



**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 0A1
Gatineau, Québec
K1A 0S5 (or K1A0C9 if using FedEx)

**Amendment #12
REQUEST FOR
PROPOSAL**

**Amendment n ° 12
DEMANDE DE
PROPOSITION**

Proposal to: Public Works and Government Services
Canada

We hereby offer to sell to Her Majesty the Queen in
right of Canada, in accordance with the terms and
conditions set out herein, referred or attached hereto,
the supplies and services listed herein or on any
attached sheets at the price(s) set out therefor.

Propositions aux: Travaux publics et Services
gouvernementaux Canada

Nous offrons par la présente de vendre à sa Majesté la
Reine du chef du Canada, aux conditions énoncées ou
incluses par référence dans la présente et aux annexes
ci-jointes, les articles et les services énumérés ici et sur
toute
feuille ci-annexée, au(x) prix indiqué(s).

Comments - Commentaires

Questions and answers/ Les questions
et les réponses.

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Acquisitions Branch / Direction générale
des approvisionnements
Marine Systems and Small Vessels Sector
Major Projects Directorate – Sea
AJISS Project Office
Gatineau, Quebec

Title-Sujet Arctic Offshore Patrol Ship (AOPS) and Joint Support Ship (JSS) In-Service Support/Le soutien en service (SES) du navire de patrouille extracôtier et de l'Arctique (NPEA) et du navire de soutien interarmées (NSI)	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W8476-133818/C/B	Date October 12, 2016/le 12 octobre 2016
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8482-156698	
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-16-00738522	
Solicitation Closes – L'invitation prend fin November 8th 2016 at 14 :00 /le 8 november 2016	Time Zone / Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Time (EDT) / Heure avancé de l'est
F.O.B. – F.A.B Plant-Usine : <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Ryan Gigliotti	
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone NPEANSISES.AOPSSISS@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca	FAX No. - N° de FAX
Destination of Goods, Services and Construction: Destinations des biens, services et construction : Specified Herein Précisé aux présentes	

Instructions : See Herein

Instructions : voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée See Herein – voir aux présentes	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 #12 is being issued to make changes to the Arctic Offshore Patrol Ship (AOPS) and Joint Support Ship (JSS) In-Service Support RFP and to answer questions received against this solicitation.

RFP Closing Date Extended to: November 8th 2016

Part 1 Amendments to the RFP

1 Reference RFP Item 1a, No. 6, Experience - Information and Data Management

Delete in its entirety: The **Bidder's Team** will be evaluated for experience in integration and handling of Information and Data Management.

A written submission not to exceed 15 pages in total is required and should describe the Bidder's:

1. Experience in ERP & Integration: The Bidder is to provide a minimum of one example demonstrating the integration of an IT Enterprise System between the Bidder and its Subcontractors or a Client for system to system Data Exchange, where no deliberate intervention is required as in a typical automated Business-to-Business (B2B) solution.
2. Experience in Data Management Environment (DME): The Bidder is to provide a minimum of one example demonstrating the development of a Common Source Data Base (CSDB) for Interactive Electronic Technical Manuals (IETM) using the S1000D specification. The evidence should demonstrate their ability to implement a complex functionality design including evidence of customer requirement analysis and incorporation in the IETM design.
3. Experience in Collaborative Environment (CE): The Bidder is to provide a minimum of one example demonstrating the use of an internet web-based Collaborative Environment, hosted by the Bidder that is used between the Bidder and its subcontractor or a Client to provide service delivery management.
4. Experience in Cyber Security: The Bidder is to provide a minimum of one example demonstrating a structured System Security Engineering (SSE) process for a Government-to-Business (G2B) data solution to sustain a defence system.

Insert in its entirety: The **Bidder's Team** will be evaluated for experience in integration and handling of Information and Data Management.

A written submission not to exceed 15 pages in total is required and should describe the **Bidder's Team**:

Experience in ERP & Integration: provide a minimum of one example demonstrating the integration of an IT Enterprise System between the prime contractor and its subcontractors or between a prime contractor and their client for system to system Data Exchange, where no deliberate intervention is required as in a typical automated Business-to-Business (B2B) solution.

1. Experience in Data Management Environment (DME): provide a minimum of one example demonstrating the development of a Common Source Data Base (CSDB) for Interactive Electronic Technical Manuals (IETM) using the S1000D specification. The evidence should demonstrate the ability to implement a complex functionality design including evidence of customer requirement analysis and incorporation in the IETM design.
2. Experience in Collaborative Environment (CE): provide a minimum of one example demonstrating the use of an internet web-based Collaborative Environment, hosted by a member of the Bidder's Team, that is used between the prime contractor and its subcontractors or between a prime contractor and their client to provide service delivery management.
3. Experience in Cyber Security: provide a minimum of one example demonstrating a structured System Security Engineering (SSE) process for a Government-to-Business (G2B) data solution to sustain a defence system.



2. Reference: Attachment 1 to Part 4, Item 1a, No. 1 ISS Program Management, Assessment Criteria No. 6.

Delete in its entirety: Experience in Marine Engineering, 3D Modeling and TDP Management;

Insert in its entirety: Experience in: Marine Engineering Management; 3D Modeling Management; and TDP Management

3 Included in this amendment is the SRCL Supplementary guide See attached documents.

4. Reference RFP Part 7, Para 7.10.5 Refer to attached document Revised 87 of 227

Delete in it entirety

7.10.5 Economic price adjustments will be calculated only on the labour portion of the base MMF and the Fully Loaded Labour Rates and the fully Loaded Overtime Rates without general and administrative expenses, profit, or overhead.

Insert in its entirety

7.10.5 Economic price adjustments will be calculated only on the labour portion of the base MMF and the Fully Loaded Labour Rates without general and administrative expenses, profit, or overhead.

5. Reference: Part 4, Attachment 1, Item 1c Technical Scenarios

Delete in its entirety: "Description of assessment factors for Situational Scenarios are not available for discussion purposes at this point in time."

6. Reference: Part 4, Attachment 1, Item 1 – Evaluation of Technical Elements

Delete in its entirety:

Within the Technical Evaluation, there are three (3) Technical areas; Experience, Plans, and Scenarios. Each technical area is divided into technical elements. The Experience area is divided into seven (7) elements. The Plans area is divided into five (5) elements. The Scenarios area is divided into (3) elements.

Each technical element will be assessed using two (2) assessment factors:

1) The bid suitably addresses all the assessment criteria with the element

The assessment criteria used to assess the suitability of the bid responses for each evaluated technical element are detailed below for Technical Elements in item 1a for experience, 1b for plans and 1c for scenarios. Relative breadth, depth and relevancy of the responses will all be taken into consideration while making the overall assessment in this assessment factor.

2) The bid identifies commitments by the Bidders to make use of actions, processes, tools, techniques or other resources that would provide a tangible ability to achieve desired outcomes in the relevant sections of the AJISS PWS.

Insert in its entirety:



Within the Technical Evaluation, there are three (3) Technical areas; Experience, Plans, and Scenarios. Each Technical area is divided into elements. The Experience area is divided into seven (7) elements. The Plans area is divided into five (5) elements. The Scenarios area is divided into (3) elements.

Each of the Technical Evaluation elements will be assessed using two (2) assessment factors:

1) The written submission requested in response to each element, together with those parts of the bid referenced in the response, suitably addresses all the assessment criteria within each element.

The assessment criteria used to assess the suitability of the bid responses for each evaluated technical element are detailed below for Technical Elements in item 1a for experience, 1b for plans and 1c for scenarios. Relative breadth, depth and relevancy of the responses will all be taken into consideration while making the overall assessment in this assessment factor.

2) The written submission requested in response to each element, together with those parts of the bid referenced in the response, identifies the Bidder's use of actions, processes, tools, techniques or other resources that would provide a tangible ability to achieve desired outcomes in the relevant sections of the AJISS PWS.

7. Reference: Part 4, Attachment 1, Item 2 – Evaluation of Relational Elements

Delete in its entirety: Item 2 – Evaluation of Relational Elements

Insert in its entirety revised: Item 2 – Evaluation of Relational Areas

Within the Relational Evaluation, there are five (5) Relational **Areas**: Common Goals & Collaborative Behaviours, Joint Governance, Information Sharing, Joint Collaboration, and Innovation & Continuous Improvement.

For the Evaluation of each Relational **Area**, the evaluators will be evaluating the bid responses as well as the Relationship Management Plan (RMP). Only the first twenty-five (25) pages of the RMP will be looked at for the purpose of the Evaluation of Relational **Areas**.

Each Relational **Area** will be assessed using two (2) Assessment Factors:

1) The written submission requested in response to each Relational Area together with those parts of the RMP referenced in the response, suitably addresses all the elements in the Assessment Criteria.

The Assessment Criteria used to assess the suitability of the bid responses are detailed in the table below. Relative thoroughness, detail, and description of specific actions, tools, techniques, processes, or resources will all be taken into consideration while making the overall assessment in this Assessment Factor.

2) The written submission requested in response to each Relational Area, together with those parts of the RMP referenced in the response, demonstrates tangible benefits to achieving the desired relational outcomes.

The Bidder should demonstrate in their response and in their Relationship Management Plan (RMP) measurable and verifiable evidence of the positive outcomes achieved utilizing the above items while also demonstrating how these items are collaborative, efficient, viable in the AJISS context, draws on relevant experience, and has been shown to have achieved positive outcomes.



The pairwise comparison in each evaluated **Area** will be based on the two (2) Assessment Factors described above. This will result in one overall pairwise statement for each Relational **Area** in accordance with the example provided in Part IV, Section 4.3 of this RFP.

While determining the comparison statements for each Relational **Area**, the evaluators will consider the relative strengths and weaknesses of each bid in comparison with another. The Assessment Criteria for each Relational **Area** will be taken into consideration while gauging the Bidder's response quality in meeting the Assessment Factors listed above. The Assessment Criterion defined for each **Area** below, are not ranked or rated individually, but are considered holistically in the pairwise comparison for that **area**.

The Bidder's proposed approach should be described in its Relationship Management Plan (RMP), submitted in accordance with DID AJISS-PM-009. In addition, for each of the 5 Relational **Areas**, the Bidder should provide a written submission that describes its experience employing its proposed approach and the benefits that were observed. In substantiating its experience, the Bidder should describe the context of each project cited, including identification of the client, the Bidder's role, the scope and scale of the work performed, the time period, and the relevance to AJISS' context.

Determination of comparison statement for each Relational Area

When determining the overall comparison statement for a given relational **area**, the evaluators will consider the following statements against both Assessment Factors:

"As good as" would be the statement for two bids that compared very closely to each other or had strengths and weaknesses that were determined to offset each other or not present a clear advantage to one Bidder over the other.

"Slightly better/Worse than" would be the statement for two bids in which one Bidder demonstrated a clear advantage in addressing one or both of the assessment factors.

"Better/Worse than" would be the statement for two bids in which one Bidder demonstrated a substantial advantage in addressing one or both of the assessment factors.

For the purpose of these comparisons, the following interpretations of clear and substantial will be used:

Clear – demonstrably better than (capable of being shown, logically proved)

Substantial – overwhelmingly better than (overpowering, total or nearly so)

8. Reference 3.2.2b)

Delete in its entirety: A joint venture Bidder may rely on the experience of one of its members to meet any evaluated Technical, Relational and Value Proposition criterion of this bid solicitation.

Insert in its entirety: A joint venture Bidder may rely on the experience of one of its members to meet any evaluated Technical and Relational criterion of this bid solicitation.

Part 2 Questions and Answers

Q165: Reference: RFP Part 7, 7.24.5 and 7.24.6



Para 7.24.5 of Part 7 of the RFP states: "Canada at its sole discretion may terminate the contract if, at any time, the total cumulative liability of the Contractor for losses or damage suffered by Canada caused by the Contractor's performance of or failure to perform the Contract, excluding liability described under subsection 7.24.2 exceeds \$40 million."

Para 7.24.6 of Part 7 implies the Contractor will have the same right to terminate under the same circumstances. Can Canada please confirm the implied meaning of Para 7.24.6 and amend Para 7.24.5 accordingly?

A165: Refer to Amendment 8 part 1 #3 as well as attachments to the AJISS Solicitation: [revised 7.24.6 page 87 of 227.pdf](#)

Q166: Reference: RFP Annex H - Annex H of the RFP requires the Contractor to obtain "All Risks Property insurance to cover Government Property while in the Contractor's care, custody or control". Does Canada require the All Risks Property Insurance clause to apply to the entire vessel or is the intent to limit this type of insurance to Government Property such as spares, special tools, and test equipment? If Canada requires the All Risks Property insurance to apply to the vessel, please advise the replacement value of one of each class of Vessel?

A166: Refer to Amendment 11 Q159

Q167: Reference: RFP Annex B, PWS Appendix U - The RFP Annex B- Basis of Payment Section 2.8 Contractor's quoted hourly personnel rates for initial four (4)-year Contract period and the Financial Evaluation Spreadsheet have rates categories titled Warehouse and Logistics Support junior, intermediate and senior. The PWS Appendix U – Personnel Categories does not provide a description for these labour categories but instead has Integrated Logistics Support Specialist, junior, intermediate and senior, which has university education requirements which do not align with a Warehouse Technician. Can Canada please update the RFP Annex B and the Financial Evaluation Spreadsheet to address the rate categories and personnel categories by separating the Warehouse Support, junior, intermediate and senior from the Integrated Logistic Support Specialist, and providing descriptions for both in the PWS Appendix U?

A167: Refer to Amendment 11 Part 1 #8

Q168: Reference: PWS 1408 AND 1409: According to PWS-1408, the contractor must design, develop, maintain and manage an interim CE during the transition phase and according to PWS-1409, the contractor must design, develop, maintain and manage a final CE during the steady state phase. Can Canada confirm that it intends the interim CE to be operational from the commencement of the start-up phase and the final CE to be operational from the commencement of the steady state phase. If so, this will require the design and development activities for the two CEs to take place earlier than stated in the PWS.

A168: Canada confirms its intent for the interim CE within an EIE emergent task to be fully operational within 1 - 2 years after Contract Award early in the transitional phase. The EIE Emergent Task will specify a Full CE + EDE to be completed approximately 3 – 4 years after Contract Award in expectation of delivery before the Steady State phase.

Q169: Reference: ANNEX K, S. 1.1.13: Definition of "Eligible Donor". This definition states that "Eligible Donor" means the parent corporation of the Contractor, and all of the parent's subsidiaries, divisions and subdivisions; and the Contractor's Tier-One suppliers related to the performance of the Work under this Contract, their respective parent corporations and all of the parent's subsidiaries, divisions and subdivisions." For more complex corporate structures, this definition could be interpreted as excluding related entities within a corporate family if they do not happen to have the same corporate parent as the Contractor or a Tier-One supplier, as the case may be, but that are under common control with such Contractor or Tier-One supplier. It does not logically follow that this is Canada's intention as, once, per the definition, you take one step "up" in a corporate structure, you can go any number of steps "down" in the structure as all subsidiaries, divisions and sub-divisions are included. Could Canada please confirm



that all references to “parent” in the definition of Eligible Donor are to be read as meaning “ultimate parent”?

A169: For the purposes of the ITB Terms and Conditions, we do not differentiate between parent and ultimate parent.

Q170: Reference: Part 4, Item 1a, Technical Element No. 1 ISS Program Management

The ISS Program Management experience technical element states a maximum of two relevant projects can be used to outline the Bidder’s experience. Where the bidder is a Joint Venture consisting of Member A and Member B, is it acceptable to submit two examples, one from Member A and one from Member B, where each example answers the entire requirement of Technical Element 1 and both adhere to the rules regarding pooling of experience and the total page limitation of 20 pages? If acceptable, Can Canada confirm that both examples would be reviewed and the evaluation of each combined to provide a single holistic score for the Technical element?

A170: Negative. Refer to Amendment #6 A64.

Q171: Reference: RFP Annex K, Para 1.1.13, Canada’s answer to Q69 in Amendment # 6 is troubling. If the AJISS Contractor were to utilize, for the performance of work under the AJISS contract, reputable and reliable Canadian small businesses that happen to be eligible parties under other programs with IRB or ITB commitments, the AJISS Contractor cannot claim this work as SMB solely because the small business is, e.g., an eligible party under the AOPS contract and will act as an IRB donor for doing indirect transactions. To aid in satisfying Canada’s mandatory 15% SMB commitment, bidders would be incented NOT to use these small businesses, who are the original equipment manufacturers, to service their own equipment. This, therefore, in our opinion, unfairly discriminates against these small Canadian businesses. We assume that to incentivize the AJISS Contractor to NOT use these reputable and reliable Canadian small businesses is not Canada’s intent. We respectfully request Canada to reconsider its position to remove the wording “or Eligible Donor on any contract with IRB/ITB obligations”.

A171: No changes will be made to the definition of Small and Medium Business. For clarification of the definition, a Canadian Company will not qualify as an SMB if: 1) They have more than 250 full-time personnel as of the date of entering into a Transaction; 2) They are an agent or distributor of foreign goods and services; 3) They are a subsidiary of the Contractor; and 4) They are a subsidiary of an Eligible Donor on any contract with IRB/ITB obligations.

Q172: Reference: Annex I, Are quotations in response to a DND 626 Form, acceptable in a foreign currency? Will Canada take the foreign exchange risk from the period of quotation to payment of the DND 626 form?

A172: Negative, Quotes are to be in Canadian funds.

Q173: Reference: Amendment 7, Q/A73. The ITB terms and conditions in Annex K are largely based on ISED standard terms, which presume commitments, are being made against known, quantifiable requirements at the time of contract award. For AJISS, significant components of the requirement may occur as Emergent Work and the breakdown of the CCV for such Emergent Work as between goods and services to be supplied cannot be predicted with any accuracy. As Emergent Work has the potential to add significantly to the Contract Value, it may distort otherwise reasonably estimated VP commitment percentages. However, the ITB Terms and Conditions in some ways allows for alterations of obligations where changes arise that are outside the control of the contractor. Will Canada be treating Emergent Work as “changes in the Work initiated by Canada” for the purposes of the ITB Terms and Conditions?

A173: No, Canada will not be treating Emergent Work as “changes in the Work initiated by Canada” for the purposes of the ITB Terms and Conditions



Q174: Reference Amd 006 A64, Part 3, Paragraph 3.2.2, Part 4 Attachment 1 Items 1 & 2: Would Canada kindly confirm that the evaluated or technical “criteria” for the purposes of paragraph 3.2.2 the RFP, specifically each being an “evaluated ... criterion” per subparagraph 3.2.2 b) or a “single technical criterion” per subparagraph 3.2.2 c) and A64, are the 15 Elements in the tables in Part 4, Attachment 1, Item 1 (being seven in Item 1a, five in Item 1b and three in Item 1c) and the five Areas in Part 4, Attachment 1, Item 2.?

A174 Canada confirms that the “evaluated ... criterion” or, per A64 “single technical criterion” for the purposes of paragraph 3.2.2 b) and c) are the 15 Technical Elements in the tables in Part 4, Attachment 1, Item 1 and the five Relational Areas in Part 4, Attachment 1, Item 2. See change to 3.2.2 b) in Amendment 012 to clarify that Value Proposition is not included.

Q175: Reference: Part 3, Paragraph 3.2.2, Part 4, Attachment 1, Item 1b. A hypothetical Bidder might be any number of members in joint venture. Part 4, Attachment 1, Item 1b, No. 1 calls for the submission for evaluation of the Bidder’s Preliminary Program Management Plan (PMP). Subparagraph 3.2.2 c) indicates that, “[j]oint venture members cannot pool their abilities with other joint venture members to satisfy a single technical criterion of this bid solicitation” (emphasis added). We see it as an advantage of forming a joint venture that a joint venture bidder would be able to bring its combined abilities forward in being able to deliver the best possible solution to achieve Canada’s objectives for this procurement. Is it Canada’s intention that the Bidder’s plan documents, such as the PMP, cannot describe and combine the abilities of more than one member of the joint venture?

A175: Refer to Amendment #6 A64.

Q176: Reference: Part 3, Subparagraph 3.2.2 c). The first sentence of subparagraph 3.2.2 c) of the RFP states, “members cannot pool their abilities with other joint venture members to satisfy a single bid criterion”. The second sentence states, “a joint venture member can pool its individual experience with the experience of the joint venture itself”. Is the distinction between abilities on the one hand and experience on the other intentional?

A176: There is no intended distinction between “abilities” and “experience” in this clause.

Q177 Reference Amd 007 A93, Part 4 Attachment 1 Item 1: Please confirm that the “8 areas of experience” pertaining to Element 1 – ISS Program Management are simply some of the assessment criteria for that element that should be addressed in the a bidder’s response?

A177. Confirmed.

Q178: Reference: PWS Appendix J, FMF Strategic Capabilities Statement: During the FMF visits it was emphasized that bidder's must pay close attention to Appendix J. Can Canada please let bidders know the intention of that statement? We understand the FMFs are, as stated in the cover letter included in Appendix J, "the Royal Canadian Navy's strategic assets responsible for the planning and co-ordination of all 2nd and 3rd level activities performed in the Dockyard." A129 in Amendment # 8 does not define which systems the FMF intend to maintain but points to PWS 1199 and PWS 1293 which state that the FMF will determine on an annual basis the systems where they will conduct the 2nd level maintenance, based upon their expected capacity. Further, during the FMF visits it is quite clear that the FMFs have the capability to conduct 2nd level maintenance on nearly all systems in the AOPS and the JSS. However, as all systems, with the exception of crypto are considered hybrid, can Canada explain the purpose of the column "FMF Recommended Strategic Model" in Annex B pages B-4/7 and B-5/7? Does this indicate which systems the FMF intend to maintain and will commit resource for?

A178: See response to Q134, Amendment No. 10.



Q179: Reference: Appendix U - Personnel Categories Final: The Life Cycle Management Specialist qualifications, are states as equivalent to QL 6 trade level which no longer exists. Will Canada provide an equivalent current Trade level reference?

A179: The professional development milestone that is equivalent to QL 6 is Development Period 4 (DP4) either QL6 or DP4 are sufficient.

Q180: Reference: PWS Appendix T, Para 6.3: This includes the statement that there is "no mechanism for inputting platform level ISSC requirements into Formation Level Plans." A similar statement is included in para 8.1, "Formation processes do not include planning, execution and completion of ISSC-led work periods although Designated Contracting Technical Authorities (DCTA) are now involved in work management processes such as weekly Operations Meetin." Can Canada explain what that these statements mean with respect to how a contractor will manage dedicated maintenance periods and work with the FMFs?

A180: These statements represent the current state of ISSC input to Formation and FMF Plans. This does not preclude future input to Formation and/or FMF Plans that should develop in accordance with ISSC AJISS Plans, Relational Contracting, Governance and SDPP/SDAOP submissions.

Q181: Reference: Part 4, Attachment 1, Item 1. RFP Page 29 lists Scenarios as a Technical area that contains 3 Technical Elements. Each Technical Element is to be evaluated using the two Assessment Factors, Assessment Factor 1: "The bid suitably addresses all the assessment criteria within the element." It states that the criteria are detailed for each technical element, however, while this has been done for Experience and Plans there are no criteria provided for the Scenarios. (A statement marked "Mission - Describe how your company would respond to this situation from receipt of the Unsatisfactory Condition Reports through to resolution of the issue." is not a criteria). Could Canada please let bidders know what are the criteria that will be assessed for each of the Scenarios?

A181: Assessment Factors for Situational Scenarios are based upon the relative breadth, depth and relevancy of the responses, and Assessment factor 2 under Part 4, Attachment 1, Item 1, Page 29.

Q182: Reference: Part 3, Paragraph 3.2.2. Subparagraphs 3.2.2 b) and 3.2.2 c) both cover the evaluated technical criteria but subparagraph 3.2.2 b) applies also to the evaluated Relational and Value Proposition criteria. Is it therefore permissible for joint venture members to pool their abilities and experience to meet the evaluated Relational and Value Proposition criteria? That is to say, is subparagraph 3.2.2 c) intended to also apply to the evaluated Relational and Value Proposition criteria intentional?

A182: Refer to Amendment #6 A64