



RETURN BIDS TO:

Shared Services Canada (SSC)
Procurement and Vendor Relationships
180 Kent Street, 13th Floor
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 0B6

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Services Partager Canada (SPC)
Acquisitions et relations avec les
fournisseurs
180 rue Kent, 13ieme étage
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 0B6

**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

Issuing Office – Bureau de distribution

Procurement and Vendor Relationships | Achats et relations avec les fournisseurs
EO Division | Division EO
180 Kent Street | 180 Rue Kent
13th Floor
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 0B6

Title – Sujet Satellite Space Segment/Teleport Service/Remotes Sites Stream 1, 2 and 3 for Shared Service Canada (SSC)	
Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation R000022831/A	Amendment No. – N° de modif. 005
Client Reference No. – N° référence du client	Date July 9, 2018
GETS Reference No. – N° de reference de SEAG	
File No. – N° de dossier n/a	
Solicitation Closes – L'invitation prend fin THE CLOSING is : LA DATE DE CLOTURE EST : at – à 11 :00 am on – le July 20, 2018	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Time (EDT)
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Inquiries to - Adresser toutes questions à: Kenny Leung	Buyer Id – Id de l'acheteur CCG
Telephone No. – N° de téléphone : 613 790-6964	FAX No. – N° de FAX Not applicable
Delivery required - Livraison exigée See Herein	Delivered Offered – Livraison proposée
Destination – of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination – des biens, services et construction : Kenny Leung: (613) 790-6964 Shared Services Canada (SSC) 180 Kent Street, 13th Floor, Ottawa, Ontario, K1G 4A8	

Vendor/firm Name and address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Facsimile No. – N° de télécopieur	
Telephone No. – N° de téléphone	
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



SOLICITATION AMENDMENT # 005

The purpose of this amendment is to:

- 1) Amend Annex A Statement of Work;
 - 2) Amend Annex B1 Stream 1 Pricing Sheet;
 - 3) Amend Annex B2 Stream 2 Pricing Sheet;
 - 4) Amend Bidder Form
 - 5) Answer Bidder Questions
-

1) At Annex A Statement of Work of the Solicitation R000022831/A:

DELETE Annex A – Statement of Work
INSERT **Annex A – Statement of Work_V2**

2) At Annex B1 Pricing Sheet for Stream 1 of the Solicitation R000022831/A:

DELETE Annex B1 – Pricing Sheet for Stream 1
INSERT **Annex B1 – Pricing Sheet for Stream 1_V2**

3) At Annex B2 Pricing Sheet for Stream 2 of the Solicitation R000022831/A:

DELETE Annex B2 – Pricing Sheet for Stream 2
INSERT **Annex B2 – Pricing Sheet for Stream 2_V2**

4) At Bidder Form of the Solicitation R000022831/A:

DELETE Bidder Form
INSERT **Bidder Form_V2**

5) Respond Bidder Question:

Question 10: Reference SOW, Annex A, 3B.1.3, Paragraph indicates that the teleports must be located within Canada and the Conus and then goes on to say that at a minimum one must be in Canada. Can you clarify the intent here? Is termination of service of the primary or secondary Teleport acceptable outside of Canada? Is one teleport required in Canada and a second within the Conus but outside of Canada acceptable?

Answer 10: Please refer to the amended SOW section 3.B.1.3. Additional teleport(s) in CONUS can be listed in the Contractor's bid response and will be rated as per Annex D1 – Evaluation Methodology.

Question 11: Reference RFP Document, Section 2.7, Page 11, Volumetric Data; Stream 2, Verbiage indicates network growth of 1MHz capacity per year but unlike stream 1 and 3 does not indicate a # of MHz in "steady state". Only a growth of 1 MHz per year. Can you clarify?

Answer 11: Please refer to Amendment 3 of this bid solicitation dated June 11th, 2018 to find the answer to this question.



Question 12: Reference Annex A 3A.1.1, 7A1.1, Please confirm that single hops can be accommodated on 2 satellites. For example, traffic flows between the teleport location in Canada and Port au Prince Haiti on one satellite and then between the Teleport and Whitehorse on a different satellite.

Answer 12: While more than one satellite can be used in certain situations and yet maintain single hop connectivity, the bidder's primary satellite as well as its alternate satellite space segment capacity to provide restoration capability must meet the requirements described in section 3A.3 of the SOW as well as the pricing outlined in Annex B1 – Appendix B.

Question 13: Reference Annex A 3A3.3, 6.1.13, 7A3.3, We are respectfully questions the value of the restoration availability requirement, particularly as it is held up in this RFP as a mandatory requirement. There seems to be no value in this if there is no way of ensuring that the capacity will be available in the event of a failure on the primary satellite. For example, anyone could offer a backup satellite with no spare capacity or insufficient spare capacity to serve all of the demand in case of a failure, or alternatively any backup satellite could be subsequently sold. Without a guarantee of availability (i.e. what the industry terms a fully-protected service) on a second satellite, it appears to be prejudicial to advantage the incumbent who has more than one satellite covering the region, but who does not have to guarantee that backup capacity will be available.

Answer 13: There is nothing in this requirement to prevent a bidder from obtaining alternate satellite space segment capacity with restoration capability using existing assets and include it in their proposal. Please refer to our response to question 5 of Amendment 3 of this bid solicitation dated June 11th, 2018.

Question 14: Reference Annex A 3A4.4, 5A4.4, 7A5.4, "For all SLBA's, the contractor will use a Comtech CDM-625A satellite modem at the proposed Teleport location and at the remote earth station location." Modems have a variety of options that are purchased at time of sale. Therefore, it is important to know if the existing modems include TPC, LDPC, and/or ACM? Please provide all options purchased on the modem. This information is important for the SLBA's.

Answer 14: For the selected Comtech CDM-625A, all available MODCOD options, including the TPC and LDPC coding schemes, as well as ACM can be used to produce the link designs. Furthermore, the Carrier in Carrier technology option is also allowed.

Question 15: Reference Annex A 3A4.4, 5A4.4, This section specifies a carrier spacing factor of 1.35. But the vast majority of satellite operators will accept spacing factors of 1.2 for this particular modem, saving nearly 15% of the satellite space cost. As an effort to reduce the cost to the government and the Canadian taxpayer, we encourage a revision to using the lower carrier spacing factor, where the bidder deems it possible.



Answer 15: We understand that in some cases a carrier spacing factor as low as 1.2 can be used. We also understand that in the actual implementation of any of these solutions, the link budget design may allow a lower carrier spacing factor of 1.2. However, the required carrier spacing factor of 1.35, stated in the SOW is maintained to allow a common baseline for comparative evaluation purposes of the bid responses.

Question 16: Reference Annex A 3A4.4 5A4.4, The antenna size listed for most of the current locations, (i.e. 1.8m and 2.4m), is considered very large for Ku-band in the industry – such antenna sizes are much more commonly associated with C-band installations – while for Ku-band installations, a size of 1.2m or 1m antennas are the most common, and now many new service installations (such as military and commercial aero) are using antennas as small as 30cm. While the sites listed are already existing, the RFP also specifies the possibility and likelihood for future installations – as such, Canada should have the option of using these smaller antennas instead of the more expensive and cumbersome ones specified here – but no pricing options are required for the various antenna options available. While the current incumbent has weaker Ku satellite coverage and may perhaps be more limited in providing service to smaller antennas, it is clear that all branches of the military as well as several civilian agencies, view smaller and more portable satcom antennas as critical for their current and future requirements. In order to provide the government and its end-user agencies with not just a cheaper service, but with greater capabilities and options, it is necessary to include a request in the RFP for service options for a variety of antennas including 1.2m, 1.0m, 0.75m, 0.45m, etc.

Answer 16: The antenna sizes chosen for the eight (8) sites are only to allow a common denominator for comparative evaluation of power and bandwidth evaluation and do not reflect the actual antenna sizes that a particular implementation requires. We understand that a higher power satellite can facilitate a smaller earth station antenna size and higher satellite link availabilities if required. However, such relative advantages are accounted for through the link design PEB utilization.

The Power Equivalent Bandwidth (PEB) utilization reflects any EIRP and G/T advantages that a proposed satellite would have. The PEB, along with the cost per unit of PEB would show the relative cost effectiveness of different solutions.

Question 17: Reference Annex A 5A3.2, This section specifies coverage up to 60 degrees north latitude. Why does the RFP limit to such a low latitude? This limitation again seems to benefit the incumbent due to their weaker Ku-coverage in the far north, but there is more than one new satellite option in Ku-band that services up to 80 north latitude. It is important to note that we have received expressions of interest, written or verbal, for coverage up to 90 degrees north latitude (recognizing that geostationary satellites are limited to about 80 degrees) from DND, Coast Guard, RCMP, Army Rangers, and Health Canada, among others. In addition, the current ESCP RFI stated the government's urgency in providing broadband coverage for the far north – not just for community civilian internet, but for all the various government agencies. Please amend the RFP to reflect requirements further



north. Also note that the table in section 5A4.4 includes Resolute, which is well north of 60 degrees.

Answer 17: The reference to 60 degrees North latitude mentioned as part of Annex A-Section 5A3.2 does not limit provision of services above 60 degrees north latitude. Sections 3A.3.2, 5A.3.2 and 7A.3.2 in the SOW are changed for further clarity.

Question 18: Reference Annex A 7A3.3, The service performance parameters are specified in a similar manner to the equivalent sections for the other two streams and appear to follow the capabilities of the incumbent's satellites. By using satellites with only marginally lower service performance parameters, a bidder could still provide the services to each of the locations (including locations north of 70 degrees north latitude) and future locations at a lower cost if the price per MHz is materially lower. This outcome would clearly benefit Canada. In order to ensure a fair and competitive process that allows more than just the incumbent satellite options, we request amending the RFP to allow a lower satellite EIRP and G/T and judge the offerings on the more appropriate price per Mbps.

Answer 18: The service performance parameters are different for each stream. In order to ensure service continuity to existing satellite network, and to also ensure that no changes would occur to the existing ground segment infrastructure, the service performance parameters must meet, at a minimum, the specifications outlined in Annex A – Section 7A3.3. With respect to space segment pricing, the bidder proposal evaluation does include assessments on a per Mbps basis as required in the link designs and reflected in the pricing table.

Question 19: Reference RFP, page 11, section 2.7, Volumetric Data, This section specifies the number of MHz required and the anticipated growth in MHz for each of the three streams, which we assume to be the current volume of MHz being purchased on the incumbent's satellites. But a bidder may be able to provide the required amount of Mbps service using fewer MHz, if their MHz are more powerful. Please confirm that the evaluation will be done on the number of MHz that the bidder needs to provide the required stated Mbps service and the resulting price as indicated in Annexes B1, B2, and B3, instead of the number of MHz as currently required by the incumbent provider.

Answer 19: The volumetric data is provided to give the bidders an appreciation of the amount of business that can be obtained for each stream, without commitment guarantee. With respect to space segment pricing, the bidder proposal evaluation does include assessments on a per Mbps basis as required in the link designs and reflected in the pricing table.

Question 20: The RFP indicates the use of the Comtech 625A modem. Comtech offers optional licenses for ACM, Carrier in Carrier etc. Please advise which options are available on the modems currently deployed. Please advise if SSC allows us to assume all options are available on these modems?



Shared Services Canada
Services partagés Canada

Answer 20: Yes, all options available on the Comtech CDM-625A as outlined in the question can be used.

**ALL OTHER INFORMATION RELATED TO THIS SOLICITATION,
REMAINS UNCHANGED**