



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

Electrical & Electronics Products Division
11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier
7B3, Place du Portage, Phase III
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet LED Lanterns	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation F7047-160038/A	Date 2017-05-12
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client F7047-160038	Amendment No. - N° modif. 006
File No. - N° de dossier hn329.F7047-160038	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$HN-329-72683	
Date of Original Request for Standing Offer Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale 2017-03-14	
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2017-05-26	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Dumaresq, Steve	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur hn329
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 420-0341 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 953-4944
Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	
Security - Sécurité This revision does not change the security requirements of the Offer. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de la présente offre.	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Acknowledgement copy required	Yes - Oui	No - Non
Accusé de réception requis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer. Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.		
Signature	Date	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant. (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)		
For the Minister - Pour le Ministre		

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
F7047-160038/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
F7047-160038/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
006
File No. - N° du dossier

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
hn329
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

This Amendment 006 is raised for the following:

Answers to bidder questions attached.

Question 17

Re: Amendment 002

Follow-Up to Question and Answer, Evaluation Matrix, 2.1.4 Corporate Experience

The question posed appears to reflect a request for clarification within the meaning assigned to this criteria in previous RFSOs for SCOLs.

The corporate experience criteria historically related to the depth and extent of experience in designing, manufacturing and field service of SCOLs.

Points were awarded for every SCOL developed by a bidder / manufacturer. This criteria was introduced to reflect risk associated with direct experience.

The answer provided is not consistent with the historical interpretation of this criteria.

The answer suggests that product breadth is most important and not experience developing and manufacturing SCOLs.

The answer provides means that a company focused on SCOLs would be at a disadvantage to a company that offers many products unrelated to SCOLs.

It is possible that a manufacturer, new to developing SCOLs, could be awarded more points than a focused and highly SCOL developer.

Could you please review the answer with respect to historical precedent?

Could you please explain how experience in developing unrelated, incandescent, mains powered products is relevant in determining the experience of bidders developing self-contained solar powered LED lanterns with calendar functionality, etc.

Answer 17

See Answer 3 for background.

In the last paragraph of question 17, as part of a question the offeror writes “... *how experience in developing unrelated, incandescent...*” To be clear, section 2.1.4 of the statement of work (Annex A1) states: “*To make it possible to assess corporate experience, the Bidder should include with the proposal information related to the number of LED lanterns the manufacturer has developed...*”

The development of different types of lanterns does demonstrate breadth of experience. Experience which in many respects, is applicable to self-contained lanterns. The design of optics and associated electronics, and housings, contribute to corporate knowledge applicable to several requirements for self-contained omnidirectional LED lanterns such as optical performance, resistance to icing and high winds, ingress protection, and protection from static discharge, etc.

In a similar manner, the design of multiple different types of self-contained lanterns can provide similar corporate experiences.

The rated item 2.1.4 1) of the evaluation framework is one item intended to assess a manufacturer’s experience. As such, different designs of self-contained lanterns may be cited for qualification.

Question 18

Appendix A

Lantern Weights

The maximum weights of the lanterns specified in the tables are 1.0x to 2.2x heavier than the lanterns currently used by Canadian Coast Guard.

Use of lanterns at the maximum weight specified will have a detrimental impact on buoy stability performance and overall level of service.

This will be especially significant on an SB-30 Spar Buoy.

Could you please verify the maximum weights stated in Appendix A for each lantern?

Answer 18

The weights in Appendix A of the performance specification (Annex A2) have been verified and will remain as stated for the current process.

Question 19

Re: Amendment 004, Q & A - #6

It is noted from the answer to Question 6 that Table 2, of Section 2.2 Quantities, of Annex 1 has been removed.

This table provided a Description of usage types.

Follow-Up Questions:

As the description of Usage Type under the Statement of Work has been removed; should Section 2.4 also be removed?

If Section 2.4 remains, can you please explain:

- A) Will Coast Guard use the responses in the Evaluation Process?
- B) Will Coast Guard use the information as the basis for Operational Use Selection and/or to provide a basis for Warranty Claims ?
- C) If so, how should claims be verified / supported by respondents given that only two (2) of the Usage Types described in the Table that was removed are verified within Annex 2 ?

Under Section 2.4, can you please explain the “+” term with respect to the following statement “to indicate a lantern would be operating at,or above rated capacity to meet the requirement and perhaps that additional equipment (solar panels, batteries) may be beneficial or required” AND with respect to “Self-Contained Omnidirectional LED Lanterns” AND with respect to interpretation of Warranty, and more specifically, the battery warranty required?

Answer 19

Section 2.4 of the statement of work (Annex A1) has no normative requirements. Further, the CCG will have all of the information required to create the table based from offerors’ submissions for the 6 type A and 5 type B for which offers are being solicited.

The CCG understands the lack of clarity with the “+” and “-” descriptors and will review how it evaluates lantern performance.

Section 2.4 of the statement of work (Annex A1) is deleted.

Question 20

An offeror has asked a number of questions with respect to section 2.11 Warranty of the statement of work (Annex A1). The questions addressed 4 points summarized as follows:

1. **Preferred warranty.** Would the CCG be willing to pay extra for the preferred 8-year warranty and if so, how would it be evaluated?
2. **High water pressure.** Quoting the informative statement of requirements of the performance specification (Annex A2) *“In heavy seas, lanterns may occasionally be immersed in seawater.”* the offeror states that lanterns can be hit by waves and can become submerged. The offeror asks if these conditions are covered by warranty.
3. **Handling.** Quoting the informative statement of requirements *“The lanterns will generally encounter shock and vibration when they are mounted on buoys as well as when they are transported on vessels to be deployed or retrieved.”* and the normative section 3.5.7.1 *“The lantern shall be capable of operating when under continuous exposure to shock and vibration as a marine aid to navigation. This includes handling on ships, and when mounted on buoys or pile structures.”* of the performance specification (Annex A2) the offeror asks if lanterns damaged under these conditions would be covered under the mandatory warranty?
4. **Shock.** The offeror references Section 4 CCG Engineering test guide, section 4.6.1 Shock and Vibration and states the referenced tests are intended to verify the integrity of the electronics and the security of the battery. The offeror suggests there are no requirements to assess the durability of design, materials and overall impact resistance.

Answer 20

The preferred requirement for an 8-year warranty is removed.

The first sentence of the first paragraph of section 2.11 of the statement of work (Annex A1) is modified to read

The Manufacturer shall provide a minimum of four (4) years full replacement warranty including shipping costs to original delivery point.

Note: No points had been accorded for the preferred 8-year warranty thus no modifications to the evaluation framework (Annex B) are required.

Lanterns’ abilities to protect against water ingress have been steadily improving. Section 3.5.11 of the performance specification (Annex A2) requires a mandatory IP rating of 68 for self-contained lanterns. Section 4.6.5 requires manufacturers to state the conditions under which the IP 68 rating was obtained. The offeror are not be expected to warrant water ingress from pressures over those reported under section 4.6.5 of the performance specification (Annex A2). Resolution will have to be on a case-by-case basis.

Section 3.5.7.2 and section 3.5.7.3 of the performance specification (Annex A2) prescribe shock and vibration requirements to which offered lanterns are subjected. The purpose of these tests is to uncover and avoid design-level weaknesses.

The notion that lanterns operate in harsh marine environments is a core assumption expressed in the first performance specifications for self-contained lanterns in 2004 and are repeated essentially unchanged in the informative section 1.1 *Statement of operational requirements* of the performance specification (Annex A2). Section 3.5.7.1 states *“The lantern shall be capable of operating when under continuous exposure to shock and vibration as a marine aid to navigation. This includes handling on ships, and when mounted on buoys or pile structures.”* This is consistent with section 1.1. It is assumed that lanterns being offered are indeed fit for their intended use.

At one extreme, a lantern being crushed between a vessel and its buoy, and a lantern falling off of a tower onto a concrete pier, would not be considered failures subject to warranty claim. At another extreme, lanterns bumping against each other when being placed on a shelf, and a lantern on a buoy being swung around by a combination of sea state and the tugs by the mooring would be expected to continue working as expected. Resolution will have to be on a case-by-case basis.