



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

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY
REQUIREMENT

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Systems Integration & Software Development Division
(XG)/Div. d'intégration des systèmes et du
développement des logiciels (XG)
Terrasses de la Chaudière 4th Floor
10 Wellington Street
Gatineau
Quebec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Data Remediation and Marking RFP	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W6381-170008/D	Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W6381-170008	Date 2020-04-16
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$XG-624-37464	
File No. - N° de dossier 624xg.W6381-170008	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2020-05-19	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: NGUYEN, Mark Nam	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 624xg
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (343) 550-1613 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: 105 HOTEL DE VILLE GATINEAU QC J8X 4H7 CANADA	

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

Solicitation Amendment 002 is raised to:

- A. At Section 2.2 Submission of Bids: changes to the RFP clauses concerning Bid Receiving.
- B. At Section PART 3 - BID PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS: changes to Epost Connect Bid Submission.
- C. At Section 3.3 Section IV: Certifications: amend heading reference number.
- D. At Section 3.4 Section V: Additional Information: amend heading reference number.
- E. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.3, Core Team - Data Remediation Lead (DRL): the minimum points required has been lowered to 25 pts (from 35).
- F. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 5.1, Data Remediation Lead (DRL) Point-Rated Criteria: the minimum points required has been lowered to 25 pts (from 35).
- G. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.3, Core Team – DRM-SM Project Manager: University Master's Degree has been removed as a rated criteria, the maximum points available has been lowered to 70 pts (from 80), and the minimum points required has been lowered to 35 pts (from 40).
- H. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 5.1, Project Manager (PM) Point-Rated Criteria: University Master's Degree has been removed as a rated criteria, the maximum points available has been lowered to 70 pts (from 80), and the minimum points required has been lowered to 35 pts (from 40).
- I. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, 5.2, Overall Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Summary: Core Team Resources Point Rated has been lowered to 245 pts (from 255), and the minimum points required has been lowered to 35 pts (from 40), and the total point rated available has been lowered to 345 pts (from 355).
- J. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.2, Data Remediation Lead, DRL-M1: Master records amended to 50,000 (from 200,000).
- K. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.3, Data Remediation Lead, DRL-R1: Master records amended to 50,000 (from 200,000).
- L. At Appendix B to Annex A – Task Authorization (TA) Evaluation Grid, Section A3 - Data Remediation Lead, DRL-M1: Master records amended to 50,000 (from 200,000).
- M. At Annex A – Statement of Work (SOW), Sections 10.2 to 10.5: changes to bilingual requirements.
- N. Provide responses to Bidder's questions.

A. At Section 2.2 Submission of Bids:

DELETE: Section 2.2 in its entirety

REPLACE BY:

2.2 Submission of Bids

- (a) Bids must be submitted only to the Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) Bid Receiving Unit **via e-post Connect** by the date and time indicated on page one of the bid solicitation.

Note: For bidders needing to register with epost Connect the email address is:

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

Interested Bidders must register a few days prior to solicitation closing date.

Note: Bids will not be accepted if emailed directly to this email address. This email address is to be used to open an epost Connect conversation, as detailed in Standard Instructions 2003, or to send bids through an epost Connect message if the bidder is using its own licensing agreement for epost Connect.

- (b) Due to the nature of the bid solicitation, bids transmitted by facsimile or electronic mail to PWGSC will not be accepted.

B. At Section PART 3 - BID PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS:

DELETE:

Canada requests that the Bidder submits its bid in accordance with Section 08 of the 2003 Standard Instructions with epost Connect as the preferred option. The epost Connect system has a limit of 1GB per single message posted and a limit of 20GB per conversation.

The bid must be gathered per section and separated as follows:

Section I: Technical Bid
Section II: Financial Bid
Section III: Certifications
Section IV: Additional Information

If the Bidder is simultaneously providing copies of its bid using multiple acceptable delivery methods, and if there is a discrepancy between the wording of any of these copies and the electronic copy provided through epost Connect service, the wording of the electronic copy provided through epost Connect service will have priority over the wording of the other copies.

REPLACE BY:

3.0 Bid Preparation Instructions

(a) Epost Connect Bid Submission

- (i) Canada requires that the Bidder submit their electronic bid in accordance with section 08 of the 2003 Standard Instructions. The epost Connect system has a limit of 1GB per single message posted and a limit of 20GB per conversation.
- (ii) The bid must be gathered per section and separated as follows:
- (A) Section I: Technical Bid
 - (B) Section II: Financial Bid
 - (C) Section III: Certifications
 - (D) Section IV: Additional Information

- (iii) Prices must appear in the financial bid only. No prices must be indicated in any other section of the bid.
- (iv) For further information please refer to article 08 - Transmission by facsimile or by epost Connect at <https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual/1/2003/23#transmission-by-facsimile>

C. At Section 3.3 Section IV: Certifications:

DELETE: heading of RFP Section 3.3 Section IV: Certifications

REPLACE BY: 3.3 Section III: Certifications

This change is reflected in the Table of Contents

D. At Section 3.4 Section V: Additional Information:

DELETE: heading of RFP Section 3.4 Section V: Additional Information

REPLACE BY: 3.4 Section IV: Additional Information

This change is reflected in the Table of Contents

E. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.3, Core Team - Data Remediation Lead (DRL):

DELETE: Minimum points required: 35

REPLACE BY: Minimum points required: 25

F. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 5.1, Data Remediation Lead (DRL) Point-Rated Criteria:

DELETE: Minimum points required: 35

REPLACE BY: Minimum points required: 25

G. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.3, Core Team – DRM-SM Project Manager:

DELETE: PM-R3 in its entirety.

DELETE: Maximum points available: 80

REPLACE BY: Maximum points available: 70

DELETE: Minimum points required: 40

REPLACE BY: Minimum points required: 35

H. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 5.1, Project Manager (PM) Point-Rated Criteria:

DELETE: PM-R3 in its entirety.

DELETE: Maximum points available: 80

REPLACE BY: Maximum points available: 70

DELETE: Minimum points required: 40

REPLACE BY: Minimum points required: 35

I. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, 5.2, Overall Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Summary:

DELETE: Core Team Resources Point Rated: 255

REPLACE BY: Core Team Resources Point Rated: 245

DELETE: Total Point Rated Available: 355

REPLACE BY: Total Point Rated Available: 345

J. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.2, Data Remediation Lead, DRL-M1:

DELETE:

“*Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 200,000 master data records.” in its entirety.

REPLACE BY:

“*Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 50,000 master data records.”.

K. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.3, Data Remediation Lead, DRL-R1:

DELETE:

“*Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 200,000 master data records.” in its entirety.

REPLACE BY:

“*Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 50,000 master data records.”.

L. Appendix B to Annex A – Task Authorization (TA) Evaluation Grid, Section A3 - Data Remediation Lead, DRL-M1:

DELETE:

“*Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 200,000 master data records.” in its entirety.

REPLACE BY:

“*Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 50,000 master data records.”

M. At Annex A – Statement of Work (SOW), Sections 10.2 to 10.5:

DELETE: Section 10.2 to 10.5 in their entirety.

REPLACE BY:

10.2 All Deliverables must be provided in English. Any training or courseware materials must be provided in English and French, as specified in the Task Authorization.

N. Responses to Bidders' Questions:

ID #	RFP Section	Question	Reason for Question	Answer
BQ-01	3.3, 3.4	Section 3.3 and 3.4 of the RFP have incorrect heading references.	n/a	Headings of Sections 3.3 and 3.4 of the RFP: Delete from RFP: 3.3 Section IV: Certifications and replace with 3.3 Section III: Certifications Delete: 3.4 Section V: Additional Information and replace with 3.3 Section IV: Additional Information These changes are also reflected in the Table of Contents. Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd002_W6381-170008.D (Clause C)
BQ-02	Cover page	We respectfully request a four week extension to the bid submittal date to May 18.	Due to the complexity of the category of personnel being requested as well as difficulties associated with contacting candidates and confirming references during the recent public and private closures and other emergency management efforts enacted to minimize the spread of COVID-19.	Canada has extended the Bid Closing Date to May 19th, 2020. Due to the uncertainty of outcomes related to COVID-19, this date will be reviewed as more information becomes available. Change addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd001_W6381-170008.D (Clause D)
BQ-03	Contract Reference Confirmation Form (page 150) and Attachment 4.1 (page 153 – 172)	Would the Crown please confirm that a contract reference, and subsequently the Contract Reference Confirmation Form is not required for C-R4, PM-M2, PM-M3, PM-R3, and ULMC-R3?	The Contract Reference Confirmation Form on page 150 of the RFP includes spots for bidders to provide a description of services provided and have a client sign off on each mandatory and rated requirement. The requirements C-R4, PM-M2, PM-M3, PM-R3,	The Contract Reference Confirmation Form is required to substantiate the experience of Bidders. It is not used to substantiate the Certification/Diploma/Degree Bidders submit in support of their proposals.

			and ULMC-R3 are for corporate ISO certification, candidate education, or candidate certification, and are not related to services provided on previous contracts. Please confirm that Bidders are not required to provide a contract reference for the above noted requirements, provided that bidders include a copy of the applicable certification/diploma.	
BQ-04	Part 6, 6.1 and 6.3 (page 29 – 31); Part 7, 7.5 (page 36 – 38); and Annex C (page 129 – 135)	Would the Crown please confirm that only the primary bidder and resources put forward need to meet the security requirements.	The majority of work is to be performed on DND premises as specified at the TA stage. Offsite work, if required, can be performed at the site of the primary bidder, who meets the current security requirements. If work is not to be conducted at a subcontractor's site, then please confirm that it is not necessary for a subcontractor to meet the security requirements.	<p>A Canadian Subcontractor to a Canadian Prime Contractor does not necessarily require the same security requirements as the Prime.</p> <p>Once the prime contract is awarded, the prime contractor must submit SRCLs for their subcontractors. With the assistance of their contracting and/or project authority, if required, the prime contractor will determine what security requirements will apply to their subcontractor. This determination will depend on what portions of work the subcontractor will be performing. According to the SRCL, contract W6381-170008 contains portions of work that would require only a Reliability clearance. Therefore, if one subcontractor was only going to be accessing sites and/or information that required reliability clearance, they would not require the Facility Security Clearance (FSC) Secret.</p>
BQ-05	Front cover	Request for Bid Closing Date extension due to COVID-19 crisis.		Refer to BQ-02

BQ-06	4.3 Core-Team Point-Rated Technical Criteria (DRL-R2, DRL-R3 & DRL-R4)	These three rated requirements require experience with SAP and together they amount to 30 of the 75 points (with a minimum of 35 required). We see in the mandatory DRL requirement experience is confined to "an ERP system". Given the fact that data remediation activities are largely system agnostic, we would request that these three rated requirements have the SAP requirement removed and replaced with the same phrasing "an ERP system". Otherwise we will have a great deal of difficulty in achieving the minimum score for this resource and we may not be able to compete. Alternatively, we would request the removal of "SAP" from at least some of the rated requirements to allow us to have a better chance in meeting the minimum score.	Difficulty in recruiting resources thus impacting our ability to submit a bid. In addition, locally staffing is a particular problem.	<p>The minimum points required has been lowered to 25 pts (from 35).</p> <p>At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.3, Core Team - Data Remediation Lead (DRL): DELETE: Minimum points required: 35 REPLACE BY: Minimum points required: 25</p> <p>At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 5.1, Data Remediation Lead (DRL) Point-Rated Criteria: DELETE: Minimum points required: 35 REPLACE BY: Minimum points required: 25</p> <p>Change addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd002_W6381-170008.D (Clauses E to F)</p>
BQ-07	4.3 Core-Team Point-Rated Technical Criteria	The following requirements for the DRL PM are posing qualification and scoring issues for our otherwise extremely qualified resource. PM-R3 states that "The Bidder should	Best PM resource will not be competitive and may negatively impact the likelihood of a successful implementation. In addition, locally staffing is a particular problem.	<p>University Master's Degree has been removed as a rated criteria.</p> <p>At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.3, Core Team – DRM-SM Project Manager: DELETE: PM-R3 in its entirety</p>

		<p>demonstrate that the proposed resource successfully completed a University Master's degree." While we understand that this is a rated requirement, we do not see the importance of a Master's degree particularly as there is no limitation on the discipline. Another year of university bears no relevance to the education or experience of a Project Manager. We respectfully request that this requirement be removed especially given its impact on the minimum points threshold.</p>		
				<p>DELETE: Maximum points available: 80 REPLACE BY: Maximum points available: 70</p> <p>DELETE: Minimum points required: 40 REPLACE BY: Minimum points required: 35</p> <p>At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 5.1, Project Manager (PM) Point-Rated Criteria: DELETE: PM-R3 in its entirety</p> <p>DELETE: Maximum points available: 80 REPLACE BY: Maximum points available: 70</p> <p>DELETE: Minimum points required: 40 REPLACE BY: Minimum points required: 35</p> <p>At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 5.2, Overall Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Summary: DELETE: Core Team Resources Point Rated: 255 REPLACE BY: Core Team Resources Point Rated: 245</p> <p>DELETE: Total Point Rated Available: 355 REPLACE BY: Total Point Rated Available: 345</p>

				Change addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd002_W6381-170008.D (Clauses G to I)
	4.2 & 4.3 Core-Team Technical Criteria	Both DRL-M1 and DRL-R1 indicate that *Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 200,000 master data records." We would suggest that in the area of Defence there is no difference between 50,000, 100,000 and 200,000 master records when developing a data remediation plan. The order of magnitude is comparable and a data remediation plan for 50,000 master records can be implemented for 200,000 master records, most equipment managers manage less than 50,000 serialized EMRs. Complex and fully featured systems have been developed and implemented which involve far fewer than 200K master data records. To sum up, the volume of records does not impact system capability or functionality. We would request therefore that the volume requirement be changed to 50,000 to 100,000 vs 200,000.	The most qualified DRL resource will not be competitive and we will have to bid a less-qualified resource. In addition, local staffing is a particular problem given the high record count requirement.	Master records amended to 50,000 for DRL-M1 and DRL-R1 in: At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.2, Data Remediation Lead, DRL-M1: DELETE: "Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 200,000 master data records." in its entirety. REPLACE BY: "Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 50,000 master data records.". At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.3, Data Remediation Lead, DRL-R1: DELETE: "Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 200,000 master data records." in its entirety. REPLACE BY: "Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 50,000 master data records.". At Appendix B to Annex A – Task Authorization (TA) Evaluation Grid, Section A3 - Data Remediation Lead, DRL-M1: DELETE: "Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 200,000 master data records." in its entirety. REPLACE BY: "Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 50,000 master data records.".

BQ-08

BQ-09	10.1 & 10.3	<p>10.0 LANGUAGE</p> <p>Section 10.1 states that "The Contractor must provide services to DND in both official languages of Canada (English and French) as defined in the individual DND 626, Task Authorizations."</p> <p>Section 10.3 states that the "DRM-SM Project Manager must be fluent in English and French."</p> <p>Our most qualified PM would score almost full points except for the bilingual requirement (which removes him from the running). We are able to provide bilingual service using another operational member of the team who can also act as translator. Can you therefore remove the 10.3 requirement while leaving a general bilingual capability within the team? Note that our intention would be to commence with our most skilled PM, utilize existing bilingual staff in support, and skill</p>	Best unilingual PM resource will not be competitive.	<p>Change addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd002_W6381-170008.D (Clauses J to L)</p> <p>Changes to bilingual requirements.</p> <p>At Annex A – Statement of Work (SOW), Sections 10.2 to 10.5:</p> <p>DELETE: Section 10.2 to 10.5 in their entirety.</p> <p>REPLACE BY:</p> <p>10.2 All Deliverables must be provided in English. Any training or courseware materials must be provided in English and French, as specified in the Task Authorization."</p> <p>Change addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd002_W6381-170008.D (Clause M)</p>
-------	-------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		transition to a local, fully bilingual resource.			
BQ-10	5.2.1 Integrity Provisions – Required Documentation	<p>The link provided in this paragraph shows as 404 Not Found. Can you confirm that what is required to address this requirement is a List of Company Directors?</p> <p>In accordance with the section titled Information to be provided when bidding, contracting or entering into a real property agreement of the Ineligibility and Suspension Policy (http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/ciif/politique-policy-eng.html), the Bidder must provide the required documentation, as applicable, to be given further consideration in the procurement process.</p>	Hyperlink not functional	<p>Faulty imbedded hyperlink.</p> <p>Please use the following link: http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/ci-if/politique-policy-eng.html</p>	
BQ-11	Security requirements on pages 29-31, 36-38, and pages 129-135. The sections are 6, 6.1, 6.3, 7, 7.5,	<p>Would like to confirm that only the prime contractor is required to provide resources required to meet the security requirements as needed?</p>	<p>The RFP states that most of the work is to be performed at DND locations as outlined at the TA stage. Any worked required to be performed offsite can be performed at the site of the prime contractor, who does meet all the</p>	<p>Refer to BQ-04</p> <p>The resources need to meet the security requirements whether they are resources of the prime contractor or subcontractor, as detailed in Appendix A to Annex C – Supplemental Security Guide.</p>	

	and Annex C respectfully.		current security requirements. If there are sub-contractors who are not performing that work, do they still need to meet the security requirements called out for secure facilities?	
BQ-12	Part 7.1.1.3 (page 72)	Would the Crown please confirm that all supplied UID labels must meet ISO:15415:2011 verification requirements with a minimum grade of "B"?	The range of UID labels provided are to be module size 0.19- 0.635mm and constructed of photo anodized aluminum or polyacrylic materials. It is typical to verify 2D codes to ISO: TR29158 with a minimum grade of "C" OR- to ISO:15415 with a minimum grade of "B" at the supplier's choice to minimize cost of implementation or possibility of technical limitation. It will be much harder and may not be possible in some circumstances to grade codes .19 mm cell size to ISO:15415 on the requested materials produced with a flatbed laser.	Response in development
BQ-13	Part 10.0 (page 127)	Would the Crown please confirm which hosting & security requirements apply for public cloud services, (i.e FedRAMP, NIST, CSE, etc.)	This question is to make clear the cost implications of contractor provided cloud hosting requirements.	Response in development

BQ-14	Part 4.1.5 (page 59)	For each UID label are 3 UII Package labels required for (1) unit containers, (2) intermediate containers, and (3) exterior containers?	This question is to make clear the cost implications of producing and kitting/handling the UII Package labels.	Response in development
BQ-15	Part 7.1.1.15 (page 74)	For the "leave-behind" capability including attachment method and surface preparation consumables, please confirm if screws/rivets are required as part of the scope for delivery of tags with holes in them?	This question is to make clear the technical requirements and cost implications of producing and kitting/handling the "leave-behind" capability.	Response in development
BQ-16	Part 6.2.4.4, 7.1.1.16, Appendix 1 (page 69, 74, 89)	For the UII Package labels, would the Crown please confirm if the materials, sizes and styles, used for the companion UII Package labels must match the materials, sizes and styles, used for the UID labels?	This question is to make clear the cost implications of producing and kitting/handling the UII Package labels.	Response in development
BQ-17	Part 7.2.5.3, 7.2.5.7, 7.2.5.8, 7.2.5.9, (page 78)	What type of fixture is required to have a marking window of at least 10 centimeters wide by 6 centimeters long; produce module sizes 0.19mm-0.635mm, and 2D codes up to 25.4mm square? Typically, a T-slot plate is provided with option to attach clamp or rotary attachment. Will the Crown consider changing the RFP to allow	Multiple pins and pin heads will have to be used to meet the requirements of this RFP and will definitely make it harder to achieve satisfactory results.	Response in development

		a quote for a portable dot- peen system which can also be column mounted with a slightly smaller marking window? Also, will the Crown consider restricting the cell size specification required for dot-peen?		
BQ-18	Part 7.2.4.4.5 (page 77)	Please confirm if the Crown provides external ventilation plumbing -OR- if the contractor must provide self-enclosed ventilation with HEPA/VOC treatment for the laser enclosure?	Any laser marking system for use with the range of materials as specified in Part 7.2.4.5 is required to have some type of ventilation to extract the fumes/smoke resulting in the engraving/cutting process, particularly with the polyacrylic material. Any smoke which builds up in the marking chamber will diffract the laser beam and cause issues with marking quality. In addition, caustic fumes may generate by marking/cutting process, these machines cannot be safely operated without self-enclosed or exterior ventilation.	Response in development.
BQ-19	Part 7.2.4.4.4, (page 77)	Please confirm If a rotary attachment to secure and rotate cylindrical parts to be laser marked will meet this requirement.	Flat parts may be laid in the laser bed and do not require clamping.	Response in development.
BQ-20	Appendix 1-7 (page 89)	Is the intention of the Crown for the contractor	This question is to make clear the cost	Response in development.

		to produce the Ull packaging labels on- demand while in the field or at the marking stations located on base to print these at the same time the UID labels are produced?	implications of producing and kitting/handling the Ull Package labels.	
BQ-21				
BQ-22				
BQ-23				
BQ-24				
BQ-25				
BQ-26				

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.