



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 Services in International VSAT C and KU Band for SSC	
Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation R000041820/A	Amendment No. – N° de modif. 004
Client Reference No. – N° référence du client	Date August 13, 2019
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 August 26, 2019	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 # 004

The purpose of this amendment is to:

- 1) Revise the Statement of Work – Annex A;
 - 2) Amend the Bid Submission Forms;
 - 3) Revise Annex B1;
 - 4) Revise Annex B2.
 - 5) Revise the Request of Proposal to reflection correction;
 - 6) Response to bidder questions
-

1)At the Statement of Work document:

DELETE Statement of Work_Annex A in its entirety
INSERT **Statement of Work_Annex A_dated 08_012_2019_AMD_002**

2)At the Bid Submission Form document:

DELETE Bid Submission Form in its entirety
INSERT **Bid Submission Form_dated 08_012_2019_AMD_002**

3)At the Pricing Sheet_Annex B1 document:

DELETE Pricing Sheet_Annex B1 in its entirety
INSERT **Pricing Sheet_Annex B1_dated 08_012_2019_AMD_002**

4)At the Pricing Sheet_Annex B2 document:

DELETE Pricing Sheet_Annex B2 in its entirety
INSERT **Pricing Sheet_Annex B2_dated 08_012_2019_AMD_002**

5)At the request for Proposal document:

DELETE Request for Proposal (RFP) posted 07_05_2019 in its entirety
INSERT **International VSAT_Request for Proposal (RFP) dated 08_12_2019_AMD_001**

6) Response to bidder questions (Q&A):

Question 12: Section 5.3, a. i and ii, lists requirements related to Professional Services Resources. The requirement does not seem to cover Professional Services, please confirm applicability of this requirement. This also possibly impacts 7.11 iv. And 7.29.



Answer 12: Professional Service Resource is not part of requirement. Please see update in International VSAT_Request for Proposal (RFP) dated 08_01_2019_AMD_001.

Question 13: Section 5.3, c. lists requirements related to OEM certification, as we understand it, hardware is not being provided to the customer, please confirm applicability of this requirement.

Answer 13: Please see update in International VSAT_Request for Proposal (RFP) dated 08_01_2019_AMD_001.

Question 14: Section 5.3 d. lists requirements related to the supply of software and the requirement to supply certification and/or authorization, however as we understand it, software is not being provided to the customer, please confirm applicability of this requirement.

Answer 14: Please see update in International VSAT_Request for Proposal (RFP) dated 08_01_2019_AMD_001.

Question 15: Section 7.6 c) has a requirement of NATO SECRET, but the SRCL has a requirement of NATO Confidential, please confirm the correct security requirement.

Answer 15: The SRCL was reflects that NATO Secret personnel security clearance (10a) is required to access NATO Confidential. There is no changes required. However that escort clause is missing on the English version. Please see update in International VSAT_Request for Proposal (RFP) dated 08_01_2019_AMD_001.

Question 16: Section 7.28 lists requirements for training in accordance with the Annex A, training was not found as part of Annex A, please confirm.

Answer 16: Training is not part of requirement. Please see update in International VSAT_Request for Proposal (RFP) dated 08_01_2019_AMD_001.

Question 17: Annex A, 2.7 and 2.9.4. In 2.7, the term TST is being used and in 2.9.4 the term TNT is being used, are these meant to be the same value for any given month? Please describe the difference in use between the 2.

Answer 17: The terms TST and TNT are the same value for any given month.

Question 18: Annex A, 2.7.1.1. In Section 2.6.1, the availability of services is listed as 99.8%, but in payment credits section 2.7.1.1, no indication of when the credits start to apply. Are the credits meant to be when the availability of services target is not met? Please confirm.

Answer 18: Yes, the credit would be applied only when the availability of service target is not met.

Question 19: Annex A, 3.3.2.1 lists requirements for Type 1 and Type 3 satellite space segment, but in 3.1.1.1, only Type 3 is listed. Please confirm.

Answer 19: Sections 3.3.2.1 and 4.3.2.1 have been modified in the SOW to reflect the need to supply Type 3 service only. Furthermore, the pricing tables have been modified to provide pricing for Type 3 satellite space segment only.

Question 20: Annex A 4.3.2.1 lists requirements for Type 1 and Type 3 satellite space segment, but in 4.1.1.1, only Type 3 is listed. Please confirm.



Answer 20: Sections 3.3.2.1 and 4.3.2.1 have been modified in the SOW to reflect the need to supply Type 3 service only. Furthermore, the pricing tables have been modified to provide pricing for Type 3 satellite space segment only.

Question 21: Annex B1 and Annex B2, pricing sheets has sheets for Primary Beam and Secondary beam. There is no mention of these terms in Annex A, what is the requirement?

Answer 21: The primary beam is defined as the beam with the best characteristics (satellite EIRP and G/T) that would be offered first when a service is requested from the contractor. If the space segment is not available on the primary beam, then space segment on the secondary beam can be offered to meet the service requirement. The SOW has been amended to include the definition of Primary and Secondary beams.

Question 22: Section 7.35 b) talks about transition of services for UHF Satellite Service, should this state C & Ku-band satellite services?

Answer 22: Section 7.35 of the RFP has been changed to correct the wording and remove the reference to UHF Satellite Service.

Question 23: Annex A 2.3.3.3, the MSDI for Regular Priority Service delivery is defined in business days, but the Express Priority service delivery is defined in calendar days, please confirm.

Answer 23: The MSDI for regular priority service delivery is expressed in business days while the MSDI for express priority service is expressed in calendar days.

Question 24: Annex A 2.3.3.3, how many times would the Express Priority Service delivery clause be invoked and in what situations and for what services specifically in the SOW?

Answer 24: The request for Express Priority Service is invoked in cases when the requirement calls for it

Question 25: Annex A 3.4.1.7, do you have specific security requirements at the teleport against unauthorized access?

Answer 25: No, there is no specific requirement, as long as access to the Teleport is secure. With respect to the security requirements at the teleport, clause 3.4.1.8 in SOW has been amended. Also please refer to Form 3 – Substantiation of technical compliance with respect to the teleport requirement.

Question 26: With a closing date in August, we would need an extension of 4 weeks, can this be accommodated?

Answer 26: We agree to an extension of the closing date to Monday August 26th, 2019

Question 27: In the RFP, the Comtech CDM-600 is being requested. The CDM-600 is no longer produced by Comtech, would SSC accept an equivalent, currently produced modem like the CDM-625 which can support both serial and IP?

Answer 27: Yes, SSC accepts the Comtech CDM-625 as an equivalent. All references to the Comtech CDM-600 in the SOW, and in the pricing tables have been changed to reflect the Comtech CDM-625 modem.



Question 28: In the RFP, there is also a possibility to provide other modems, does SSC know in which direction their customers will be going seeing that IP is the new standard? Which modems might be required under this possible contract?

Answer 28: If a new type of satellite modem is required, SSC will advise the contractor that a new type of satellite modem would be provided to the Contractor for installation at the Teleport to be compatible with the service.

Question 29: We request further clarification regarding the NATO classification with regard to the SRCL document. We have reviewed the SRCL document and we have also spoken with the CISD and it is not clear if this precludes the use of non-NATO countries from providing ground facilities or spacecraft to support the missions outlined in the RFP. Please clarify further or direct us to other sources where we can obtain a specific response.

Answer 29: The bidder must abide to conditions of the Security Requirements Check List (SRCL) form as part of this bid solicitation for the Space Segment, Teleport, Terrestrial Backhaul as well as other related facilities.

Question 30: Due to the scope of this RFP (worldwide service request) and the amount of resources needed to provide a thorough response we request an extension of 45 days be granted to allow us sufficient time to complete the proposal.

Answer 30: We agree to an extension of the closing date to Monday August 26th, 2019

Question 31: In the RFP you request Comtech CDM 600 modems. These modems are no longer available and are not supported by Comtech. Please clarify if we can use a comparable modem (i.e. CDM 625A) that would be backward compatible with the legacy modems currently deployed.

Answer 31: Please refer to the answer to question 27.

Question 32: The standard modem would support the link budgets requested in the RFP. Any optional features would be subject to an additional charge. Please concur or otherwise clarify.

Answer 32: If the link design for a specific service calls for options that are not available on the standard modem that is part of the modem service, SSC would make an arrangement for Teleport service using the required modem to meet the needs of the link design.

Question 33: Section 5.3, c. lists requirements related to OEM certification, as we understand it, hardware is not being provided to the customer, please confirm applicability of this requirement.

Answer 33; Section 5.3c has been removed from the RFP. (Here PVR to remove as section 5.3c is part of the front end of the RFP.)

Question 34: Section 5.3 d. lists requirements related to the supply of software and the requirement to supply certification and/or authorization, however as we understand it, software is not being provided to the customer, please confirm applicability of this requirement.

Answer 34; Section 5.3d has been removed from the RFP. (Here PVR to remove as section 5.3d is part of the front end of the RFP.)



Question 35: In Annex B1 and Annex B2 – Instructions, there is a statement in the Notes under Note 2 that refers to 4.3 (d) in the main body of the RFP, we are unable to find that clause. Please confirm correct reference.

Answer 35: The reference is 4.3 (b). The pricing tables, Annex B1 and Annex B2 have been corrected accordingly.

Question 36: In RFP, section 4.2, “Subject to the mandatory compliance, the compliance bids will be further evaluated on rated criteria to determine the overall quality of the technical proposal. This criteria are identified in Annex E.”, Annex E is the claim for exchange rate fluctuation, please confirm reference.

Answer 36: Response: The reference is Annex D – Technical and Financial Evaluation Methodology. This document is now titled Annex D and not Annex E.

Question 37: SSC’s request for proposal for Satellite Services in International VSAT C and Ku Band issued July 5, 2019 requires extensive technical resources and is very time consuming if a bidder wishes to provide a compliant bid response that meets all the Mandatory Primary and Secondary coverage as well as the Non-Mandatory Primary and Secondary coverage between Canada and 3 separate Satellite Coverage zones at C-Band and the Mandatory Primary and Secondary coverage and the Non-Mandatory Primary and Secondary coverage between Canada and 5 separate Satellite Coverage zones at Ku-Band, the bidder therefore requests an extension to September 23, 2019.

Answer 37: We agree to an extension of the closing date to Monday August 26th, 2019

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