



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

**Bid Receiving Public Works and Government
Services Canada/Réception des soumissions Travaux
publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada**
1713 Bedford Row
Halifax, N.S./Halifax, (N.É.)
Halifax
Nova Scotia
B3J 1T3
Bid Fax: (902) 496-5016

Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer

Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes

Regional Individual Standing Offer (RISO)
Offre à commandes individuelle régionale (OCIR)

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

Atlantic Region Acquisitions/Région de l'Atlantique
Acquisitions
1713 Bedford Row
Halifax, N.S./Halifax, (N.É.)
Halifax
Nova Scot
B3J 1T3

Title - Sujet Deployed Logistics	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W010A-18A001/A	Date 2018-04-27
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W010A-18-A001	Amendment No. - N° modif. 001
File No. - N° de dossier HAL-7-79028 (203)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$HAL-203-5736	
Date of Original Request for Standing Offer Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale	
2018-04-13	
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2018-05-16	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Atlantic Daylight Saving Time ADT	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: MacDonald (HAL), Isabelle	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur hal203
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (902) 403-9839 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (902) 496-5016
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 Accusé de réception requis	Yes - Oui <input type="checkbox"/>	No - Non <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 Amendment 001

This solicitation amendment is issued to:

- Correct R8 numbering of "Points to Consider"
- Correct Ports under Zones 3 and 4
- Answer questions that have been posed during the solicitation period

Under Attachment 2, Evaluation Criteria:

Delete:

R8	<p>Adequacy of planned team organization, including availability of team members and backup capability, reporting structure, management of project, subcontracts and capability to carry out the project.</p> <p>Points to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provides a plan for in-port coordination between the Project Coordinator and the On-site Representative.2. Provides an at sea communication/liaison plan between the Firm, the Project Coordinator and the On-site Representative.4. Relevant business practices to ensure qualified On-Site Agents are available to support multiple naval ships at multiple ports at the same time5. Provides a copy of the Firms' code of ethics, code of conduct, bond of employees and an agreement structure with sub-contractors.
----	---

Insert:

R8	<p>Adequacy of planned team organization, including availability of team members and backup capability, reporting structure, management of project, subcontracts and capability to carry out the project.</p> <p>Points to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provides a plan for in-port coordination between the Project Coordinator and the On-site Representative.2. Provides an at sea communication/liaison plan between the Firm, the Project Coordinator and the On-site Representative.3. Relevant business practices to ensure qualified On-Site Agents are available to support multiple naval ships at multiple ports at the same time4. Provides a copy of the Firms' code of ethics, code of conduct, bond of employees and an agreement structure with sub-contractors.
----	---

Under Appendix 2 – Typical Ports of Call

Delete:

Zone 3

Europe and Surrounding Areas

Reykjavik, Iceland

Belfast, Ireland

Dublin, Ireland

Glasgow, UK

Faslane, UK

Greenoch, UK

Plymouth, UK

Portsmouth, UK

Lisbon, Portugal

Brest, France

Antwerp, Belgium

Zeebrugge, Belgium

Amsterdam, Netherlands

Hamburg, Germany

Whilhelmshaven, Germany

Kiel, Germany

Aarhus, Denmark

Copenhagen, Denmark

Gdynia, Poland

Klaipeda, Lithuania

Tallin, Estonia

Helsinki, Finland

Stockholm, Sweden

Bergen, Norway

Haakonsværn, Norway

Trondheim, Norway

Constanta, Romania

Varna, Bulgaria

Odessa, Ukraine

Insert:

Zone 3

Europe and Surrounding Areas

Reykjavik, Iceland

Belfast, Ireland

Dublin, Ireland

Glasgow, UK

Faslane, UK

Greenoch, UK

Plymouth, UK

Portsmouth, UK

Lisbon, Portugal

Brest, France

Antwerp, Belgium

Zeebrugge, Belgium

Amsterdam, Netherlands

Hamburg, Germany

Whilhelmshaven, Germany

Kiel, Germany

Aarhus, Denmark

Copenhagen, Denmark

Gdynia, Poland

Klaipeda, Lithuania

Tallin, Estonia

Helsinki, Finland

Stockholm, Sweden

Bergen, Norway

Haakonsværn, Norway

Trondheim, Norway

Delete:

Zone 4

Mediterranean/Red Seas, Africa, Middle East and Surrounding Areas

Ponta Delgada, Azores

Funchal, Madeira

Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Island of Gran Canaria

Gibraltar, UK

Cartagena, Spain

Malaga, Spain

Palma De Majorca, Spain

Rota, Spain

Toulon, France

Augusta Bay, Italy

Civitavecchia, Italy

Naples, Italy

Cagliari, Sardinia

Catania, Sicily

Valletta, Malta

Souda Bay, Crete

Split, Croatia

Istanbul, Turkey

Aksaz, Turkey

Limassol, Cyprus

Acaba, Jordan

Haifa, Israel

Suez Canal, Egypt

Alexandra, Egypt

Port Said, Egypt

Djibouti, Djibouti

Muscat, Oman

Salalah, Oman

Dubai, United Arab Emirates

Jebel Ali, United Arab Emirates

Doha, Qatar

Manama, Bahrain

Kuwait City, Kuwait

Mumbai, India

Mombasa, Kenya

Simons Town, Cape Town, South Africa

Accra, Ghana

Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire

Monrovia, Liberia

Freetown, Sierra Leone

Dakar, Senegal

Casablanca, Morocco

Insert:

Zone 4

Mediterranean/Red Seas, Africa, Middle East and Surrounding Areas

Ponta Delgada, Azores	Suez Canal, Egypt
Funchal, Madeira	Alexandra, Egypt
Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Island of Gran Canaria	Port Said, Egypt
Gibraltar, UK	Djibouti, Djibouti
Cartagena, Spain	Muscat, Oman
Malaga, Spain	Salalah, Oman
Palma De Majorca, Spain	Dubai, United Arab Emirates
Rota, Spain	Jebel Ali, United Arab Emirates
Toulon, France	Doha, Qatar
Augusta Bay, Italy	Manama, Bahrain
Civitavecchia, Italy	Kuwait City, Kuwait
Naples, Italy	Mumbai, India
Cagliari, Sardinia	Mombasa, Kenya
Catania, Sicily	Simons Town, Cape Town, South Africa
Valletta, Malta	Accra, Ghana
Souda Bay, Crete	Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire
Split, Croatia	Monrovia, Liberia
Istanbul, Turkey	Freetown, Sierra Leone
Aksaz, Turkey	Dakar, Senegal
Limassol, Cyprus	Casablanca, Morocco
Acaba, Jordan	Constanta, Romania
Haifa, Israel	Varna, Bulgaria
	Odessa, Ukraine

Questions and responses:

1) The numbering of the pages of the RFSO presents some little mistakes that could create confusion when we have to quote the relevant pages, both in our questions and in our Offer.

For example, after the first 57 pages, numbered from "1 of 57" till "57 of 57", there are also "page 58 of 57", "page 59 of 57" etc. until "page 75 of 57". After this page, there are four pages without number and then, "page 54 of 83".

We suggest to check all the numbering and correct them for a better and unique identification of the various points of the RFSO.

Answer: The PDF document did not correctly change the page count. We will not be reissuing the RFSO based on this error. We strongly suggest you use section numbers and names if you need to quote from the RFSO.

2) In the Notice at page 4 of 57: "If you are a foreign bidder and have the required clearances in your country, you may submit that information to the Standing Offer Authority for verification."

The question is: do we have to submit this information to the Standing Offer Authority before the expiring date of the Solicitation with a separate communication or at the time of the offer submission, within our proposal, in the Certifications' section?

Answer: Confirmation of your security clearances must be submitted with your offer.

3) At page 5 and at page 29 of 57, Black Sea is listed among the areas covered by Zone 4. But in Appendix A2, the ports on Black Sea (Constanta - Rumania), Varna - Bulgaria) and Odessa - Ukraine) are listed among the typical ports of Zone 3. Please, clarify this point, taking into consideration that Black Sea Ports, for many factors (best practices, cultural and social attitudes, sourcing methodologies) are more homogenous to the ports of North Europe than to the Mediterranean ones. So, in our opinion, they should pertain to Zone 3, as correctly stated in Appendix A2, and not to Zone 4.

Answer: Location used to define zone 3 and 4 is Cabo de Sao Vincent. Zone 3 is north of Cabo de Sao and covers all waters heading north; zone 4 starts in Cabo de Sao and covers all areas of the Mediterranean Sea and all adjoining bodies of water. Appendix A2, typical port visits, remove Constanta, Romania; Varna, Bulgaria; and Odessa, Ukraine from zone 3 and place under zone 4.

4) Is it correct to assume that if an Offeror will be submitting offers for more than one Zone must submit separate offer packages (i.e. Sections I, II and III) for each Zone ?

Answer: Yes, correct. Each zone is evaluated separately.

5) Part 6 - Paragraph 6.3 Insurance Requirements. Our current Insurance is compliant to the Insurance Requirements listed in Annex E.

May we attach to our Offer directly the Insurance Certificate we have in place, instead of "the letter from an insurance broker or an insurance company" requested at Paragraph 6.3?

Answer: You could attach the Certificate but we will also require the letter from an insurance broker.

6) Attachment 2 - Table 1 with the Technical Criteria - Criteria R2 - Points to consider number 2 "The Offeror has previous experience in both planned and ad hoc missions". Criteria R7 - last sentence "experience with planned and ad hoc missions". Please, be so kind to clarify if the expression "ad hoc missions" in the two aforementioned Criteria means "unplanned" activities, that are all those missions organised and/or ordered with very short notice.

Answer: ad hoc missions are those organized with very short notice; unplanned missions.

7) Attachment 2 - Table 2 with the Management Criteria - Criteria R8 - Points to consider number 5 (actually should be number 4): Among others we are requested to provide copy of

"Bond of Employee". In UK we have never heard about this bond.

Perhaps is this a kind of protection against bad employee's behavior ? things like dishonesty, theft and other unacceptable behaviors ?

In UK we would normally cover most of this in a contract of employment.

Please confirm whether this is something that applies to Canadian companies only.

Answer: This term is related to Canadian and US companies and a bond of employee is when companies bond employees to protect against employee theft and dishonesty and provides the company with compensation in cases of property loss due to the acts of an employee. The onus is on the Offeror to ensure that this rated criteria is sufficiently answered with this expanded definition regardless of the country they do business in.

8) Please be so kind to explain the exact difference between the first part of Point 3 of Criteria R2 "Demonstrated understanding of the importance to perform work in a manner to successfully participate in financial audits and performance audits" and Point 2 of Criteria R4 "Demonstrate the understanding of the importance to perform work in a manner to successfully participate in financial audits and performance audits".

Answer: The "Points to Consider" were inserted in the technical criteria to assist Offerors in preparing their submissions. They are meant as a guide to help Offerors submit a compliant proposal.

R2 and R4 are different technical questions having similar "Points to Consider" and so the Offeror must review each technical criteria and decide how to incorporate the "Points to Consider" in their submission as it relates to the criteria.

9) Please be so kind to explain the exact difference between the second part of Point 3 of Criteria R2 "The Offeror shall indicate how they will collect and maintain records for audits" and Point 3 of Criteria R4 "The Offeror shall indicate how they will collect and maintain records".

Answer: The "Points to Consider" were inserted in the technical criteria to assist Offerors in preparing their submissions. They are meant as a guide to help Offerors submit a compliant proposal.

R2 and R4 are different technical questions having similar "Points to Consider" and so the Offeror must review each technical criteria and decide how to incorporate the "Points to Consider" in their submission as it relates to the criteria.

10) Table 2 - Management Criteria - Criteria R8. Please correct the numbering of the "Points to consider" because number 3 is missing.

Answer: Corrected.

11) Please be so kind to explain the exact difference between Point 2 of Criteria R1 “Relevant business processes to ensure qualified on-site agents are available to support multiple naval ships at multiple ports at the same time.” and Point 4 (actually is Point 3) of Criteria R8 “Relevant business practices to ensure qualified On-Site Agents are available to support multiple naval ships at multiple ports at the same time.

Answer: Answer: The “Points to Consider” were inserted in the technical criteria to assist Offerors in preparing their submissions. They are meant as a guide to help Offerors submit a compliant proposal.

R1 and R8 are different technical questions having similar “Points to Consider” and so the Offeror must review each technical criteria and decide how to incorporate the “Points to Consider” in their submission as it relates to the criteria.