

**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

**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> Medium Range Radar (MRR)	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> W8476-133817/E	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 005
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> W8476-133817	<b>Date</b> 2014-04-30
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$QD-023-24350	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 023qd.W8476-133817	<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 2014-07-03</b>	<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> Specified Herein - Précisé dans les présentes <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Bright, James	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 023qd
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-6181 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-0636
<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> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<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>

---

## Amendment #5

Amendment # 5 is being released to answer questions from Industry and to replace sections of the RFP.

The following questions and responses are listed below:

### Question 1:

In Annex K, Appendix 2, Proof of Compliance Instructions, 5.1, The High Level Mandatory requirement and rated requirement required proof of compliance with certification according to Appendix K2 paragraph 5.

### Answer 1:

**As per K, Appendix 2, Proof of Compliance Instructions, para 5.1, any Allied govt institution is acceptable.**

### Question 2:

RFP Annex A, Appendix 5 has delivery of the first two (2) MRR systems is expected to be approximately two (2) years after contract award, with the remaining six (6) in the third year of the contract. Will the Govt consider extending the delivery period for the first 2 units to 30 months?

### Answer 2:

**RFP remains unchanged as per Annex A, Appendix 5. Industry to provide exact milestone information for example first 2 units delivered 30 MACA.**

### Question 3:

In RFP Annex A, Appendix 5, the First Article Test (FAT) verification is very extensive and requires significant tests and demonstrations requiring associated lengthy time periods. Some FAT performance tests/demos will already be done during the LFTE tests. Will the Govt accept the LFTE tests as satisfying FAT tests which are duplicated/same?

### Answer 3:

**Yes if there are no design changes affecting the specific requirements**

### Question 4:

In Annex A, Appendix 1, System Performance Specification, 3.1.4.1.1, it is assumed that this requirement is at 360 degrees. Can you please confirm?

### Answer 4:

**Contractor design decision**

### Question 5:

Annex A, Appendix 1, System Performance Specification, 3.1.5.15.1, states "all of the latest feature of a modern IFF." This is unclear, can you please clarify?

### Answer 5:

**Contractor design decision**

Question 6:

Annex A, Appendix 1, System Performance Specification, 3.2.1.3, states "all necessary Electronic Protection Measures (EPM)." This is unclear, can you please clarify?

Answer 6:

**Contractor design decision**

Question 7:

In Annex A, Appendix 1, System Performance Specification, 3.2, side lobe level and operating frequencies number are not specified. Why has the requirement for side-lobe level and number of operating frequencies (which are important ECCM features) removed compared to the document version dated 27 of November 2013 and all previous requirements documentation?

Answer 7:

**SPS 3.2 was revised based on industry feed back.**

Question 8:

In Annex K, Appendix 6, Live Fire Evaluation Plan Overview, 5.1.3-5.1.4, it is assumed that scaling of RCS as in 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 is allowed. Can you please confirm this?

Answer 8:

**Contractor test design decision**

Question 9:

In Annex K, Appendix 6, Live Fire Evaluation Plan Overview, 3.2.3, it is assumed that accuracy means azimuth and that several parameters can be combined for each pass. Can you please confirm this?

Answer 9:

**Accuracy is specified under 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 and combining several parameters is Contractor test design decision.**

Question 10:

In Annex E, List of acronyms and definitions, the definition of "False Tracks" is unclear. Can you please provide further detail that is possible to measure ( e.g. tests based on internal noise and demonstration in real environment)?

Answer 10:

**The definition of False Track in Annex E remains as written.**

Question 11:

In Annex A, Appendix 1, System Performance Specification, 3.5.7.1, Definition of MRR System for MTBCF; Does the MTBCF figure for the MRR system include all other ancillary equipment such as the electric generator and trailer?

Answer 11:

**Yes, as per Annex A, Appendix 1, System Performance Specification 1.2.1 the MRR system include the sensor system and the other Ancillary equipment but does not include the generator which has its own specifications for MTBCF.**

## Question 12:

In Annex A, Appendix 1, System Performance Specification, 3.1.3.12.3, the time for POI prediction not specified. At what time during the track should the prediction be made?

## Answer 12:

**Contractor design decision.**

## Question 13:

Annex A-ACQ, Appendix 5 , 3.3, Scope for Environmental Qualification as part of First Article. Does Test as 'First Article Verification Method' imply that a test shall actually be performed as part of First Article Acceptance Test or can prior tests for same product be referred to?

## Answer 13:

**Contractor test design decision, a test or an existing validated test report can be used.**

## Question 14:

In Annex A-ACQ, SOW and Annex A-ACQ, Appendix 1, SPS, SOW:4.7, 4.8, SPS 3.1.6.2, 3.1.6.3, LCSS Land Command Support System, what capacity will be provided for the LCSS link? Will video be required?

## Answer 14:

**Contractor design decision.**

## Question 15:

In Annex A-ACQ, Appendix 1, SPS, 3.1.1.3.1, 3.1.6.3, MRR Operator Station, is the "MRR operator's station" and the "ruggedized equipment/workstation" referring to the same Suppliers equipment in the Command Post for remote operation of the MRR System?

## Answer 15:

**Yes, it is the same equipment**

## Question 16:

In Annex A-ACQ, Appendix 1, SPS, 3.1.5.16.2.8, IFF, what is the definition of "emergency beacons, urgency modes, safety related alerts and warnings received from aircraft IFF transponders"?

## Answer 16:

**Contractor design decision.**

## Question 17:

RFP Part 4, Section 1.4.2 states "...Canada requests that the Bidder provide the Contracting Authority with a proposed date and location of the LFE. The LFE date and location will be mutually agreed to by Canada and the Bidder."

- a) Will a bidder be ruled non-compliant if a date and location are proposed that are unacceptable to Canada?
- b) Does Canada have a preferred timeframe for the LFE?

- 
- c) What will the course of action be if a date and location cannot be agreed upon by Canada and the Bidder?

Answer 17 a)

**We will mutually agree to a date and ensure deconfliction between bidders to prevent anyone from becoming non-compliant**

Answer 17 b)

**By end Fall 2014**

Answer 17 c)

**See 17 a) above.**

**Note: Once a date and location are agreed it becomes part of the bid and therefore cannot be changed without affecting bid process. The only exception would be a fully recognized case where Force Majeure applies.**

Amendment# 5 replaces the following:

- 1) The RFP terms and conditions have been deleted in their entirety and replaced with RFP Terms and Conditions V2.
- 2) Annex F-ACQ and Annex F-ISS have been deleted in their entirety and replaced with Annex F-ACQV2 and Annex F-ISSV2.
- 3) Annex L -ACQ and Annex L-ISS have been deleted in their entirety and replaced with Annex L-ACQV2 and Annex L-ISSV2.
- 4) Annex M-ACQ and Annex M-ISS has been added for Value Propositions.
- 5) Appendix 6 to Annex K – Live Fire Evaluation Plan Overview has been deleted in its entirety and replaced with Appendix 6 to Annex K V2- Live Fire Evaluation Plan Overview

**ALL OTHER ANNEXES, TERMS AND CONDITIONS FROM THE ORIGINAL POSTING REMAIN UNCHANGED.**