



**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 0B2 / Noyau 0B2  
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 Individual Standing Offer (NISO)

Offre à commandes individuelle nationale (OCIN)

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><br>Single Band Encrypted P25 Radios   |  |  |
| <b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b><br>E60QD-170251/A   | <b>Date</b><br>2016-08-11                    |  |
| <b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b><br>20170251  | <b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b><br>006      |  |
| <b>File No. - N° de dossier</b><br>020qd.E60QD-170251  | <b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>       |  |
| <b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b><br>PW-\$\$QD-020-25864   |  |  |
| <b>Date of Original Request for Standing Offer</b>   |  | 2016-06-01   |
| <b>Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale</b>   |  |  |
| <b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin<br/>at - à 02:00 PM<br/>on - le 2016-08-31</b>   |  | <b>Time Zone<br/>Fuseau horaire</b><br>Eastern Daylight<br>Saving Time EDT |
| <b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b><br>Hebert, Marc-Andre  |  | <b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b><br>020qd                                |
| <b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b><br>(819) 420-1769 ( )   | <b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b><br>(819) 956-0636 |  |
| <b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b><br><b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>  |  |  |
| <b>Security - Sécurité</b><br>This revision does not change the security requirements of the Offer.<br>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>Yes - Oui</b>         | <b>No - Non</b>          |
| <b>Accusé de réception requis</b>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer.</b><br><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)<br>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant.<br>(taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie) |                          |                          |
| <b>For the Minister - Pour le Ministre</b>   |                          |                          |

## **AMENDMENT 006**

This Amendment is raised to:

- 1) provide answers to questions submitted by bidders;
- 2) change the RFSO to reflect the answers where applicable; and
- 3) extend the closing date.

### **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:**

#### **Question 34:** At Annex E (Revision 1)

There seems to be a conflict in the revised price pages. The description of the GPS microphone is different in the French version than the English version. It is clear in the RFP that the radio and regular microphone are required to be 'IS'. However the GPS speaker microphone is not required to be 'IS'. Will PSPC please remove the term "IS" in the description of the GPS speaker microphone in the English price pages?

#### **Answer 34:**

No, intrinsically safe "IS" is a must for radio, battery and speaker microphone and will be changed accordingly in Revision 2 of Annex E.

#### **Question 35:** At Amendment 5, Question 10

Contrary to the response given to question 10, a 2.5m microphone is currently in use and widely accepted by public safety and non-public safety departments and agencies in the United States and Canada; including but not limited to the US Department of Defense, Homeland Security, and RCMP and RNC in Newfoundland and Labrador, Province of Alberta (AFFRCS), Province of Saskatchewan (PPSTN) and numerous other municipalities and territories which have border entry points used by CBSA.

Since we are not aware of any technical or commercial advantage of using a 3.5mm over a 2.5mm, both are widely used and widely accepted, can you please explain why PWGSC doesn't adjust the requirement to also include a 2.5mm jack/plug?

Will PWGSC please reconsider and adjust the requirement to also include a 2.5mm jack/plug?

#### **Answer 35:**

PSPC will accept 2.5MM or 3.5MM speaker microphone jack/Plug.

#### **Question 36:** At Amendment 5, Question 21

Contrary to what is stated various manufacturers support FIPS-140-2 Level 2, which is currently used by public safety and non-public safety departments and agencies in the United States and Canada; including the RCMP. They are well served with FIPS-140-2 Level 2.

Can you please explain why Level 3 requirement has just been added?

Will CBSA and PSPC modify the RFP to accept FIPS-140-2 Level 2?

#### **Answer 36:**

- PSPC will accept level "1" as minimum for FIPS 140-2 certification.
- Bidders MUST provide FIPS certification indicating what level (1, 2, 3 or 4).

**Question 37:** At Amendment 4, Question 6

The new price line for a Key loader on the accessory page seems to be inconsistent with the latest technology and description of the Key loader in sections 4.12.3 and 4.12.4 of the RFP.

The specification suggests the use of a dedicated key loader, something similar to the old-style Motorola KVL3000. This is a standalone piece of equipment that uses rechargeable batteries and compatible chargers. Technology has improved recently where the key loader function is now implemented as a software application on a standard computer. The crypto officer can use their own computer, or laptop, equipped with the proper encryption key loading application software. In this configuration, there is no need for the supply of rechargeable batteries (specified in 4.12.3), or compatible chargers (specified in 4.12.4).

Will PWGSC please modify paragraphs 4.12.3 and 4.12.4 as “not required” if the Key loader can be provided as a software application to be run on a standard computer?

**Answer 37:**

CBSA will accept both key loading methods:

- Standard key loader unit with rechargeable battery supplied with charger; or
- Software application runs on a standard computer

**Question 38:** At Amendment 5, Question 22

The response does not provide “best value” proposition, because it adds unnecessary additional cost for Radio Authentication (also known as Link Layer Authentication - LLA) on the radio in cases where this feature cannot be used on the network.

Radio Authentication (LLA) involves communication between the radio and a network switch on a trunking system, but there is no such capability on a conventional system. Therefore there is no need for such feature on a radio in conventional mode. The current response forces bidders to add the cost of Radio Authentication to each user terminal equipped with P25 trunking, regardless of the associated network supporting this feature.

LLA involves two parts: (i) An optional feature of the users terminals, and (ii) the P25 trunking network counterpart. The P25 trunking network must accept and manage LLA. There are currently many systems in Canada that do not support LLA, so bundling this option into ALL trunking radios will result in extra costs to be incurred by CBSA needlessly.

In order to achieve the “best value” will PSPC revise the RFP to allow for the following: (1) No option for Conventional, since it is not supported and (2) Only price as option for trunking to allow CBSA to purchase only if associated trunking network also supports this feature?

**Answer 38:**

(A) Authentication in conventional system:

- Unit price without the option
- Unit price with the option

(B) Authentication in Trunking system:

- Unit price without the option
- Unit price with the option.

**Question 39:** At Amendment 4

In addendum 4, PWGSC indicated that it intended to award one Standing Offer. Can PSPC provide more clarity; is the intent to offer one standing offer, for all user gear specified, to only one vendor?

Based on the different configurations that PSPC is asking for, wouldn't it be in the Crown's best interests to use multiple vendors?

**Answer 39:**

The intent is to offer a single Standing Offer, for all the equipment specified, to one vendor only.

**Question 40:**

Please extend the period of the solicitation by two weeks to provide time to take the responses provided in consideration of our submission.

**Answer 40:**

The solicitation period will be extended by two weeks, to 31 August 2016.

**MODIFICATIONS TO THE REQUEST FOR STANDING OFFER:**

11) On the cover page of the RFSO:

**Delete:** Solicitation Closes at 2:00 PM on 2016-08-17

**Insert:** Solicitation Closes at 2:00 PM on 2016-08-31

**All other terms and conditions shall remain unchanged.**