

**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**  
Clothing and Textiles Division / Division des  
vêtements et des textiles  
11 Laurier St./ 11, rue Laurier  
6A2, Place du Portage  
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> CG634 GEN II INTERIM COMBAT HELMETS		
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> W8486-148836/A		<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 001
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> W8486-148836		<b>Date</b> 2014-12-29
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$PR-707-66243		
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> pr707.W8486-148836	<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 2015-01-30</b>		<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire 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> Elder, Sylvie		<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> pr707
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-3830 ( )		<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-5454
<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>

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W8486-148836/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

001

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

pr707

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

W8486-148836

File No. - N° du dossier

pr707W8486-148836

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

---

This page has been left blank intentionally.

**This amendment is raised to answer questions from potential bidders and add a certification to Annex F.**

**ADDITION to Annex F, PARA . 2.3**

In addition to the certification required on shell weight for production (Annex F section 2.3), bidders are also required to certify the Nominal and Minimum levels for V50 and the Nominal and Maximum levels for Vproof BFD of their helmet shell solution during production when tested as new at ambient temperature.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

**Q1.** Table F2 specifies that the DND will be doing testing on 6 shells for post environmental ballistics however the shell quantities are not specifically allocated to the V50 17gr, V50 16gr sphere or Vproof BFD tests shown in Table 11.4. To perform internal tests we would like to replicate this testing (with understanding it is not required for the bid). **Question:** could you confirm how the 6 helmets will be tested (i.e. 2 for V50 17gr, 2 for V50 16gr sphere, 2 for Vproof BFD)?

**A1.** Four helmets are assigned to V50: two for group one (Loose Cargo Hot) and two for group two (Loose Cargo Cold). Two helmets are assigned to Vproof BFD: one for group one and one for group two. All are shot with the NATO 17 gr FSP. Due to the time and cost of this test, it is normally done once during Bid Evaluation by DND and the results are passed to the bidder.

However if results are marginal DND reserves the right to conduct this or any other test again during the production phase on any or all sizes of helmets as specified in section 4.4.3 of Annex C.

**Q2.** Annex C, Section 3.5 and 3.6 specifies that the suspension sub-system and retention system shall be manufactured in accordance with the CG634 Product Specification Rev. 3 – Dec 06 (pages 24-49 and 50-74). **Question:** Could you confirm that Annex G is this reference? If not could the bidders be given this document?

**A2.** Yes it is.

**Q3.** On page 10 and page 11 of the RFP it specifies bonus points are available for the Chemical Resistance and Flame Resistance. In the Statement of Work in Annex C however the Chemical and Flame Resistance are mandatory requirements. **Question:** How are the bonus points scored? Also, where are the bonus points factored into the overall bid scoring as per Table 2 of the RFP?

**A3.** During Bid Evaluation we are automatically assigning 100% Bonus to all bidders and subtracting points for any requirements that are not fully met when tested. Noted problems must be corrected before First Article approval is given, but we would not declare a proposal NON-COMPLIANT for a minor correctable issue; we therefore apply penalty by subtracting points. They remain mandatory for production.

**SCORING:** The breakdown for scoring is found with the scaling graphs in the RFP ( max 6 points per chemical and 15 for DEET [Total of 75 points]- 25 max for flame resistance [max 5 points for ea of 5 specimen tests].

**Q4.** In Annex F, Section 1 the RFP states that technical proposals shall include thirty (30) samples. **Clarification:** Please confirm that these samples are only deliverable during Phase 2 and consist of the quantities specified in Annex F, Section 2.2 and Table F2 (i.e. 16 complete assemblies, 14 ballistic shells and 8 spare impact liners).

**A4.** That is correct; an additional 8 weeks are provided after the written proposals are scored and the retention sub-systems and barrel nut kits are sent to bidders who submitted a COMPLIANT written proposal.

**Q5.** The scoring matrix in Table 2 does not add up correctly for the final row Total Points.  
**Question:** To confirm how the bids will be scored, could you confirm the following is correct?

**A5.** A few transcription errors from the official scoring spreadsheet were made and the table has been revised to correct this.

Scoring step	Category	Scoring method										
Step 1	Weight reduction scaled score	Single parameter –scored as per “weight” table on page of the RFP (YES)										
Step 2	Ballistic average scaled	<p>Scored as average of “V 50 17gr FSP” + “V50 16gr sphere” + 95% 17 gr FSP” for example</p> <table><tr><td>property</td><td>points</td></tr><tr><td>V50 17 gr FSP</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>V50 16gr sphere</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>95% 17 gr FSP</td><td>100</td></tr><tr><td>Ballistic average scaled</td><td><math>50=(0+50+100)/3</math></td></tr></table> <p>NO .Ballistic average includes all ballistic tests (V50 and V proof BFD) under all conditions (15 test results in total)</p>	property	points	V50 17 gr FSP	0	V50 16gr sphere	50	95% 17 gr FSP	100	Ballistic average scaled	$50=(0+50+100)/3$
property	points											
V50 17 gr FSP	0											
V50 16gr sphere	50											
95% 17 gr FSP	100											
Ballistic average scaled	$50=(0+50+100)/3$											
Step 3	Materials scaled (backface)	<p>Scored as average of “backface” table on page 10 of the RFP for both “17gr as post conditioning For example</p> <table><tr><td>property</td><td>points</td></tr><tr><td>BACKFACE 17gr as new</td><td>50</td></tr><tr><td>Average BFD post conditioning</td><td>0</td></tr></table>	property	points	BACKFACE 17gr as new	50	Average BFD post conditioning	0				
property	points											
BACKFACE 17gr as new	50											
Average BFD post conditioning	0											



		Materials scales (backface)	25=(50+0)/2
		NO .This section is for Chemical and flame resistance tests; backface in brackets is a transcription error and belongs in the previous row with other ballistic tests.	
Step 4	Written proposal scaled	Scored as per table 1 YES for this row and remaining rows.	
Step 5	Mass reduction weighted		
Step 6	Ballistic average weighted		
Step 7	Material weighted		
Step 8	Written proposal weighted		
Step 9	Technical subtotal		
Step 10	Canadian component		
Step 11	Pricing proposal		
Step 12	Total points		

Point score for scaled items	Bid M	Bid N	Bid P	Bid Q	Bid spare
Score/100 mass reduction scaled	50	10	60	70	FAIL
Score/100 ballistic ave scaled	18.1	12.3	53.0	68.0	24.3
Score/100 materials scaled	91	80	85	95	89
Score/100 WR proposal scaled	100	90	90	80	90
Individual weighting after normalization					
25% mass reduction weighted	17.9 %	3.6%	21.4%	25.0%	fail
30% ballistic ave weighted	8.0%	5.4%	23.4%	30.0%	10.7%
5% materials weighted	4.8%	4.2%	4.5%	5.0%	4.7%
10% WR proposal weighted	10.0%	9.0%	9.0%	8.0%	9.0%
Technical sub-total	40.6%	22.2%	58.3%	68.0%	fail
Cdn content	75	60	55	15	45
Aggregate unit cost	\$9,400,000	\$8,600,000	\$10,000,000	\$6,900,000	\$6,900,000.
Category weighting					
Max 70% technical merit	40.6%	22.2%	58.3%	68.0%	FAIL
Max 5% Canadian Content	5.0%	4.0%	3.7%	1.0%	N/A
Max 25% Pricing Proposal	18.4%	20.1%	17.3%	25.0%	N/A
TOTAL POINTS	64%	46.3%	79.2%	94.0%	FAIL

**Q6. Bidder Testing Requirements 1** –Annex F – Table F1 indicates a total of 24 Helmets for bidder testing without any indication of size requirements, whereas the information provided in Annex C, Appendix 1, Table 11.4 indicates a requirement for 54 Helmets using all sizes. Can the Government of Canada confirm the minimum number of test samples required?

**A6.** Size requirements for Pre-award samples are stated at Annex F, Section 1, sentence 1 in BOLD “(Medium size ONLY)”

Annex C, Appendix 1, Table 11.4 applies to preproduction (First Article) samples in all 3 sizes after Contract Award to the winning Bidder. You are only required to deliver pre-award samples at this time. Also read section 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 for further clarification.

**Q7. Bidder Testing Requirements 2** – Based on the available time needed to produce new shells and to manufacture samples of the suspension system for testing, is DND able to provide suspension and retention systems for the testing of the shells so that the Bidder Testing Requirements can be completed in time for bid submission. If this is not possible can an extension to the deadline be granted in order to complete all of the necessary production and testing prior to submission of the bid?

**A7.** DND has provided a source for the impact liners and is also providing the retention systems and the barrel nut kits. These will be automatically shipped to Bidders immediately after the written proposals are scored and an additional 8 weeks is allocated before any samples or test records are required. In addition to the shells, only the suspension sub-system needs to be produced by the bidders for the bid phase.

**Q8. Shell Construction** - Annex C – Para 3.4 – Shape of unfinished shell. This para indicates that the front tapered lip should be eliminated. Is it possible to receive drawings of the intended shape and where it is specifically to be removed or will this be to the discretion of the manufacturer without penalty?

**A8.** The frontal coverage remains the same, but the shell contour continues to the edge with no taper to allow soldiers to get in closer to sighting equipment. There are no DND drawings because this is Industry's challenge to manufacture. A photo of a prototype produced at our research facility is attached for additional guidance at the end of these questions.

**Q9. Shell Construction** - Annex C – Para 3.4.1 – Thickness. Is there any limitation on providing a shell that is thinner than the in-service nominal thickness? (i.e. thinner than 8.4mm on the crown) If yes, what are these limitations?

**A9.** Absolutely not. The bidder can manufacture shells as thin as is feasible as long as all performance requirements are met and the interior geometry of the shells remains exactly the same as the in-service CG634. It however, cannot be thicker than the in-service helmet otherwise fit of the helmet covers will be compromised.

**Q10..Edging Requirements** - Annex C – Para 3.4.4 Edging – Is injection molded edging an acceptable replacement for this requirement?



**A10.** A solution where edging is not required is preferred, but edging is permitted if it is required for purposes of preventing fraying, tearing, or delamination of fibers along the raw edge. Injection molded edging is acceptable, but the height of the edging must be minimized.

**Q11.Benchmarks** - 3.4.2 – Shell Surface - If an injection molded edging is acceptable, can the benchmarks be on the edging rather than the shell surface?

**A11.**Benchmarks must be molded into the shell as specified.

**Q12.Benchmarks** - 3.4.2 – Shell Surface - The RFP makes reference to a cross benchmark on the top center of the helmet and two benchmarks in the back (on either side of the center line of the helmet). The provided helmet sample does not have these benchmarks so there is no ability for us to accurately position them in our helmet shell model. Is it possible to get Official CAD drawings that include these benchmarks in order to properly achieve the desired accuracy?

**A12.**The in-service shell does not have benchmarks and this has created a very difficult situation for alignment of the CVC impact helmet when the shells are reconfigured for the CVCMH role. This is precisely why all subsequent ballistic shells must have the benchmarks incorporated. This is Industry's challenge to solve. This info was passed in the INDUSTRY RELEASE of the spec in 2013.

**Q13.Chinstrap** - Annex C – Para 3.6 - Why is the requirement for interchangeable parts with the current CG 634 necessary? Is it possible to supply a COTS solution for the chin strap that will provide the same or better retention capabilities? Specifically this could also reduce the need for the retention screws (boltless system) thus reducing production costs, and set up times.

**A13.**This is a sustainment buy to put more helmets on the shelf until the next Helmet Project is funded, therefore all components must remain fully interchangeable at this time. The next project in 4 to 6 years will allow a much greater degree of innovative solutions to be assessed. Also SOW 2 will be used to explore some of these potential changes and improvements.

**Q14.Weight Reductions** – p.10 indicates a maximum point system for weight reduction under 840g. Given the heavy rating on weight reduction of the CG634 Combat Helmet, will the Government of Canada award bonus points for achieving a greater reduction than what has been asked for in this RFP?

**A14.**The likelihood of a solution under 900 grams in this size that meets all requirements is remote in our opinion, but we anxiously welcome this breakthrough. We cannot offer higher than 100% for any solution less than 840grams, but in the event of a tie score then the lighter weight helmet will win the bid.

