



**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

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Data Remediation and Marking RFP	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> W6381-170008/D	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 004
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> W6381-170008	<b>Date</b> 2020-05-04
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$XG-624-37464	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 624xg.W6381-170008	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2020-05-19</b>	<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> NGUYEN, Mark Nam	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 624xg
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (343) 550-1613 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> 105 HOTEL DE VILLE GATINEAU QC J8X 4H7 CANADA	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/</b> <b>de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

**Solicitation Amendment 004 is raised to:**

- A. Master records amended to 50,000 for C-M3 and C-R3.
  - B. Update to PM-M3 requirements.
  - C. Remove all references requirement for the resources and keep references requirement for the Bidder's experience only.
  - D. Update to PLE-M1, PLE-M2, ULMC-M1, and ULMC-R1 requirements.
  - E. Typo correction to Amendment 003 (Item C)
  - F. Provide updated list of responses to Bidders' questions.
- 

**A. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 3.1:**

AMEND **C-M3** to include:

"\*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 3.2:**

AMEND **C-R3** to include:

"\*Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 50,000 Master Data records."

**B. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.2:**

DELETE: PM-M3 in its entirety.

REPLACE BY: "PM-M3: The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has successfully completed a post-secondary degree or diploma.

The Bidder must provide a copy of the post-secondary degree or diploma."

**C. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.2:**

**PLE-M1:**

DELETE: "The Bidder must provide one (1) corporate Project reference for each distinct Project demonstrating how this experience was obtained. For each corporate Project reference, the following must be provided:

- Client Name;
- Project start and end date (dd/mm/yy);
- Contact information of the reference (telephone and email address); and
- A description of the services provided."

**PM-M4:**

**DELETE:** "The Bidder must provide one (1) corporate Project reference for each distinct Project demonstrating how this experience was obtained. For each corporate Project reference, the following must be provided:

- Client Name;
- Project start and end date (dd/mm/yy);
- Contact information of the reference (telephone and email address); and
- A description of the services provided."

**At Attachment 4.1 – Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.3:**

**PM-R4:**

**DELETE:** "The Bidder must provide one (1) corporate Project reference for each distinct Project demonstrating how this experience was obtained. For each corporate Project reference, the following must be provided:

- Client Name;
- Project start and end date (dd/mm/yy);
- Contact information of the reference (telephone and email address); and
- A description of the services provided."

**DRL-R2:**

**DELETE:** "The Bidder must provide one (1) corporate Project reference for each distinct Project demonstrating how this experience was obtained. For each corporate Project reference, the following must be provided:

- Client Name;
- Project start and end date (dd/mm/yy);
- Contact information of the reference (telephone and email address); and
- A description of the services provided."

**DRL-R3:**

**DELETE:** "The Bidder must provide one (1) corporate Project reference for each distinct Project demonstrating how this experience was obtained. For each corporate Project reference, the following must be provided:

- Client Name;
- Project start and end date (dd/mm/yy);
- Contact information of the reference (telephone and email address); and
- A description of the services provided."

**D. At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.2:**

**AMEND PLE-M1** to include:

"The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience, within the last ten (10) years, as a Project Leader/Executive in two (2) distinct Projects which each included the

implementation of a substantial\* STANAG 2290 or Military Standard 130 (MIL-STD-130) compliant Legacy Equipment Unique Identification (UID) labelling and marking programs for military organizations **or government organizations.**"

**AMEND PLE-M2** to include:

"The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has a minimum 60 months of experience within the last fifteen (15) years directing and leading the implementation of STANAG 2290 or Military Standard 130 (MIL-STD-130) compliant Unique Identification (UID) marking programs for military organizations **or government organizations.**"

**AMEND ULMC-M1** to include:

"The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has a minimum 24 months of experience within the last fifteen (15) years in the development\* of STANAG 2290 or MIL-STD-130 compliant Unique Identification marking specifications, describing how to apply UID to various types of legacy military equipment **or industrial equipment.**"

**At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.3:**

**AMEND ULMC-R1** to include:

"In addition to ULMC-M1, the Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed resource has more than 24 months of experience in the development\* of STANAG 2290 or MIL-STD-130 compliant Unique Identification marking specifications, describing how to apply UID to various types of legacy military equipment **or industrial equipment.**"

**E. At Solicitation Amendment 003 Item C (BQ-13):**

Clarified to:

At Attachment 4.2 – Pricing Schedule, Table 5.3:

DELETE: Table 5.3 in its entirety.

**F. Updated list of responses to Bidders' Questions: (see below)**

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.  <b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd002_W6381-170008.D (Item C)</b>
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.  <b>Change addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd001_W6381-170008.D (Item D)</b>
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: <b>25</b></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: <b>25</b></p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd002_W6381-170008.D (Items E to F)</b></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: <b>70</b></p> <p>DELETE: Minimum points required: 40 REPLACE BY: Minimum points required: <b>35</b></p> <p>At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 5.1, Project Manager (PM) Point-Rated Criteria:</p> <p>DELETE: PM-R3 in its entirety</p> <p>DELETE: Maximum points available: 80 REPLACE BY: Maximum points available: <b>70</b></p> <p>DELETE: Minimum points required: 40 REPLACE BY: Minimum points required: <b>35</b></p> <p>At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 5.2, Overall Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Summary:</p> <p>DELETE: Core Team Resources Point Rated: 255 REPLACE BY: Core Team Resources Point Rated: <b>245</b></p> <p>DELETE: Total Point Rated Available: 355 REPLACE BY: Total Point Rated Available: <b>345</b></p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd002_W6381-170008.D (Items G to I)</b></p>
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



BQ-08	4.2 & 4.3 Core-Team Technical Criteria	<p>Both DRL-M1 and DRL-R1 indicate that</p> <p>*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.</p>	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.	<p>Master records amended to 50,000 for DRL-M1 and DRL-R1 in:</p> <p>At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.2, Data Remediation Lead, DRL-M1:</p> <p>DELETE: "**Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 200,000 master data records." in its entirety.</p> <p>REPLACE BY: "**Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least <b>50,000</b> master data records."</p> <p>At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.3, Data Remediation Lead, DRL-R1:</p> <p>DELETE: "**Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 200,000 master data records." in its entirety.</p> <p>REPLACE BY: "**Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least <b>50,000</b> master data records."</p> <p>At Appendix B to Annex A – Task Authorization (TA) Evaluation Grid, Section A3 - Data Remediation Lead, DRL-M1:</p> <p>DELETE: "**Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least 200,000 master data records." in its entirety.</p> <p>REPLACE BY: "**Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least <b>50,000</b> master data records."</p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd002_W6381-170008.D (Items J to L)</b></p>
-------	-------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

BQ-09	10.1 & 10.3	10.0 LANGUAGE 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." Section 10.3 states that the "DRM-SM Project Manager must be fluent in English and French." 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 transition to a local, fully bilingual resource.	Best unilingual PM resource will not be competitive.	Changes to bilingual requirements. 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."  <b>Change addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd002_W6381-170008.D (Item M)</b>
BQ-10	5.2.1 Integrity Provisions –	The link provided in this paragraph shows as 404 Not Found. Can you	Hyperlink not functional	Faulty imbedded hyperlink. Please use the following link:

	Required Documentation	confirm that what is required to address this requirement is a List of Company Directors?  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 ( <a href="http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/ciif/politique-policy-eng.html">http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/ciif/politique-policy-eng.html</a> ), the Bidder must provide the required documentation, as applicable, to be given further consideration in the procurement process.		<a href="http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/ci-if/politique-policy-eng.html">http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/ci-if/politique-policy-eng.html</a>
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, and Annex C respectively.	Would like to confirm that only the prime contractor is required to provide resources required to meet the security requirements as needed?	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 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?	Refer to BQ-04  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.

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"?	<p>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.</p>	<p>At Annex A – Statement of Work:</p> <p>7.1.1.4 All machine readable 2D bar codes must use IEC/ISO 15434 syntax;</p> <p>INSERT</p> <p>a. UID Direct Part Marks supplied must be verified to ISO TR29158 and achieve a minimum overall grade of "C" or "2.0". A sampling plan IAW IEC/ISO 2859-1 is acceptable (Contractor to propose Acceptable Quality Limit for DND's approval);</p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd003_W6381-170008.D (Item B)</b></p>
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.)	<p>This question is to make clear the cost implications of contractor provided cloud hosting requirements.</p>	<p>Delete references to public cloud throughout the Statement of Work, Basis of Payment and Pricing Schedule:</p> <p>At Annex A – Statement of Work:</p> <p>DELETE: 7.3.4.1.c. in its entirety.</p> <p>At Annex B – Basis of Payment</p> <p>DELETE: Table 10.0 in its entirety.</p> <p>At Attachment 4.2 – Pricing Schedule, Table 5.3:</p>

				<p>DELETE: Table 5.4 in its entirety.</p> <p>At Attachment 4.2 – Pricing Schedule, Table 5.4:</p> <p>DELETE: “Total Price UID Registry (SaaS model, public cloud)”</p> <p>DELETE: “Average Price UID Registry (Total Price UID Registry ÷ 3)”</p> <p>REPLACE BY: “Average Price UID Registry (Total Price UID Registry ÷ 2)”</p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd003_W6381-170008.D ( Item C)</b></p>
BQ-14	Part 4.1.5 (page 59)	For each UID label are 3 Ull 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 Ull Package labels.	<p>Ull Packaging labels printed on demand therefore kitting/handling not required.</p>
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?	<p>This question is to make clear the technical requirements and cost implications of producing and kitting/handling the “leave-behind” capability.</p>	<p>The leave behind capability must support the application of the marking in accordance with the approved marking specification, including all consumables required, but not including tooling.</p> <p>At Annex A – Statement of Work:</p> <p>DELETE: 7.1.1.15 in its entirety</p> <p>REPLACE BY:</p> <p>“7.1.1.15 The Contractor will be required to develop and deliver a pre-packaged kit for items that will need to be marked at some future date by an entity other than the DRM Contractor (for example, a maintainer or installer). This “leave behind kit” would include everything required to apply the mark in accordance with the approved</p>

BQ-16	Part 6.2.4.4, 7.1.1.16, Appendix 1 (page 69, 74, 89)	For the ULI Package labels, would the Crown please confirm if the materials, sizes and styles, used for the companion ULI 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 ULI Package labels.	<p>marking spec, include labels, adhesion/attachment method, hardware consumables, any surface preparation consumables, and instructions with pictures of the application method;"</p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd003_W6381-170008.D (Item D)</b></p> <p>On demand packaging marks should be applied using commercially available label roll stock between 3 and 5 inches in width, or A5 or 4x6 in paper stock affixed adhesively. DND will entertain alternative sizes based on written requests.</p> <p>At Annex A – Statement of Work:</p> <p>Section 7.1.1.16:</p> <p>INSERT</p> <p>a. The ULI package labels must be produced in accordance with AAP-44A and AAITP-02. The ULI package labels must be printed on adhesive roll stock labels between 3 and 5 inches in width or on paper of size A5 or 4 x 6 inches affixed adhesively. The label must have printed on it a PDF417 mark appropriate for the materiel in the package and human readable the part number(s) serial number(s) of the materiel in the package.</p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd003_W6381-170008.D (Item H)</b></p>
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-	Multiple pins and pin heads will have to be used to meet the requirements of this RFP and will definitely make it harder to	<p>At Annex A – Statement of Work:</p> <p>Section 7.2.5.3:</p>

		<p>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.</p> <p>Will the Crown consider changing the RFP to allow 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?</p>	achieve satisfactory results.	<p><b>DELETE:</b> "Have marking window of at least a marking window of at least 10 centimeters wide by 6 centimeters long;"</p> <p><b>REPLACE BY:</b> "Have marking window of at least a marking window of at least <b>9</b> centimeters wide by <b>5</b> centimeters long;"</p> <p><b>Section 11.4:</b></p> <p><b>INSERT:</b></p> <p><b>11.4.3</b> The Contractor is responsible to provide all equipment and material required to perform the Services and Deliverables on site as indicated in the Task Authorization.</p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd003_W6381-170008.D (Item E)</b></p>
BQ-18	<p>Part 7.2.4.4.5 (page 77)</p>	<p>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?</p>	<p>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,</p>	<p>Contractor to supply ventilation system as required.</p>

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.	these machines cannot be safely operated without self-enclosed or exterior ventilation. Flat parts may be laid in the laser bed and do not require clamping.	The Crown will accept any solution which meets the specification. The specifics are at the Contractor's discretion.
BQ-20	Appendix 1-7 (page 89)	Is the intention of the Crown for the contractor 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?	This question is to make clear the cost implications of producing and kitting/handling the Ull Package labels.	The intent is to produce the Ull packaging labels on-demand.
BQ-21	4.3 Core-Team Point-Rated Technical Criteria	DRL-R1 requires "more than 24 months experience in the last 60 months in planning, documenting, and executing substantial Master Data Remediation..." The other three DRL rated requirements all require SAP experience, which puts the preponderance of required experience on a specific technology which limits our ability to score competitively with an otherwise extremely experienced resource. We have also noticed in other requirements eligible time frames such as 15 years for C-R1; 10 years for	Three of four requirements are technology specific, which tends to exclude otherwise qualified data remediation resources.	At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria: Table 4.3, DRL-R1:  DELETE: "In addition to DRL-M1, the Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed resource has more than 24 months experience in the last 60 months in planning, documenting, and executing substantial* Master Data Remediation** involving master data records in an ERP system."  REPLACE BY: "In addition to DRL-M1, the Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed resource has more than 24 months experience in the last <b>120</b> months in planning, documenting, and executing substantial* Master Data Remediation** involving master data records in an ERP system."

**Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment:  
Amd003\_W6381-170008.D (Item F)**



BQ-22	ULMC-R3	<p>PLE-M1 etc. Accordingly, we would request that the R1 requirement time frame is expanded from 60 months to 120 months. Can you confirm if this can be done?</p> <p>This requirement states that "The Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed resource has successfully completed a post-secondary education." We are requesting that this requirement be removed as we feel a post secondary education does not relate to the specialized nature of the work. We believe that the direct work experience listed in the requirement (particularly with military applications) should be the only criteria. (We would note that even the Project Leader/Executive does not require or is evaluated on post-secondary education).</p>	<p>To ensure that the most directly qualified resource with direct experience is competitive.</p>	<p>At Attachment 4.1; Table 4.3 – Core Team Point Rated Technical Criteria:  DELETE: ULMC-R3 in its entirety;  Amend Maximum points available to <b>80</b> (from 100); and  Amend Minimum points available to <b>40</b> (from 50).  Table 5.1:  DELETE: ULMC-R3 in its entirety;  Amend Maximum points available to <b>80</b> (from 100); and  Amend Minimum points available to <b>40</b> (from 50)  At Table 5.2:  Amend Core Team Resources Point Rated: <b>225</b> (from 245); and  Amend Total Points Available: <b>325</b> (from 345)</p>
BQ-23	Amd 002, BQ-04	<p>Does the same hold true for a foreign Subcontractor from a NATO country?</p>	<p>Our team includes a foreign Subcontractor, required to supply labeling equipment and</p>	<p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd003_W6381-170008.D (Item G)</b> If a foreign subcontractor doesn't require access to restricted zones/assets/information then it does not require a Facility Security Clearance (FSC).</p>

			material to a Canadian Prime Contractor.  This subcontractor will not be required to access sites and/or information that require reliability clearance. As such, it is assumed that a Facility Security Clearance (FSC) Secret for that Subcontractor will not be necessary.	
BQ-24	RFP C-M3, RFP C-R3, and AMD 0002 BQ-08	We request that the volume of 200,000 master data records be changed to 50,000.	Please confirm.  For consistency and with the rational of AMD 002 BQ-08, we request that the DRL substantial data remediation definition change to a minimum of 50,000 master data records be reflected throughout the RFP, including in C-M3 and C-R3.	Master records amended to 50,000 for C-M3 and C-R3.  At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 3.1:  AMEND <b>C-M3</b> to include:  "Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least <b>50,000</b> Master Data records."  At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 3.2  AMEND <b>C-R3</b> to include:  "Substantial in this context is defined as a program that remediated at least <b>50,000</b> master data records."
BQ-25	RFP PM-M3	Would the Crown accept a Bachelor Diploma	It has been our determination that a Bachelor Diploma	<b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd004_W6381-170008.D (Item A)</b>  At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.2:

			obtained from a technical institute?	received from a Technical Institutes should be considered equivalent in this environment. Please confirm.	<p>DELETE: <b>PM-M3</b> in its entirety.</p> <p>INSERT the following at <b>PM-M3</b>:</p> <p>"The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has successfully completed a <b>post-secondary degree or diploma</b>.</p> <p>The Bidder must provide a copy of the <b>post-secondary degree or diploma</b>."</p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd004_W6381-170008.D (Item B)</b></p> <p>Remove all references requirement for the resources and keep references requirement for the Bidder's experience only.</p> <p>At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.2:</p> <p>DELETE the following at <b>PLE-M1</b>:</p> <p>"The Bidder must provide one (1) corporate Project reference for each distinct Project demonstrating how this experience was obtained. For each corporate Project reference, the following must be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Client Name;</li> <li>• Project start and end date (dd/mm/yy);</li> <li>• Contact information of the reference (telephone and email address); and</li> <li>• A description of the services provided." <p>DELETE the following at <b>PM-M4</b>:</p> <p>"The Bidder must provide one (1) corporate Project reference for each Large-scale project demonstrating how this experience was obtained. For each corporate Project reference, the following must be provided:</p> </li></ul>
BQ-26	Attachment 4.1 Technical Evaluation Criteria	Would the Crown accept projects without references, provided that at least one project with a reference is used to support each requirement?	References who could verify candidate experience become increasingly difficult to provide for past projects for many reasons, including but not limited to retirement, changing positions, etc. Additionally, and more prevalent: due to security reasons, many client authorities for defence-related programs do not have permission to discuss the project outside of the project team, especially if it is an international program.	Requiring a reference for all projects will significantly limit the project examples that can be used and hinders	

			the ability to provide the best projects to support each requirement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Client Name;</li><li>• Project start and end date (dd/mm/yy);</li><li>• Contact information of the reference (telephone and email address); and</li><li>• A description of the services provided.”</li></ul> <p>At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.3: DELETE the following at <b>PM-R4</b>:</p> <p>“The Bidder should provide one (1) corporate Project reference for each Large-scale project demonstrating how this experience was obtained. For each corporate Project reference, the following must be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Client Name;</li><li>• Project start and end date (dd/mm/yy);</li><li>• Contact information of the reference (telephone and email address); and</li><li>• A description of the services provided.”</li></ul> <p>DELETE the following at <b>DRL-R2</b>:</p> <p>“The Bidder should provide one (1) corporate Project reference for each Project demonstrating how this experience was obtained. For each corporate Project reference, the following must be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Client Name;</li><li>• Project start and end date (dd/mm/yy);</li><li>• Contact information of the reference (telephone and email address); and</li><li>• A description of the services provided.”</li></ul> <p>DELETE the following at <b>DRL-R3</b>:</p> <p>“The Bidder should provide one (1) corporate</p>
--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

BQ-27	RFP PLE-M1, PLE-M2, ULMC-M1, ULMC-R1	We request that the experience for military organizations and military equipment be changed to government organizations and industrial equipment.	The requirements for government organizations and industrial equipment are as, or more, rigorous than those identified for military organizations and military equipment. It is assumed that the experience associated with the conduct of these programs would be used to meet these requirements. Please confirm.	<p>Project reference for each Project demonstrating how this experience was obtained. For each corporate Project reference, the following must be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Client Name;</li> <li>• Project start and end date (dd/mm/yy);</li> <li>• Contact information of the reference (telephone and email address); and</li> <li>• A description of the services provided."</li> </ul> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd004_W6381-170008.D (Item C)</b></p> <p>At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.2: AMEND <b>PLE-M1</b> to include:</p> <p>"The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has experience, within the last ten (10) years, as a Project Leader/Executive in two (2) distinct Projects which each included the implementation of a substantial* STANAG 2290 or Military Standard 130 (MIL-STD-130) compliant Legacy Equipment Unique Identification (UID) labelling and marking programs for military organizations <b>or government organizations</b>."</p> <p>AMEND <b>PLE-M2</b> to include:</p> <p>"The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has a minimum 60 months of experience within the last fifteen (15) years directing and leading the implementation of STANAG 2290 or Military Standard 130 (MIL-STD-130) compliant Unique Identification (UID) marking programs for military organizations <b>or government organizations</b>."</p> <p>AMEND <b>ULMC-M1</b> to include:</p> <p>"The Bidder must demonstrate that the</p>
-------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

				<p>proposed resource has a minimum 24 months of experience within the last fifteen (15) years in the development* of STANAG 2290 or MIL-STD-130 compliant Unique Identification marking specifications, describing how to apply UID to various types of legacy military equipment <b>or industrial equipment</b>.”</p> <p>At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.3: AMEND <b>ULMC-R1</b> to include:</p> <p>“In addition to ULMC-M1, the Bidder should demonstrate that the proposed resource has more than 24 months of experience in the development* of STANAG 2290 or MIL-STD-130 compliant Unique Identification marking specifications, describing how to apply UID to various types of legacy military equipment <b>or industrial equipment</b>.”</p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd004_W6381-170008.D (Item D)</b></p> <p>Solicitation Amendment 003 Item C (BQ-13):</p> <p>Clarified to:</p> <p>At Attachment 4.2 – Pricing Schedule, Table 5.3:</p> <p>DELETE: Table 5.3 in its entirety.</p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd004_W6381-170008.D (Item E)</b></p> <p>1. Refer to BQ-28</p> <p>2. Refer to BQ-13</p>
BQ-28	Amd 003 item C and BQ-13	Please confirm Pricing Schedule, Table 5.3 is deleted.	Please clarify as the amendment states “At Attachment 4.2 – Pricing Schedule, Table 5.3: Delete Table 5.4 in its entirety.”	
BQ-29	Amendment #3	1. The amendment indicates the following: “At Attachment 4.2 – Pricing Schedule, Table 5.3: DELETE: Table 5.4 in	1. Believe typo for “5.3”  2. A reference to “public cloud” was not specifically	

		its entirety." Please confirm 5.3 should read 5.4.  2. Please confirm in Table 5.4 that "Total Price UID Registry (SaaS model, public cloud)" should read "Total Price UID Registry (SaaS model)".	requested to be removed.	
BQ-30	RFP PLE-M1, PLE-M2, ULMC-M1, ULMC-R1	The current requirements call out experience for military organizations and military equipment. Would the crown consider allowing experience from government organizations and industrial equipment?	We have identified possible team members with extensive marking experience in government industries other than military. Those standards require guidelines that are stricter than STANAG 2290 on very diverse items. This diversity and experience would be leveraged to employ enhanced strategies.	Response in development.
BQ-31	RFP C-R2, C-R3, C-M3, and AMD 0002 BQ-08	For consistency, would the crown consider applying the definition of substantial from 200,000 to 50,000 to all applicable requirements? This would include C-R2, C-R3, and C-M3.	This would establish consistency throughout the RFP and is based on the same rational of AMD 002 BQ-08. We are asking that the substantial data remediation definition change to a minimum of 50,000 master data records be reflected throughout the RFP.	Response in development.

BQ-32	Attachment 4.1 Technical Evaluation Criteria	We are asking the crown to consider accepting projects without references if each requirement has one project with supporting references?	<p>In the defense industry it is very uncommon for entities to publicly outline their processes or strategies to third parties, especially where clearances are required.</p> <p>In addition, to formally put their contact information on any document or receive permission to talk to 3<sup>rd</sup> party entities require an extensive legal review from those organizations as well.</p> <p>Finally, in some cases, the POC is no longer in that position due to job change, retirement, etc.</p> <p>The reference requirement and the constraints that come with that will severely limit the number of projects provided and thus limiting the ability to provide the best projects for each requirement listed.</p>	Response in development.
BQ-33	Part 7.1.1.15 (page 74) BQ-15, (page 13)	For the "leave-behind" capability does this include ULL package labels?	<p>This question is to make clear the technical requirements and cost implications of</p>	Response in development.



BQ-34	Part 6.2.4.4, 7.1.1.16, Appendix 1, (page 69, 74, 89) <b>BQ-16, (page 13)</b>	For the UII Package labels, does the Crown require the contractor to furnish all necessary printers, scanners and consumables to facilitate on-demand printing capability?	producing and kitting/handling the "leave-behind" capability. This question is to make clear the cost implications of producing the UII Package labels.	Response in development.
BQ-35	ANNEX A - Statement of Work Subparagraph 7.1.1.18	For Styles 8-12 "Pressure Sensitive Adhesive and/or holes for mechanical fasteners" Would there ever be a circumstance to order both holes and adhesive? Should pricing be inclusive of both attachment methods?	Clarity requested	Response in development.
BQ-36	ANNEX A - Statement of Work Subparagraph 11.5 "Health and Safety of Contractor Resources"	Are there specific cited Occupational Health & Safety Requirements?	Clarity requested	Response in development.
BQ-37	ANNEX A - Statement of Work Subparagraph 8.2	8.2 states, work in confined spaces. Is it different than what is described in the link at <a href="https://www.ccohs.ca/osh/answers/hsprograms/confinedspace_program.html">https://www.ccohs.ca/osh/answers/hsprograms/confinedspace_program.html</a>	Clarity requested	Response in development.
BQ-38	ANNEX A - Statement of Work	What additional training or certification is required for confined spaces or	Clarity requested	Response in development.

	Subparagraphe 8.2	heights to 15 meters above ground working conditions?		
BQ-39	ANNEX A - Statement of Work Subparagraphe 8.2	Are the UID Marking Leads, UID Label Application technicians, UID Direct Part Marking Technicians, UID Validation and Verification Technicians handling weapons? If so, is there a certification or training that is required?	Clarity requested	Response in development.
BQ-40	APPENDIX 1: CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS	What is the expectation of the "Marking Work Management Field Devices" (Contractor owned/DND custody)? a. If contractor supplied, should they be priced separately? b. If so, how many devices? c. What are the compatibility requirements, if any?	Clarity requested	Response in development.
BQ-41	ANNEX A - Statement of Work Subparagraphe 7.2.4 & 7.2.5	Is installation and training part of the requirement? If so, should it be included in the price?	Clarity requested	Response in development.
BQ-42				
BQ-43				
BQ-44				

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.