



Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Gendarmerie royale du Canada

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS A:
Bid Receiving/Réception des soumissions
 Bid Receiving Unit
 Procurement & Contracting Services
 Branch
 VISITOR'S CENTRE
 Royal Canadian Mounted Police
 73 Leikin Drive
 Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0R2
 Attn: Shannon Plunkett
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 - Commentaries

Title-Sujet Pilatus PC-12/45 or 47 Avionics Upgrade		Amendment No. N° de la modification 002
Solicitation No. - No. de l'invitation 201606619	Date November 3, 2016	
Client Reference No. - No. De Référence du Client 0644 - M0080 1005110		
GETS Reference No. - No. de Référence de SEAG PW-16-00753183		
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at – à 02:00 PM (EST) on – le November 17th,2016		
F.O.B. - F.A.B.		
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Diane Palarchio Procurement & Contracting Officer		
Telephone No. - No de téléphone 613-843-5907	Fax No. - N° de FAX: (613) 825-0082	
Destination of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destinations des biens, services et construction: See Herein / Voir aux présentes		
Instructions: See Herein Instructions : Voir aux présentes		
Delivery Required - Livraison exigée: See Herein/Voir aux présentes	Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur		



QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS SERIES #2:

Q1

Regarding RCMP solicitation number 201606619 titled "Pilatus PC-12/45 or 47 Avionics Upgrade", VENDOR wishes to dispute the Point Rated Technical Criteria of section 4.1.1.3 (Page 10/45) because they are excessively stringent and unfair. As an example, a company scores 55/140, and the minimum points required to be compliant are 98. The requirement in section 4.1.1.3 R3, R4, R5, R6 and R7 are excessively stringent as they do not take into account the work performed on similar airframes and similar avionics systems. The PC-12/45, 47 fleet is limited in Canada to 49 units, therefore any one offeror is unlikely to achieve the minimum total points required.

As an example of our experience on the PC-12/45, in 2004, VENDOR performed TCAS and TAWS avionics upgrades on RCMP aircraft C-GMPY and C-FMPO, and we have performed minor upgrades to Air Sprint's PC12/45 fleet, but these facts do not count as valid points because they are outside of the 4 year time requirement. VENDOR has performed numerous Garmin GTN750 and GTN-650 installations to STCs on aircraft similar to the PC-12.

Q2

This is a letter to complain/dispute the selection process for Solicitation No 201606619 in reg. With this background, based on your current points system, Vendor would not qualify to bid on this project solely on the fact that we have not completed a major modification on a Pilatus PC12/45 within the last 4 years. Even though we very well may possibly have the most experience on these airframes and in particular airframes in your fleet, we are possibly not considered solely based on recent experience. By the way your contract is written, if a company was lucky enough to have completed an installation within the last 4 years on this airframe and especially if it included a Garmin navigator, they would be a 'shoe in' for the contract even though they may have the least total experience.

I would like to add a note on the Avionics field. In the world of modifying avionics and cockpits for the purpose of modernization, we work on many different airframes. We typically get different aircraft in 'waves' as they are hitting their time for overhaul in similar years. It is not uncommon to go a period without seeing a specific aircraft. These airframes may differ in size and scope but the electronic design and cockpit design does not always vary greatly. You will find that the legacy Pilatus avionics are very similar to a King Air F90 for example. Another note is the limited access to specific aircraft in current situations. There is only 45 total PC-12/45 in Canada with a very small percentage in need of immediate upgrade for their scope of use.

My point/complaint is on the method to determine experience. This in my opinion is invalid and inaccurate. Maybe a complete resume may give you a better idea of who is best and who should be given an advantage in formula? Maybe a judgment of experience on the product over the specific airframe makes more sense?



A1 and A2
See below amendment #2.

AMENDMENT #2

THE FOLLOWING REVISIONS ARE :

DELETE THE FOLLOWING:

1) PART 2 - OFFEROR INSTRUCTIONS

2.3. Enquiries - Request for Standing Offers

All enquiries must be submitted in writing to the Standing Offer Authority no later than 15 calendar days before the Request for Standing Offers (RFSO) closing date. Enquiries received after that time may not be answered.

AND

INSERT:

1) PART 2 - OFFEROR INSTRUCTIONS

2.3. Enquiries - Request for Standing Offers

All enquiries must be submitted in writing to the Standing Offer Authority no later than 5 calendar days before the Request for Standing Offers (RFSO) closing date. Enquiries received after that time may not be answered.

2) PART 4 - EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION

4.1 Evaluation Procedures

4.1.1 Technical Evaluation



. 4.1.1.3 Point Rated Technical Criteria

DELETE THE FOLLOWING :

1. Each Technical Proposal that meets all Mandatory Requirement specified above will be evaluated and scored in accordance with the following point-rated evaluation criteria.
2. In addressing the point rated evaluation criteria, the candidate should supplement the information supplied in response to the mandatory requirements with details outlining the depth and extent of the relevant experience, qualifications and specialized expertise. All claims with regard to experience, qualifications or expertise must be substantiated through the provision of detailed project descriptions of how and where the claimed experience, qualifications or expertise were gained. Unsubstantiated claims of experience, qualifications or expertise will not be considered by the evaluation team during the point rated evaluation.
3. The offeror must obtain a minimum score of 70% or 98 points to be considered compliant. Offers resulting in offerors not meeting the minimum score will be considered non-responsive

	Rated Criteria	Max Score	Offeror's Score	Substantiating Detail (Explanation)
Offeror Requirements:				
R1	<p>The offeror has more than the minimum of eight (8) years demonstrated experience upgrading aircraft within the last twenty (20) years.</p> <p>Less than 8 years of experience: 0 points 8+ to 10 years of experience: 5 points 10+ to 12 years of experience: 10 points 12+ to 14 years of experience: 15 points 14+ to 16 years of experience: 20 points 16 years or more experience: 25 points</p>	25		
R2	<p>The offeror should be within 0 to 2000 nautical miles of the following address:</p> <p>4100 – 4th Avenue. Whitehorse, Yukon Y1A 1H5</p> <p>2001 or more nautical miles: 0 points 1501 up to 2000 nautical miles: 10 points 1001 up to 1500 nautical miles: 20 points 1000 nautical miles or less: 25 points</p>	25		
R3	<p>The offeror should have previous experience performing *minor Avionics upgrades on the Pilatus PC-12/45 or 47 in the last four (4) years.</p>	15		



	Rated Criteria	Max Score	Offeror's Score	Substantiating Detail (Explanation)
	<p>* Minor is defined as modifications not requiring DAR approval and LSTC / STC.</p> <p>1 to 2 projects: 5 points 3 to 5 projects: 10 points 6 or more projects: 15 points</p> <p>For each project the offeror should provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aircraft Registration - aircraft make - aircraft model - aircraft owner - date completed - time it took to complete the project (number of days) and - a summary of the work performed , such as a list of all equipment removed and a list of all equipment installed or a copy of the logbook entry 			
R4	<p>The offeror should have previous experience performing *major Avionics upgrades on the Pilatus PC-12 /45 or 47 in the last four (4) years.</p> <p>*Major modification is defined as requiring DAR approval and LSTC / STC</p> <p>0 projects : 0 points 1 to 2 projects : 5 points 3 to 5 projects : 10 points 6 or more projects : 15 points</p> <p>For each project the offeror should provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aircraft Registration - aircraft make - aircraft model - aircraft owner - date completed - time it took to complete the project (number of days) and - a summary of the work performed , such as a list of all equipment removed and a list of all 	15		



	Rated Criteria	Max Score	Offeror's Score	Substantiating Detail (Explanation)
	equipment installed or a copy of the logbook entry - copy of the Major Mod Report			
R5	<p>The offeror should have previous experience performing *minor Structural Modifications on the Pilatus PC-12/45 or 47 in the last four (4) years.</p> <p>* Minor is defined as modifications not requiring DAR approval and LSTC / STC.</p> <p>0 projects : 0 points 1 to 2 projects : 5 points 3 to 5 projects : 10 points 6 or more projects : 15 points</p> <p>For each project the offeror should provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aircraft Registration - aircraft make - aircraft model - aircraft owner - date completed - time it took to complete the project (number of days) and - a summary of the work performed , such as a list of all equipment removed and a list of all equipment installed or a copy of the logbook entry 	15		
R6	<p>The offeror should have previous experience performing *major Structural Modifications on the Pilatus PC-12/45 or 47 in the last four (4) years.</p> <p>*Major modification is defined as requiring DAR approval and LSTC / STC</p> <p>0 projects : 0 points 1 to 2 projects : 5 points 3 to 5 projects : 10 points 6 or more projects : 15 points</p>	15		



	Rated Criteria	Max Score	Offeror's Score	Substantiating Detail (Explanation)
	For each project the offeror should provide the following: - Aircraft Registration - aircraft make - aircraft model - aircraft owner - date completed - time it took to complete the project (number of days) and - a summary of the work performed , such as a list of all equipment removed and a list of all equipment installed or a copy of the logbook entry - copy of the Major Mod Report			
R7	The offeror should have previous experience installing and integrating a Garmin GTN 750 and/ or GTN 650 in a Pilatus PC-12/45 or 47 in the last four (4) years. 0 projects : 0 points 1 to 2 projects: 20 points 3 to 4 projects: 25 points 5 or more projects : 30 points	30		
TOTAL POINTS REQUIRED (98/140) 70%:		140	/140	

And

INSERT THE FOLLOWING:

1 Each Technical Proposal that meets all Mandatory Requirement specified above will be evaluated and scored in accordance with the following point-rated evaluation criteria.

2 In addressing the point rated evaluation criteria, the candidate should supplement the information supplied in response to the mandatory requirements with details outlining the depth and extent of the relevant experience, qualifications and specialized expertise. All claims with regard to experience, qualifications or expertise must be substantiated through the provision of detailed project descriptions of how and where the claimed experience, qualifications or expertise were gained. Unsubstantiated claims of experience, qualifications or expertise will not be considered by the evaluation team during the point rated evaluation.

3 The offeror must obtain a minimum score of 50 points to be considered compliant. Offers



resulting in offerors not meeting the minimum score will be considered non-responsive

	Rated Criteria	Max Score	Offeror's Score	Substantiating Detail (Explanation)
Offeror Requirements:				
R1	<p>The offeror has more than the minimum of eight (8) years demonstrated experience upgrading aircraft avionics systems within the last twenty (20) years.</p> <p>Less than 8 years of experience: 0 points 8+ to 10 years of experience: 5 points 10+ to 12 years of experience: 10 points 12+ to 14 years of experience: 15 points 14+ to 16 years of experience: 20 points 16 years or more experience: 25 points</p>	25		
R2	<p>The offeror should be within 0 to 2500 nautical miles of the following address:</p> <p>4100 – 4th Avenue. Whitehorse, Yukon Y1A 1H5</p> <p>2501 or more nautical miles: 0 points 2001 up to 2500 nautical miles: 10 points 1501 up to 2000 nautical miles: 20 points 1500 nautical miles or less: 25 points</p>	25		
R3	<p>The offeror should have previous experience performing *minor Avionics upgrades on the Pilatus PC-12/45 or 47 in the last ten (10) years.</p> <p>* Minor is defined as modifications not requiring DAR approval and LSTC / STC.</p> <p>1 to 2 projects: 5 points 3 to 5 projects: 10 points 6 or more projects: 15 points</p> <p>For each project the offeror should provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aircraft Registration - aircraft make - aircraft model - aircraft owner - date completed - time it took to complete the project (number 	15		



	Rated Criteria	Max Score	Offeror's Score	Substantiating Detail (Explanation)
	<p>of days) and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a summary of the work performed , such as a list of all equipment removed and a list of all equipment installed or a copy of the logbook entry 			
R4	<p>The offeror should have previous experience performing *major Avionics upgrades on the Pilatus PC-12 /45 or 47 in the last ten (10) years.</p> <p>*Major modification is defined as requiring DAR approval and LSTC / STC</p> <p>0 projects : 0 points 1 to 2 projects : 5 points 3 to 5 projects : 10 points 6 or more projects : 15 points</p> <p>For each project the offeror should provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aircraft Registration - aircraft make - aircraft model - aircraft owner - date completed - time it took to complete the project (number of days) and - a summary of the work performed , such as a list of all equipment removed and a list of all equipment installed or a copy of the logbook entry - copy of the Major Mod Report 	15		
R5	<p>The offeror should have previous experience performing *minor Structural Modifications on the Pilatus PC-12/45 or 47 in the last ten (10) years.</p> <p>* Minor is defined as modifications not requiring DAR approval and LSTC / STC.</p> <p>0 projects : 0 points 1 to 2 projects : 5 points 3 to 5 projects : 10 points 6 or more projects : 15 points</p>	15		



	Rated Criteria	Max Score	Offeror's Score	Substantiating Detail (Explanation)
	<p>For each project the offeror should provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aircraft Registration - aircraft make - aircraft model - aircraft owner - date completed - time it took to complete the project (number of days) and - a summary of the work performed , such as a list of all equipment removed and a list of all equipment installed or a copy of the logbook entry 			
R6	<p>The offeror should have previous experience performing *major Structural Modifications on the Pilatus PC-12/45 or 47 in the last ten (10) years.</p> <p>*Major modification is defined as requiring DAR approval and LSTC / STC</p> <p>0 projects : 0 points 1 to 2 projects : 5 points 3 to 5 projects : 10 points 6 or more projects : 15 points</p> <p>For each project the offeror should provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aircraft Registration - aircraft make - aircraft model - aircraft owner - date completed - time it took to complete the project (number of days) and - a summary of the work performed , such as a list of all equipment removed and a list of all equipment installed or a copy of the logbook entry - copy of the Major Mod Report 	15		
R7	<p>The offeror should have previous experience</p>	30		



	Rated Criteria	Max Score	Offeror's Score	Substantiating Detail (Explanation)
	installing and integrating a Garmin GTN 750 and/ or GTN 650 in a Pilatus PC-12/45 or 47 in the last five (5) years. 0 projects : 0 points 1 to 2 projects: 20 points 3 to 4 projects: 25 points 5 or more projects : 30 points			
TOTAL POINTS REQUIRED (50/140) :		140	/140	

2) .-DELETE THE FOLLOWING

1) PART 4 EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION

4.1 Evaluation Procedures

4.1.2 Financial Evaluation

4.1.2.1

The price of the offer will be evaluated in Canadian dollars, Applicable Taxes excluded, FOB destination, Canadian customs duties and excise taxes included.

4.2 Basis of Selection – Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit and Price

To be declared responsive, an offer must:

- a) comply with all the requirements of the Request for Standing Offer;
- b) meet all mandatory technical evaluation criteria; and
- c) obtain the required minimum of 98 points or 70% for the technical evaluation criteria which are subject to point rating.

The rating is performed on a scale of 140 points.

Offers not meeting (a) and (b) and (c) will be declared non-responsive. Neither the responsive offer that receives the highest number of points nor the one that proposed the lowest price will necessarily be accepted. The responsive offer with the lowest evaluated price per point will be recommended for issuance of a standing offer.



3. The selection will be based on the highest responsive combined rating of technical merit and price. The ratio will be 70% for the technical merit and 30% for the price.
4. To establish the technical merit score, the overall technical score for each responsive offer will be determined as follows: total number of points obtained / maximum number of points available multiplied by the ratio of 70%
5. To establish the pricing score, each responsive offer will be prorated against the lowest evaluated price and the ratio of 30%.
6. For each responsive offer, the technical merit score and the pricing score will be added to determine its combined rating.
7. Neither the responsive offer obtaining the highest technical score nor the one with the lowest evaluated price will necessarily be accepted. The responsive offer with the highest combined rating of technical merit and price will be recommended for award of a standing offer.
8. The table below illustrates an example where all three offers are responsive and the selection of the offeror is determined by a 70/30 ratio of technical merit and price, respectively. The total available points equal 100 and the lowest evaluated price is \$50,000 (50).

Highest Combined Rating Technical Merit (70%) and Price (30%)			
Calculation	Technical Points	Price Points	Total Points
Offeror 1 - Tech = 88/100 - Price = \$60,000	$\frac{88 \times 70}{100} = 61.6$	$\frac{***50 \times 30}{**60} = 25$	86.6
Offeror 2 - Tech = 82/100 - Price = \$55,000	$\frac{82 \times 70}{100} = 57.4$	$\frac{50 \times 30}{55} = 27.27$	84.67
Offeror 3 - Tech = 76/100 - Price = \$50,000	$\frac{76 \times 70}{100} = 53.2$	$\frac{50 \times 30}{50} = 30$	83.2

* Maximum Technical Points

** Offeror's Price Proposal

*** Lowest Priced Proposal

In this example Offeror 1 would be recommended for Standing Offer Award.

9. In the event that there are two (2) or more responsive offers with identical overall scores at the end of the evaluation, the Offer with the highest technical merit will be recommended for award of Standing Offer.

10. Offerors should note that all standing offer awards are subject to Canada's internal approvals process. Despite the fact that the Offeror may have been recommended for standing offer award, a standing offer will only be awarded if internal approval is granted according to Canada's internal policies. If approval is not granted, no standing offer will be awarded.



And

INSERT THE FOLLOWING :

4.1.2 Financial Evaluation

4.1.2.1

The price of the offer will be evaluated in Canadian dollars, Applicable Taxes excluded, FOB destination, Canadian customs duties and excise taxes included.

4.2 Basis of Selection – Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit and Price

To be declared responsive, an offer must:

- a) comply with all the requirements of the Request for Standing Offer;
- b) meet all mandatory technical evaluation criteria; and
- c) obtain the required minimum of 50 points for the technical evaluation criteria which are subject to point rating.

The rating is performed on a scale of 140 points.

Offers not meeting (a) and (b) and (c) will be declared non-responsive. Neither the responsive offer that receives the highest number of points nor the one that proposed the lowest price will necessarily be accepted. The responsive offer with the lowest evaluated price per point will be recommended for issuance of a standing offer.

3. The selection will be based on the highest responsive combined rating of technical merit and price. The ratio will be 70% for the technical merit and 30% for the price.

4. To establish the technical merit score, the overall technical score for each responsive offer will be determined as follows: total number of points obtained / maximum number of points available multiplied by the ratio of 70%

5. To establish the pricing score, each responsive offer will be prorated against the lowest evaluated price and the ratio of 30%.

6. For each responsive offer, the technical merit score and the pricing score will be added to determine its combined rating.

7. Neither the responsive offer obtaining the highest technical score nor the one with the lowest evaluated price will necessarily be accepted. The responsive offer with the highest combined rating of technical merit and price will be recommended for award of a standing offer.

8. The table below illustrates an example where all three offers are responsive and the selection of the offeror is determined by a 70/30 ratio of technical merit and price, respectively. The total available points equal 100 and the lowest evaluated price is \$50,000 (50).



Highest Combined Rating Technical Merit (70%) and Price (30%)			
Calculation	Technical Points	Price Points	Total Points
Offeror 1 - Tech = 88/100 - Price = \$60,000	$\frac{88 \times 70}{100} = 61.6$	$\frac{***50 \times 30}{**60} = 25$	86.6
Offeror 2 - Tech = 82/100 - Price = \$55,000	$\frac{82 \times 70}{100} = 57.4$	$\frac{50 \times 30}{55} = 27.27$	84.67
Offeror 3 - Tech = 76/100 - Price = \$50,000	$\frac{76 \times 70}{100} = 53.2$	$\frac{50 \times 30}{50} = 30$	83.2

* Maximum Technical Points

** Offeror's Price Proposal

***Lowest Priced Proposal

In this example Offeror 1 would be recommended for Standing Offer Award.

9. In the event that there are two (2) or more responsive offers with identical overall scores at the end of the evaluation, the Offer with the highest technical merit will be recommended for award of Standing Offer.

10. Offerors should note that all standing offer awards are subject to Canada's internal approvals process. Despite the fact that the Offeror may have been recommended for standing offer award, internal policies. If approval is not granted, no standing offer will be awarded