



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

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

Ship Construction, Refit and Related
Services/Construction navale, Radoubs et services
connexes

11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier

6C2, Place du Portage

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Halifax Class Marine Cranes	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W8482-156383/B	Amendment No. - N° modif. 006
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8482-156383	Date 2018-09-06
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$MC-033-26914	
File No. - N° de dossier 033mc.W8482-156383	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2018-09-18	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Davies, Neil	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 033mc
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 420-0865 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée
Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur	
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

This solicitation amendment 006 is issued to:

1. Answer questions from the bidders

The following questions have been submitted. They are listed in the order in which they were received and are a continuation from Amendment 005. The responses are provided as indicated.

Q6. Although the technical requirements have only a few minor changes compared with the prior solicitation, the mandatory evaluation table has undergone significant change. We think that mandatory M2-M4 are overly restrictive for a solicitation of this nature. Why are these new mandatory requirements so specific?

R6. Mandatory technical evaluation criteria M2, M3 and M4 represent the minimum acceptable standard for a requirement of this nature.

Q7. M4 is encompassed within mandatory M2. M2 is encompassed by M3. As they are redundant, and could be easily incorporated into one requirement, why have they been repeated as 3 of the 8 mandatory requirements?

R7. Mandatory technical evaluation criteria M2, M3 and M4 are not identical and should be responded to accordingly.

Q8. M2 through M4, and M3 in particular, disqualify competent vendors who possess sufficient experience and capability, but have not built an extremely specific configuration of an offshore marine crane. For a typical vendor who has produced a crane compliant with the application and SWL, the inclusion of extra particular options, features, components or attachments could easily result the crane exceeding the maximum dimensions, and being non-compliant with M3. This would render the entire bid non-compliant, due to the restrictive nature of these mandatorys. We ask, will you replace the current mandatory criteria M2, M3, and M4, with the prior solicitation's Annex J mandatory Item #2?

R8. This solicitation is independent of any previous solicitation and it should be viewed as such. Also see response to Question 6.

Q9. An equivalent to the prior solicitation's Annex J mandatory Item #4 is missing from the current requirements. We recommend that a requirement for vendors to certify their offered crane meets the SOW be included. Can this be implemented?

R9. This solicitation is independent of any previous solicitation and it should be viewed as such.

Q10. Mandatory Evaluation Criterion M1 ("M1 Criterion"). Prior to the cancellation and retendering of this solicitation, the M1 criterion required that a proponent "must demonstrate that they have 10 years' experience in designing, manufacturing and commissioning class society approved offshore electro-hydraulic crane systems". The M1 Criterion now states that a proponent "must demonstrate that they have designed and built three (3) different offshore electro-hydraulic crane systems in the past 10 years". We ask if the criteria can be returned to the original "10-years experience" in order to ensure that only an established manufacturer would be chosen to supply cranes for this stringent Naval application.

R10. This solicitation is independent of any previous solicitation and it should be viewed as such.

Q11. Mandatory Evaluation Criterion M2 ("M2 Criterion"). Prior to the cancellation and retendering of this solicitation, the M2 criterion required that a proponent "must demonstrate that they have at least three (3) years of experience designing, manufacturing, and commissioning cranes of similar complexity of no less than 75% of the lifting capacity required by the SOW". The M2 Criterion now states that a proponent "must demonstrate that they have experience designing, building and commissioning at least one (1) Class society certified, personnel lifting, offshore electro-hydraulic knuckle boom crane of no less than 75% of the safe working load of 7030 kg at a radius of 5 meters or greater in the past 10 years". We ask if the criteria can be returned to the original in order to ensure that only an established and experienced manufacturer would be chosen to supply cranes for this stringent Naval application.

R11. This solicitation is independent of any previous solicitation and it should be viewed as such.

Q12. Point Rated Evaluation Criterion R3 ("R3 Criterion"). We ask if the R3 Criterion for compliant crane project management experience is correct, as the maximum R3 Criterion applicable to proponents is 9-10 cranes per year, or less than one crane per month. We ask if the criteria can be increased significantly in order to ensure that the technical points awarded would reflect an established Marine Crane manufacturer with sufficient capacity to complete this contract in the timescale required.

R12. Point Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria R3 shall remain as written.

All other Terms and Conditions remain the same.