



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

**Revision to a Request for Supply
Arrangement - Révision à une demande
pour un arrangement en matière
d'approvisionnement**

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

Marine Machinery and Services / Machineries et
services maritimes

11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier

6C2, Place du Portage

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet TIES CCG Supply Arrangement	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation F7012-190001/A	Date 2020-02-12
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client F7012-190001	Amendment No. - N° modif. 006
File No. - N° de dossier 029ml.F7012-190001	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ML-029-27552	
Date of Original Request for Supply Arrangement 2019-12-23 Date de demande pour un arrangement en matière d'app. originale	
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2020-02-28	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Guay, Yvan	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 029ml
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 420-2907 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-0897
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 solicitation. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de l'invitation.	

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		

This Amendment 006 to the Request for Supply Arrangement (RFSA) is issued to provide the Questions and Answers Set 6, extend the closing date to 28 February 2020, without extending the date to submit enquiries and amend the solicitation.

Questions and Answers Set 6

Question 35:

Annex F Financial evaluation 2.1

The removal of bidders due to rates not being within +10% of the second average, then being precluded from attempting to re-qualify in the following five years seems unreasonable and suggests promoting anti-competitive behaviours. Can Canada reconsider this stipulation and reduce the penalty to re-qualify to 6 months?

How will the state prevent potential providers from purposely low-balling the rates to reduce the average and eliminate competitors? As this is a supply arrangement agreement, potential suppliers have the opportunity to not response to any supply request(s) or could inflate the hours required to deliver such tasks in order to achieve profits through lower rates submitted in the tender. How does Canada propose to prevent such occurrences and achieve value for money?

Answer 35:

See Answer 32.

Question 36:

Thresholds

Should the Appendix 2 Template for MC requirements be amended to above \$25,000 and not exceeding \$400,00? Or is there another template that we should have sight of? Should complexity of tasks be defined by value or should it be through technical requirement?

Is there an equivalent for delivery time/duration limitations? For example, no contracted supply arrangement will span longer than 36 months?

Answer 36:

Appendix 2 will be posted within an updated solicitation in next solicitation amendment and an electronic copy will be sent to each potential Supplier contact who has requested an electronic copy of the solicitation as per Answer 5.

Question 37:

B. Bid solicitation 6.2.3 Bid solicitation process

Canada has the opportunity to sole source supplier up to \$25,000 through this contract. Does this replace the ability to contract through ACAN to suppliers outside of the TIES agreement for similar work or requirements?

Answer 37:

No. This TIES Supply Arrangement is intended to be competitive under \$25,000. Canada retains the ability to ACAN a sole source contract outside the TIES Supply Arrangement for similar work or requirements.

Question 38:

Administrative costs

Suppliers will be required to complete periodic usage reports. Is it Canada's intent that the cost of completing these duties will be borne by successful contractors? Or can costs associated with managing engagements and involvements be charge to the project authority?

Answer 38:

Yes. The cost of completing period usage report is to be borne by the Supplier. There is no provision to charge directly for these costs associated with managing engagements and involvements.

Question 39:

Can you please facilitate an epostConnect invitation for us so that we can submit responses electronically?

Please us my email address to send the invitation notification too.

Answer 39:

See RFSA page 6 of 33, clause 2.2, Remark:

For suppliers choosing to submit using epost Connect for arrangements closing at the Bid Receiving Unit in the National Capital Region (NCR) the email address is:

tpsgc.dgareceptiondessoumissions-abbidreceiving.pwgsc@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca

Question 40:

In the previous 2012 TIES request for supply arrangement there was an inclusion within the financial evaluation methodology which sort to prevent abnormally low rates from being used, by acknowledging that if more than 10% of the technically compliant responses were financially non-compliant, Canada would increase the threshold until no more than 10% of the technically compliant respondents would be deemed financially non-compliant.

Would Canada consider re-instating such clause to prevent unrealistic rates being successful, where the potential to then use inflated hours to cover costs and profits would offset the reduced rates?

Answer 40:

See Answer 32.

Question 41:

Once the SA is awarded and vendors qualified, at what times during the SA period can vendors add resources and/or categories?

Answer 41:

Once a Supplier is qualified with a supply arrangement, that Supplier can request the Supply Arrangement Authority to add resources at its convenience within the occupational categories.

Question 42:

According to requirements of the SOW, the only personnel able to qualify in "Marine Mechanical Engineering" Field of Speciality are practicing engineers and First or Second Class marine engineers. The requirement to be certified as First or Second Class marine engineer precludes any technologist, regardless of experience in marine systems engineering, from being considered a suitable Candidate. Is it possible to update the requirements so that the Senior or Intermediate Technologist do not have to be certified as First or Second Class marine engineer for "Marine Mechanical Engineering" Field of Speciality?

Answer 42:

No. See Answers 27 & 28. Unchanged.

Question 43:

We request an extension of the closing date to 28 Feb to allow time for Canada to provide a response and for Industry to review the response and develop their proposal based on those responses.

Answer 43:

Canada is extending closing date until 28 February.

Question 44:

I am requesting a copy of Appendix 2 - Template of Request for Proposal (RFP)/Contract Above \$25,000 and below \$100,000 for the Supply Arrangement. It is important to review this, as we are stating that we agree to be bound by those resulting contract clauses when bidding on future solicitations.

Answer 44:

See Answer 36.

Question 45:

Under Section 4.2, as an example, Area of Expertise #2 (Marine Mechanical Engineering) has a X under both Engineer and Technical Specialist. Is this to be interpreted this as:

- a. provide reference to both an engineer and a technical specialist? or,
- b. provide reference to either an engineer or a technical specialist?

Answer 45:

Neither a. or b. It is interpreted as Engineer and/or Technical Specialist which means either an Engineer, or a Technical Specialist, or both an Engineer and a Technical Specialist.

Question 46:

Under the previous SA F7048-090005, engineers were only required to be eligible for a PENG certification, while this new RFSA requires engineers to have a PENG certification. This greatly reduces the pool of suitable qualified and experienced individuals who could legitimately provide the required services. Will Canada consider relaxing this specific requirement back to that under SA F7048-090005?

Answer 46:

No. See Answer 15. The TIES requires Engineers which are Professional Engineers. Candidate eligible for a P.Eng. is insufficient to be able to seal engineering documents under the area of expertise.

Question 47:

Could a suitably qualified resource qualify as both Engineer and Technical Specialist in the same area of expertise?

Answer 47:

Yes. The same suitable candidate can be qualified as both Engineer and Technical Specialist in the same area of expertise under Areas of Expertise 1 and 5 to 12.

Question 48:

Question: Would Canada consider changing the text of Annex A SOW 4.4.1 Certification to read:

"The engineer must have, or be deemed eligible for registration as a Professional Engineer or receive a temporary licence by a recognized provincial licensing organization within 12 months of the solicitation"

Reasons: It is requested that Canada changes this stipulation because:

- This was the requirement in original CCG TIES qualification and is normal practice in dealing with suitably qualified resources often from outside Canada to have a grace period before receiving a licence (it takes about this long to qualify PEng) or a temporary licence to practice.
- X has access to a superlative worldwide pool of suitably qualified Chartered and Professional Engineers who would otherwise not be able to deliver technical excellence to the Canadian Coast across the areas of expertise specified without a change in this stipulation.

Answer 48:

No. See Answers 14, 15 & 46. This TIES requires Engineers which are Professional Engineers and able to practice in a Province of Canada. A professional license such as a temporary permit to practice by a recognized provincial licensing organization of Engineers is also acceptable, without amending the criteria.

Question 49:

Question: Would Canada consider changing the text of Annex A SOW 4.4.2 Certification to read: "Accreditation to a chartered provincial association or federal or international association related to the Area of Expertise and/or field of specialty, where applicable"

Reason: It is requested that Canada changes the stipulation because some fields/specialties such as Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering do not have provincial recognition for technological specialists but do have international designations such as Incorporated Engineer or RINA/SNAME recognition.

Answer 49:

No. Unchanged. See also Answer 16. RINA and SNAME are not regulatory bodies. With respect to the international designation of Incorporated Engineer, that designation must be recognized as equivalent to P.Eng. by the applicable Canadian professional engineering association.

Question 50:

Question 3: It is requested that Canada consider an extension of the closing date to Thursday 27 February 2020

Reasons: Canada is humbly requested to give further extension to the closing date because:

- X has changed its legal status and corporate approval is proving more lengthy than before 1 Jan 20 as multi-year contract proposals have to be approved in other countries.

- This is a much more complicated proposal structure than the previous CCG TIES (which closed after 5 weeks) and hence more time is needed to prepare this detailed proposal and have it approved

Supplementary consideration to this Question: Recognizing that the current supply arrangement finishes on the 31 March 2020, would Canada consider a temporary extension for all qualified suppliers under the current SA? This would allow the closing of the RFP to be extended and therefore facilitate all respondents to submit fully documented and approved responses to the solicitation.

Answer 50:

See Answer 43.

Question 51:

With the new format and response requirements of this new CCG TIES SA it is quite an arduous process. Surely, an extension of 1 more week is not unreasonable and still provides Canada 5 weeks for evaluation and award of the new CCG TIES SA.

Answer 51:

See Answer 43.

Question 52:

Would a company that was formed less than 1 year ago as a joint venture of companies that have been active for more than 6 years qualify as the supplier having the minimum 2 years experience in the last 5 years.

Answer 52:

As per RFSA page 6 of 33, clause 2.1, Standard Instructions 2008, sub-clause 04 Definition of Supplier, a joint venture is allowed to submit a response. If each member of the joint venture has a minimum of 2 years of experience within the last 5 years, Canada is prepared to accept the response of that Supplier that is a joint venture if each member of the joint venture provides a compliant response to the Types of Work Evaluation in SOW Article 3.1.

Question 53:

Repeat Question 10.

Answer 53:

Canada confirms that this file F7012-190001 is a new file and information from a previous TIES CCG SA file F7048-090005 cannot be transferred in this renewal file, also a Supplier's response is to provide information to answer the current TIES CCG RFSA F7012-190001/A.

Question 54:

With respect to the subject solicitation, could you please confirm the definition of a Work Day is "7.5 hours exclusive of meal breaks"?

Answer 54:

Yes. Changed. Canada confirms the definition of a work day is 7.5 hours exclusive of meal breaks.

At Solicitation page 23 of 33, Annex "B", Basis of Payment:

Insert:

Definition of a Work Day

A work day is defined as 7.5 hours exclusive of meal breaks. Time worked which is more or less than a work day shall be prorated to reflect actual time worked in accordance with the following formula:

$$\text{Payment} = \frac{\text{Hours worked} \times \text{per diem rate}}{7.5}$$

Question 55:

In addition, para 6.2.5 of the Bid Solicitation Process states "For bid solicitation above \$100,000 and not exceeding \$400,000 (applicable taxes included), a buyer within PSPC ML Division will issue the bid solicitation to all Suppliers qualified in the required Area of Expertise." Is there an associated Template for this type of bid solicitation?

Answer 55:

As per RFSA page 21 of 33, Part C, clause 6.1 (b). The associated Template above \$100,000 and below \$400,000 is the same as Appendix 2 Template above \$25,000 and below \$100,000.

Question 56:

Each of the Occupational Categories of Senior Technical Specialist, Intermediate Technical Specialist and Intermediate Technologist require a minimum of a college diploma. This disqualifies many suitable candidates who do not have a college diploma, but do have considerable training and relevant hands on experience in the Canadian military technical trades, such as Naval Electronic Technician. However, the Canadian military does not provide diplomas or certifications. Will Canada consider an ex-military Naval Electronic Technician with significant years of relevant experience as a qualified candidate for the Integrated Logistic Support Area of Expertise?

Answer 56:

No. For TIES, the Canadian military technical trades are not equivalent to a college diploma.

Question 57:

Question – we note that the Q&A to date has generated considerable changes to the initial requirements of the RFP. In order to ensure that bidders have a clear understanding of the requirements, we request that the RFP be re-issued with required categories and qualifications updated as otherwise there is a significant risk of inadvertent disqualification.

Answer 57:

An updated solicitation will be posted in next solicitation amendment and an electronic copy will be sent to each potential Supplier contact who has requested an electronic copy of the solicitation as per Answer 5.

Question 58:

Question – a number of our questions submitted some time ago have not yet received a response. As the closing date for new or supplementary questions is rapidly approaching we therefore request a bid extension of 2 weeks to ensure adequate response time, noting also that the original bid extension of a single week does not reflect the short week for most bidders in provinces observing the Family Day statutory holiday.

Answer 58:

See Answer 43.

Question 59:

Question – we note the response to Q31 regarding junior technical staff and re-raise the question. It appears inappropriate for CCG to be discouraging Canadian companies from hiring new graduates from universities and colleges and depriving them of opportunities to work on government programs – this is extremely counterproductive to the industry in both the short and long term. We therefore request that CCG add junior categories for engineers and technologists.

Answer 59:

For TIES, Canada requires experienced candidates and is prepared to pay for these candidates.

Question 60:

Question – we note that none of the job categories have any requirement for project management (PM) expertise. As TIES tasks can be quite large and complex, it would seem advisable to include PM capabilities on the requirements for any larger project. Will CCG therefore consider adding a PM category to the current list?

Answer 60:

No. For TIES, Canada requires candidates such as the Engineers, Technical Specialists and Technologists to perform the Work instead of candidates with project management background.

Question 61:

Question – we note that personnel are not required to qualify in every Field of Specialty in order to be qualified for the Area of Expertise as a whole; e.g. the Naval Architect only requires 7 of 14. In selecting companies to perform or bid for future tasks, will CCG review compliance with the specific Field or only with the general Area? For example, if a bidder has not demonstrated experience in propulsion would they be selected for a project involving propulsion systems?

Answer 61:

Canada will qualify Supplier within Area of Expertise based on a minimum number of Fields of Specialty to receive a Supply Arrangement. There is no selection based on a specific Field of Specialty to obtain a Supply Arrangement. To answer your example, the demonstrated experience about the propulsion Field of Specialty will appear in the SA RFP and a Supplier not meeting the propulsion Field of Specialty criteria will not be compliant to be selected for the SA Contract of propulsion.

Question 62:

Question – in the naval architecture Area, can CCG explain how Fields #1 and #10 are intended to differ and which aspects require to be demonstrated? For example, Field #1 includes “Ship hull structure, structural arrangement and strength, vibration and passive fire protection.” Does a bidders’ naval architect have to demonstrate experience with all of these, or only with one? (Note that fire protection seems out of place in the list.)

Answer 62:

Changed. The Field of Specialty #10 is updated to read “Advanced structural analysis techniques,” as the rest of it seems to be duplicated by Field of Specialty #1. The Field of Specialty #1 is unchanged and keep the fire protection.

At Solicitation Annex "A" page 5 of 16, Table: Naval Architecture, Field of Specialty #10:

Delete: Ship structure, design and analysis, advanced structure analysis techniques

Insert: Advanced structure analysis techniques

Question 63:

Question – can CCG explain the expectation under naval architecture, Field #8? Does "interpretation" mean justification of equivalent levels of safety under the MTRB process, or is this just application of the rules? Further, the Field states: "...federal acts and regulations, international conventions, codes and Classification society rules pertaining to design, construction and operation of ships in all Voyage Classes and ASPPR types and classes." Does this mean that bidders have to show they have experience with every possible voyage class and ASPPR type and class? Note that ASPPR has been replaced by ASSPPR, and that the old classes are now overtaken by the IMO Polar Code.

Answer 63:

Unchanged. Canada will not add explanations to demonstrate the Field of Specialty #8 in Area of Expertise #1, Naval Architecture, because of the large numbers of fields of specialty within the 12 areas of expertise of this Supply Arrangement.

Question 64:

Question – the education requirements for Senior Engineer are "University (Undergraduate Degree) in engineering within the Area of Expertise and/or Field of Specialty" etc. In many cases, our senior engineers for Areas such as ILS, environmental etc. do not have degrees in this field but can demonstrate experience in many projects – also, few or no university programs exist in some of these areas. Can CCG please clarify whether a specific degree is required or whether another engineering degree coupled with demonstrated experience is acceptable to qualify in all Areas?

Answer 64:

No. A specific degree is not required. A related engineering degree coupled with demonstrated experience is acceptable.

Question 65:

We respectfully request a new closing day.

Answer 65:

See Answer 43.

Question 66:

It is our understanding that the Senior Engineer that meets the requirements of Section 4.4.1 of SOW also meets the requirements of the Section 4.4.2 for Senior Technical Specialist in all Areas of Expertise, except for 2,3, and 4, and therefore can be proposed as a Senior Technical Specialist. Could you kindly confirm that this is correct?

Answer 66:

Confirmed. See Answer 47.

Question 67:

To follow up on the responses to Question 16 and Question 27, if the Supplier proposes both Senior Engineer and Senior Technical Specialist in Areas of Expertise 2, can a Senior Technologist without 2nd class Marine Engineer Certificate qualify "in support of Required Occupation categories in Section 4.2"?

Answer 67:

Yes.

Question 68:

Regarding the Area of Expertise #12, Integrated Logistics Support, the majority of sub-Types of Work as currently defined under "Engineering and Technical Services" and "in-Service Support" do really apply to the Fields of Specialty defined for Integrated Logistics Support. Are there other more applicable Sub-Types of Work for Integrated Logistics Support that have not yet been provided in the RFSA?

Answer 68:

No.

Question 69:

Regarding Area of Expertise # Marine Informatics Technology, several of the Fields of Specialty involve software, meaning that suitable candidates are software developers, and software testers. The majority of these people are not engineers, but do hold a diploma within a technical field such as Software Development. However, there is no recognized certification body for the majority of software development that is applicable to Marine Informatics. Please confirm that for software personnel, a certification is not applicable.

Answer 69:

Canada confirms that a certification is not applicable for software personnel applying as Technical Specialist in the Marine Informatics Technology Area of Expertise.

Question 70:

Part 6, Paragraph 6.7 On-going Opportunity for Qualification. Due to the time challenge of this RFSA some experienced and capable firms may be unable to bid the full breadth of their capability. The RFSA Part 6, Paragraph 6.7 On-going Opportunity for Qualification states that: "A Notice will be posted once a year, around September, on the Government Electronic Tendering Service (GETS) to allow new Suppliers to become qualified. "

Will Canada consider moving forward the next qualification period forward , or add an additional qualification opportunity to allow companies who are currently unable to offer their full capability the prospect to qualify additional capabilities as early as possible?

Answer 70:

Due to time limit for this RFSA, Canada is planning to start an On-going Opportunity for Qualification in September 2020.

Question 71:

Would Canada consider allowing further clarification questions only to those answers that have not yet been released, say for 48 hours after the release of Amend 5?

Answer 71:

No.

END OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS