



**RETURN BIDS TO:**

**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux  
Canada

Place Bonaventure,  
800 rue de la Gauchetière Ouest  
Voir aux présentes - See herein  
Montréal

Québec  
H5A 1L6

FAX pour soumissions: (514) 496-3822

**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**

Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Place Bonaventure,  
800 rue de la Gauchetière Ouest  
Voir aux présentes - See herein  
Montréal  
Québec  
H5A 1L6

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Sci Prio. concept studies	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> 9F050-170252/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 003
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 9F050-17-0252	<b>Date</b> 2018-04-04
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$MTB-450-14779	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> MTB-7-40257 (450)	<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 2018-04-19</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Heure Avancée de l'Est HAE	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Guérinik, Naoual	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> mtb450
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (514) 607-2651 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (514) 496-3822
<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>

This amendment is raised to answer a question asked:

Question 1:

I am somewhat puzzled by the Bid Preparation Instructions for this RFP, in that section 3A.1 (p.27 of the RFP) states that the Technical & Scientific Proposal section of the bid should include

- "a) Relevance and Expected Impact of the Investigation to the SE Program
- b) Traceability of the Investigation to the Objectives
- c) Scope and understanding of the scientific approach
- d) Scope and understanding of the technical approach"

saying "(see 3A.5)". But, section 3A.5 only specifies detailed instructions regarding the "Mandatory Criteria"; otherwise there are only brief, general instructions:

"The Bid should describe the proposed project as outlined in the following subsections. The bidder should strive to address all items described under the letter "D" of each criterion, as described in section 4A.3: Evaluation Criteria and Benchmark Statements, at Attachment 1 to Part 4 of this RFP," and  
"The management plan should provide details on the work packages and corresponding personnel allocation and identify managerial risks and recommend risk mitigation strategies. A project schedule should be provided in the form of a Gantt chart which shows the planned milestones and work package activities."

Comparing these with the much-more-detailed instructions in the other recent Space Exploration Concept Studies RFP (9F050-17-0252), I can't help but wonder if some information was inadvertently left out of the RFP (i.e., the Section 3A5.2 information from that previous RFP).

I'm quite prepared to put together a great proposal without any further information being specified in the RFP! Myself, I plan to follow the format specified in that previous RFP. But I wonder if this was the CSA's intent with this RFP. It does leave bidders somewhat guessing as to what CSA expects to see.

Answer 1:

Some information provided in previous RFP Bidder's Instructions was intentionally removed as some items that were specified in previous RFPs are not required for this RFP, and it was thought that reducing the amount of instructions provided would allow for greater flexibility on the part of the bidder to demonstrate how the proposal meets the evaluation criteria. Additionally, the descriptions in Attachment 1 to part 4 should provide sufficient detail and it was deemed preferable to have each criteria described in only one location to avoid conflicting details.