractor Selection Method, b. The point scoring will be carried out using a pair-wise comparison method and formulae for DAB and ISS Management plans as well as for cost evaluation...(p.2)

Then refer to Attachment 1 Bid Evaluation Plan, Appendix 4 DAB Rated Criteria, A4.1 DAB Rated Evaluation Criteria (p. 31) and

Appendix 8 Table 2-1 Submission Matrix, 2.3 Other Plans, Reports and Documents, 2.3.1 Project Management Plan (CDRL DAB-PP-001) (p.71)

Although the ISS Management Plan (CDRL-DAB-PP-001) is a submission requirement, it is neither mentioned under the mandatory evaluation criteria nor the rated criteria. How then will this plan be evaluated using a pair-wise comparison (as specified at page 10) when there is no point scoring allocated to it?

A83 The ISS Management Plan will be rated and points will be awarded as per the Bid Evaluation plan. However, no pair-wise comparison will be done with this document.

Q84 Refer to Attachment 1, Appendix 3, A.3.2 ISS Mandatory Criteria, 1. ...in accordance with Annex E – Statement of Work – In-Service Support (pg. 28).

Refer to Attachment 1, Appendix 8, Table 2-1 Submission Matrix, 2.1.2 In-Service Support Statement of Work Certificate of Compliance...in accordance with Annex E – Statement of Work – In service Support (pg. 67)

Annex G is the Statement of Work for ISS. Should the references to the Annex specify Annex G In-Service Support Statement of Work?

A84 Correct. The applicable section has been amended as per item 2 below.

Q85 Refer to Part 8 – Resulting Contract Clauses In-Service Support, 1.2.2 Task Authorization Process, 1. ...Task Authorization Form specified in Annex I (pg. 21) Annex I is the SRCL. Should the reference to the Annex specify Annex K Task Authorization Form?

A85 Correct. The applicable section has been amended as per item 1 below.

Q86 Refer to Part 7 – Resulting Contract Clauses Design and Build, 2.2 Supplemental General Conditions 4010 (2012-07-16), Services – Higher Complexity (pg. 14)

Refer to Part 8 – Resulting Contract Clauses In-Service Support, 2.2. Supplemental General Conditions 4012 (2012-07-16) – Goods – High Complexity (pg. 22)

Were the applicable clauses inverted? Given that Part 7 is for the design and build aspect of the resultant contract, and that Part 8 is for the in-service support aspect of the resultant contract should clause 4012 be applicable to Part 7 and clause 4010 be applicable to Part 8?

A86 The referenced clauses are Supplemental General Conditions and supplement the General Conditions applicable to the resulting contracts. Using the Design and Build resulting contract as an example, SACC Clause 2030 (2013-06-27) – General Conditions – Higher Complexity – Good applies and is supplemented by several Supplemental General Conditions including SACC Clause 4010 (2012-07-76) – Services – Higher Complexity.

Q87 Refer to Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection, 1.2.1 Mandatory Technical Criteria (pg.10)

In the event that the Bidder fails to submit any of the information in Appendix 3 of Attachment 1, the Contracting Authority may request it thereafter in writing, including after the closing date of the bid solicitation. It is mandatory that the Bidder provide the missing information within three (3) business days of the written request or within such longer period as specified by the Contracting Authority in the notice to the Bidder.

Then refer to Attachment 1 – Bid Evaluation Plan:

Section 1, 1.4 a. To be considered responsive a proposal must meet all mandatory criteria of the solicitation. Failure to meet any mandatory criteria will result in the bid being declared non-responsive. Non-responsive proposals will not be evaluated against the rated criteria. (pg 2)

Section 2, 2.1 d. Failure to meet any mandatory criteria shall result in the bid being declared non-responsive (pg. 4)

And then to:

Attachment 1 – Bid Evaluation Plan, Section 5, 5.3.2, last paragraph – If the bid does not meet all mandatory criteria, the reason shall be documented and forwarded to the ERB for concurrence. Non-responsive proposals will not be given further consideration (pg 13).

There seems to be a disconnection between Part 4 and Attachment 1. Is it the intent of the Crown to seek clarification and additional information on the mandatory criteria (within 3 business days) before rendering a bid non-responsive as indicated at Part 4 or is it the intent of the Crown to render a bid non-responsive outright once a deficiency is noted as indicated in Attachment 1? Please clarify

A87 Canada reserves the right to seek clarification and/or request missing information in accordance with the terms of the solicitation. Such requests would be made prior to declaring a bid non-responsive.

Q88 After review of the responses to Q20, Q27, Q28, and Q29 contained in Amendment 4, we believe the information provided is still insufficient for what we understand of Canada's expectation for some of the analyses in the bid response.

---

From A20 and A28:

“With respect to no. 1, the specification is to be determined on an individual communication link basis. It is important to note that Canada requires that any MG SATCOM link be available IAW required, and for as long as required, for any IER. Therefore, using the information presented in Table 1-4, Anchor Station RF propagation availability specifications are essential on the Anchor Station side (uplink forward and downlink return), per climate regions at the Anchor Sites, and which would accommodate the most stringent communication link determined (and guaranteed) by the bidder (i.e., using the designated notional remote terminal). This also necessitates accommodating the propagation availability to reflect predictable events such as sun transit outages. As stated, Site Diversity, while not a mandatory requirement, might be proposed to improve or maintain a particular guaranteed RF propagation availability.”

We understand the criticality of link availability on the MG SATCOM link. But it must also be understood that “uplink forward and downlink return” link availability cannot be looked at in isolation for analysis purposes. This is confirmed in the Bid Evaluation Plan Section 4.2.1.1 B. b. vi., which involves the terminal performance. This in turn requires the satellite performance to be known and, as we will illustrate, this information has not been provided with near enough fidelity.

“With respect to 3, the end-to-end link performance (including end-to-end propagation availability) is not a mandated requirement since the Terminal Segment is not part of this SOW. However, it is expected that the bidder will use this type of analysis to establish its guaranteed specifications (e.g., item no.1). Any assumptions being made in support of this specification will be evaluated as per its appropriateness and Canada thinks it is a reasonable start to assume (if appropriate) acceptable SATCOM link design allocations.”

We respectfully disagree. The analysis is very sensitive to the assumptions made and judging the appropriateness of the assumptions gives an unfair advantage to bidders with prior WGS program experience.

“With respect to 4, the TLDR is a living document that is initially submitted at bid but will be required to be updated after contract award prior to CDR (and other WGS-specific information can be provided to the Contractor), and as necessary thereafter during the In-Service Support phases.”

This response concedes that there is insufficient detail to prepare an accurate TLDR at this stage, and yet this is a Rated requirement. It must also be recognized that bidders with prior participation in other WGS-related programs will already have some or all of this information required to do an in-depth TLDR vs. those bidders who do not. This in turn gives them an unfair advantage during the evaluation process. How can the TLDR be a rated requirement when the input data required to do it properly cannot be provided until the CDR timeframe?

A88 In response to your comments:

1. Given that the focus of this RFP is on the Anchor Segment deployment, CANADA requires a guaranteed equipment and propagation availability relative to the Anchor Stations, regardless of the remote terminal, IER, or climate region. This is a rated criterion. The common part of the MG end-to-end link (i.e., between the satellite and Anchor Station) is, in general, the non-limited section of the end-to-end link (forward or return) and this should aid the bidder in determining the specification by using the notional terminals. Canada’s expectation is that a bidder will submit a single specification per frequency band, for each Anchor Station, that it is obligated to support. Any supporting information provided would function as proof of the appropriateness of the specifications – not as input for evaluation.

2. The submission of the TLDR and its contents is NOT a rated evaluation criterion. No points are being awarded based on an evaluating function to determine relative TLDR quality among bidders. To help clarify this issue, the CDRL Table has been amended as per items 5 and 6 below:

- Q89 From A27: The X-band Phased Array EIRP is adjustable such that 100% of the EIRP (60.2 dBW) can be made available in one beam, or the EIRP can be distributed in any desired percentage across any number of the 8 beams such that the total of percentages across all beams in use is equal to 100% EIRP (60.2 dBW).

This statement implies that we are free to assume that the decision to put all of the X-Band EIRP into a single beam to improve our link budget is ours to make. Is this a realistic assumption given that CANADA's BRA is only 1.9%? This one assumption alone can make a 9 dB difference in the X-Band link budgets between bidders – a huge difference. Similarly, the choice of Ka-Band GDA antenna type (ref: Wideband Global Satcom Fact Sheet) can make a 2.6 dB EIRP and 1 dB G/T difference in the Ka-Band link budgets between bidders. The satellite gains, EIRPs, and G/Ts must be specified by Canada for any kind of fair evaluation to be conducted between the bidders.

- A89 The information on the flexibility of the Phase Array Antenna is only for information purposes as per the initial enquiry. You are correct that post-Contract, more realistic scenarios can be determined.

- Q90 Without a common set of inputs to the various analyses requested in the bid, an apples-to-apples comparison of the bids is not possible. Significant advantages will be conferred to experienced WGS terminal providers that are able to make use of knowledge gained in other programs in both mandatory and rated bid criteria.

Canada may find that providing this detailed level of information to all bidders is not practical within the timeline available for the bid response. As an alternative, we would suggest the following:

that the EIRP, G/T, and BRA input requirements for ARSTRAT analysis stand. Note that the BRA inputs are effectively a summary of EIRP and G/T. These values are "fair", in that they do not require insight into parameters that are satellite or terminal specific. The ARSTRAT analysis will also have insight into the effects of other WGS users that we are unable to incorporate into our analysis without further input from CANADA.

that the Reliability Data stand for the Anchor Station hardware. This is again an analysis that can be fairly compared across bidders.

that the first submission of the Transmission Link Design Report (DAB-SE-002) and Availability Analysis Report (DAB-SE-003) move to PDR rather than Bid Proposal, when more detailed data can presumably be made available to the successful bidder.

Evaluation points from the TLDR and Availability Analysis reports could be re-allocated to the EIRP and G/T ratings, as they are fundamentally the same thing. However, we would strongly advise that these points be re-allocated to other areas of the MGAS that are critical but not considered in the evaluation at all. We would include in this category: The Network Management System Benefits of the proposed solution to Canada

- A90 Canada undertook extensive industry consultations over a period of 14 months. This included the use of Requests for Information, a preliminary Mercury Global Functional Requirements

Specifications, a DRAFT Mercury Global RFP review, multiple Industry Day information sessions with individual company meetings, and numerous one-on-one opportunities with interested vendors. At the same time, the project team has worked with an independent Fairness Monitor throughout. The main objectives were to ensure that Canada provided a fair, accessible opportunity to interested vendors, and solicited their input and recommendations to ensure its requirements were publicized and critiqued before issuing a final RFP that reflected Stakeholders requirements.

A case in point to how Canada has responded: The initial preliminary documents specified receive G/T and Transmit EIRP, along with other parameters. However, the results from industry consultations were almost unanimous in the observation that this approach was demanding and/or unfair. As such, Canada moved to specify a minimum Anchor Station size and publicised the rated evaluation scheme, to ensure that it would not offer an advantage to any particular entity.

With respect to the suggestion of rating other categories, note that the DAB SOW has included structured and unstructured risk areas for evaluation on a rated basis. A bidder can highlight the benefits of its technical bid with respect to the following: Solution Risk, RF Performance Risk, Channel Performance Risk, Technical Implementation Risk, and Other Risks. Therefore, unique features critical or advantageous to its bid can be presented in these areas.

### **Solicitation Revisions**

1. At Part 8 - Resulting Contract Clauses - In-Service Support, clause 1.2.2:

DELETE: Annex I

INSERT: Annex K

2. At Attachment 1, Appendix 3, A3.2 ISS Mandatory Criteria:

DELETE: Annex E

INSERT: Annex G

3. At Annex A - Statement of Work - Design and Build, Appendix 2, subsection 1.4:

DELETE: (c) MIL-STD-188-165A/B, Interoperability of SHF Satellite Communications PSK Modems (FDMA Operation)

4. At Annex A - Statement of Work - Design and Build, Appendix 4, CDRL Table, CRDL DAB-SE-002, under Remarks:

DELETE: The initial submission will be used for evaluation purposes

INSERT: The initial submission will be used for support or validation purposes

5. At Annex A - Statement of Work - Design and Build, Appendix 4, CDRL Table, CRDL DAB-SE-003, under Remarks:

DELETE: The initial submission will be used for evaluation purposes

INSERT: The initial submission will be used for support or validation purposes

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W8474-14MG25/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

011

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

006st

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

W8474-14MG25

File No. - N° du dossier

006stW8474-14MG25

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

---

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME