



**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> 008
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> W6381-170008	<b>Date</b> 2020-05-28
<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 2020-06-02</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 008 is raised to:**

- A. Confirm with bidders all the bidders' questions have been addressed.
  - B. Provide updated list of responses to Bidders' questions.
- 

- A. All the bidders' questions have been answered and no new questions have been raised since the release of Solicitation Amendment 007 with the exception of BQ-60 (below).
- B. 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>  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</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.	
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, 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.	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.
BQ-04	Part 6, 6.1 and 6.3 (page 29 – 31); Part 7, 7.5	Would the Crown please confirm that only the primary bidder and	The majority of work is to be performed on DND premises as specified at the TA stage.	A Canadian Subcontractor to a Canadian Prime Contractor does not necessarily require the same security requirements as the Prime.

	(page 36 – 38); and Annex C (page 129 – 135)	resources put forward need to meet the security requirements.	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.	Once the prime contract is awarded, the prime contractor must submit SRCs 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 SRC, 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.
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):</p> <p>DELETE: Minimum points required: 35</p> <p>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:</p> <p>DELETE: Minimum points required: 35</p> <p>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 demonstrate that the proposed resource successfully completed a University Master's degree."	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:</p> <p>DELETE: PM-R3 in its entirety</p> <p>DELETE: Maximum points available: 80</p>

BQ-08	4.2 & 4.3 Core-Team Technical Criteria	<p>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>REPLACE BY: Maximum points available: <b>70</b></p> <p>DELETE: Minimum points required: 40</p> <p>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</p> <p>REPLACE BY: Maximum points available: <b>70</b></p> <p>DELETE: Minimum points required: 40</p> <p>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</p> <p>REPLACE BY: Core Team Resources Point Rated: <b>245</b></p> <p>DELETE: Total Point Rated Available: 355</p> <p>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>
	4.2 & 4.3 Core-Team Technical Criteria	<p>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</p>	<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>	<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>

BQ-09	10.1 & 10.3	<p>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>		<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> <p>Changes to bilingual requirements.</p> <p>At Annex A – Statement of Work (SOW):</p> <p>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><b>Change addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd002_W6381-170008.D (Item M)</b></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 (<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.</p>	Hyperlink not functional	<p>Faulty imbedded hyperlink.</p> <p>Please use the following link: <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></p>	
BQ-11	<p>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 respectfully.</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 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?</p>	Refer to BQ-04	<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>	
BQ-12	Part 7.1.1.3 (page 72)	<p>Would the Crown please confirm that all supplied UID labels must meet ISO:15415:2011 verification requirements with a minimum grade of "B"?</p>	<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</p>	<p>At Annex A – Statement of Work:</p> <p>7.1.1.4 All machine readable 2D bar codes must use IEC/SO 15434 syntax; INSERT</p> <p>a. UID Direct Part Marks supplied must be verified to ISO TR29158 and achieve a minimum overall grade of "C" or</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>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>This question is to make clear the cost implications of contractor provided cloud hosting requirements.</p>	<p>"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> <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>	<p>UII Packaging labels printed on demand therefore kitting/handling not required.</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>
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.	<p>UII 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	This question is to make clear the technical requirements and cost implications of producing and kitting/handling the "leave-behind" capability.		



		part of the scope for delivery of tags with holes in them?		<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 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 material in the package and human readable the part number(s) serial number(s) of the material in the package.</p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd003_W6381-170008.D (Item H)</b></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>At Annex A – Statement of Work:</p> <p>Section 7.2.5.3:</p> <p>DELETE: "Have marking window of at least a marking window of at least 10 centimeters wide by 6 centimeters long."</p> <p>REPLACE BY: "Have marking window of at least a marking window of at least 9 centimeters wide by 5 centimeters long."</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-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.	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.	

		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?		Section 11.4:  INSERT:  11.4.3 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.
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/OC 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.	<b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd003_W6381-170008.D (Item E)</b>  Contractor to supply ventilation system as required.
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.	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 UII 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 UII Package labels.	The intent is to produce the UII 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	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,

		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 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?		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."
BQ-22	ULMC-R3	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).	To ensure that the most directly qualified resource with direct experience is competitive.	<b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd003_W6381-170008.D (Item F)</b>  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)  <b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd003_W6381-170008.D (Item G)</b>
BQ-23	Amd 002, BQ-04	Does the same hold true for a foreign Subcontractor from a NATO country?	Our team includes a foreign Subcontractor, required to supply labeling equipment and material to a Canadian Prime Contractor.	If a foreign subcontractor doesn't require access to restricted zones/assets/information then it does not require a Facility Security Clearance (FSC).

			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."  <b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd004_W6381-170008.D (Item A)</b>  At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.2:
BQ-25	RFP PM-M3	Would the Crown accept a Bachelor Diploma obtained from a technical institute?	It has been our determination that a Bachelor Diploma received from a Technical Institutes should be considered equivalent in this environment. Please confirm.	DELETE: <b>PM-M3</b> in its entirety.  INSERT the following at <b>PM-M3</b> :  "The Bidder must demonstrate that the proposed resource has successfully completed a <b>post-secondary degree or diploma</b> .  The Bidder must provide a copy of the <b>post-secondary degree or diploma</b> ."  <b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd004_W6381-170008.D (Item B)</b> Remove all references requirement for the resources and keep references requirement for the Bidder's experience only.  At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.2: DELETE the following at <b>PLE-M1</b> :
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	

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</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."</li></ul> <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> <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></ul>
--	--	--	--	--

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 could be used to meet these requirements. Please confirm.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 Project reference for each Project demonstrating how this reference 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:</p> <p>AMEND PLE-M1 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 or government organizations."</p> <p>AMEND PLE-M2 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 or government organizations."</p> <p>AMEND ULMC-M1 to include:</p> <p>"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</p>
-------	--------------------------------------	--	---	---

				<p>specifications, describing how to apply UID to various types of legacy military equipment or industrial equipment.”</p> <p>At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.3:</p> <p>AMEND ULMC-R1 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 or industrial equipment.”</p> <p>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd004_W6381-170008.D (Item D)</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.”	<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>
BQ-29	Amendment #3	<p>1. The amendment indicates the following: “At Attachment 4.2 – Pricing Schedule, Table 5.3: DELETE: Table 5.4 in its entirety.” Please confirm 5.3 should read 5.4.</p> <p>2. Please confirm in Table 5.4 that “Total Price UID Registry (SaaS model, public cloud)” should read “Total Price UID Registry (SaaS model)”.</p>	<p>1. Believe typo for “5.3”</p> <p>2. A reference to “public cloud” was not specifically requested to be removed.</p>	<p>1. Refer to BQ-28</p> <p>2. Refer to BQ-13</p>
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	Refer to BQ-27.

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.	very diverse items. This diversity and experience would be leveraged to employ enhanced strategies. 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.	C-R2 is amended as detailed in BQ-48.
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?	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.  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.  Finally, in some cases, the POC is no longer in that position due to job change, retirement, etc.  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.	Refer to BQ-26.
BQ-33	Part 7.1.1.15 (page 74) <b>BQ-15, (page 13)</b>	For the "leave-behind" capability does this include ULI package labels?	This question is to make clear the technical requirements and cost implications of producing and kitting/handling the "leave-behind" capability.	No, it does not include ULI package labels.
BQ-34	Part 6.2.4.4, 7.1.1.16, Appendix 1,	For the ULI Package labels, does the Crown require the contractor to furnish all necessary printers,	This question is to make clear the cost implications of	Yes, the Crown requires the Contractor to furnish all necessary printers, scanners, and consumables to facilitate the on-demand printing capability.



	(page 69, 74, 89) <b>BQ-16, (page 13)</b>	scanners and consumables to facilitate on-demand printing capability?	producing the ULI Package labels.	
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	At Annex A Statement of Work, in the Table at Subparagraph 7.1.1.18, amend rows 8 to 12 to include the following:  "Pressure Sensitive Adhesive <del>and</del> or holes for mechanical fasteners."  <b>Change addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd005_W6381-170008.D (Item A)</b>  Subparagraph 11.5.1 establishes the minimum Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) required to enter the storage locations. Any additional equipment required to perform the tasks may require additional PPE, such as eyewear, respirators etc. and must be provided by the contractor. It is the Contractor's responsibility to ensure its workforce is appropriately equipped, and that all necessary precautions are taken when performing such work. Contractor's resources will not enter the hazard area if not provided with the appropriate PPE by the contractor.
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	The description of the confined space in the link provided is correct.  At Annex A Statement of Work, DELETE Subparagraph 8.2, and INSERT the following:  8.2 The UID Marking Leads, UID Label Application Technicians, UID Direct Part Marking Technicians, and UID Validation and Verification Technicians will be required to stand or sit for extended periods of time, work in confined spaces, work at heights up to 15 meters above the ground, and climb ladders as detailed at the following link: <a href="https://www.ccohs.ca/oshanswers/hsprograms/confinedspace_program.html">https://www.ccohs.ca/oshanswers/hsprograms/confinedspace_program.html</a>
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/oshanswers/hsprograms/confinedspace_program.html">https://www.ccohs.ca/oshanswers/hsprograms/confinedspace_program.html</a>	Clarity requested	<b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd005_W6381-170008.D (Item B)</b>  Training compliant with local federal and provincial regulation on confined space entry will be required. There will also be a need to coordinate with each site to conform to the site specific safety systems, particularly since some will be hybridized across the safety/ security boundary, particularly with respect to access control.  Training compliant with local federal and provincial regulation on working from heights, or use of lift devices will be required.
BQ-38	ANNEX A - Statement of Work Subparagraph 8.2	What additional training or certification is required for confined spaces or heights to 15 meters above ground working conditions?	Clarity requested	

BQ-39	ANNEX A - Statement of Work Subparagraph 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	<p>It should be expected that on site teams could be asked to provide evidence of training and security credentials at any time.</p> <p>Yes, they will be working on weapons and weapons components. The Contractor or sub-Contractor they work for must be controlled goods certified, and the individuals must meet the sub requirements there-in.</p> <p>For work done at government facilities the Contractor does not need to possess business licenses for transport, storage or possession of firearms. The resources are broadly considered as "agents of a government agency" under the Firearms Act, and the Canadian Forces is exempt from the firearms act specifically. This means that as long as they comply with all local directives on the equipment, and nothing is taken off site, it is fine to handle firearms for the purpose of marking.</p> <p>For work done on government worksites when firearms will be accessed, resources must have received reasonable safe handling training (this will not be provided by DND) applicable to the tasks they will perform (noting that they won't be firing, transporting or storing weapons or accessing munitions).</p> <p>It should be expected that on site teams could be asked to provide evidence of training and security credentials at any time.</p>
BQ-40	APPENDIX 1: CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS	<p>What is the expectation of the "Marking Work Management Field Devices" (Contractor owned/DND custody)?</p> <p>a. If contractor supplied, should they be priced separately?</p> <p>b. If so, how many devices?</p> <p>c. What are the compatibility requirements, if any?</p>	Clarity requested	<p>At Annex A Statement of Work:</p> <p>DELETE: "APPENDIX 1: CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS" in its entirety</p> <p>INSERT: "APPENDIX 1: CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS (revised) circa 2025"</p> <p>Revised diagram can be found in Amd005 (Item C).</p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd005_W6381-170008.D (Item C)</b></p>
BQ-41	ANNEX A - Statement of Work Subparagraph 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	<p>Yes, training and installation should be included in the price.</p>
BQ-42	N/A	We respectfully request a three-week extension to the submission date to June 9.	The potential responses to questions posed are pertinent to our bid submission. Additionally, delays due to restrictions from COVID-19 affect Bidder's ability to qualify resources and contact references.	<p>The bid solicitation closing date is hereby extended to <b>Tuesday, 26 May 2020, 2:00pm EDT</b>.</p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd005_W6381-170008.D (Item D)</b></p>

BQ-43	4.3.3 (a)	With respect to the definition of a Team Member as it pertains to demonstrating corporate experience can you further define the term, "any major tier one subcontractor"?	<p>We have assembled a Team of three companies of which there are two American entities with a great deal of experience to be brought to the table and one Canadian company, which will be acting as the Prime for this proposal and provides a Canadian entity with experience working for the Canadian Government and will also provide a reserve, where the American company's experience will be transferred to, ensuring future support. The Canadian entity will have Teaming Agreements in place for the duration of this Program. We want to ensure that our American company's experience is allowed.</p>	<p>At Section <b>4.3.3.a</b> Evaluation of Experience of Bidder's Teaming Experience:</p> <p>DELETE: major tier one subcontractor</p> <p>REPLACE BY:</p> <p>first tier subcontractor*;</p> <p>* First tier subcontractor: a subcontractor with whom a bidder, offeror or contractor plans to have or has a direct contractual relationship to perform a portion of the work pursuant to a contract between the contractor and Canada (meaning all the activities, services, goods, equipment, matters and things required to be done, delivered or performed by the contractor under the contract), unless the subcontractor merely supplies commercial-off-the-shelf goods to the contractor. (2016-04-04)</p>
BQ-44	4.3.3 (b)	With respect to the definition of a Team Member as it pertains to demonstrating personnel experience can you further define the term, "any major tier one subcontractor"?	<p>We have assembled a Team of three companies of which there are two American entities with a great deal of experience to be brought to the table and one Canadian company, which will be acting as the Prime for this proposal and provides a Canadian entity with experience working for the Canadian Government and will also provide a reserve, where the American company's experience will be transferred to, ensuring future support. The Canadian entity will have Teaming Agreements in place for the duration of this Program. We want to ensure that our American company's personnel experience is allowed.</p>	<p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd005_W6381-170008.D (Item E)</b></p> <p>At Section <b>4.3.3.b</b> Evaluation of Experience of Bidder's Teaming Experience:</p> <p>DELETE: major tier one subcontractor</p> <p>REPLACE BY:</p> <p>first tier subcontractor*.</p> <p>* First tier subcontractor: a subcontractor with whom a bidder, offeror or contractor plans to have or has a direct contractual relationship to perform a portion of the work pursuant to a contract between the contractor and Canada (meaning all the activities, services, goods, equipment, matters and things required to be done, delivered or performed by the contractor under the contract), unless the subcontractor merely supplies</p>

BQ-45	BQ-27 (Amendment #4) RFP PLEM1, PLE-M2, ULMC- M1, ULMC-R1	<p>The following question BQ-27 was posed and agreed to:</p> <p>"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 could (sic) be used to meet these requirements. Please confirm."</p> <p>This request was agreed to with the addition of "government organizations and industrial equipment".</p> <p>We would request the reconsideration of the addition of government organizations and industrial equipment for two reasons:</p> <p>First – we are not aware of any standards that equal or exceed STANAG 2290 or Military Standard 130 (MIL-STD-130) compliant Unique Identification (UID) program standards (certainly none that are more rigorous). Given this understanding, there would appear to be no way to evaluate/confirm that a</p>	<p>As stated in the question itself, we believe that allowing Resources that do not understand the unique and demanding defence/military standards and implications of a failure is fraught with risk – <i>not only for the Crown but for serving CF members.</i></p>	<p>commercial-off-the-shelf goods to the contractor. (2016-04-04)</p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd005_W6381-170008.D (Item E)</b></p> <p>The response to BQ-27 says "...for military organizations <b>OR government organizations</b>" and "...types of legacy military <b>equipment OR industrial equipment.</b>"</p> <p>Note the word "or" in both instances and not "and" as stated in the question.</p> <p>The focus of PLE-M1, PLE-M2, ULMC-M1, and ULMC-R1 is the experience with STANAG 2290 or Military Standard 130 (MIL-STD-130). The resources must have that experience in order to be compliant whether it's acquired through "military or government organizations", or "military or industrial equipment".</p> <p>As such, BQ-27 remains. The rated criteria will also not be amended.</p>
-------	---	--	---	---



		<p>combat vehicle that will be subject to the most extreme conditions. The implication of miscounting keyboards versus handguns is profound.</p> <p>Allowing Resources that do not understand the unique and demanding defence/military standards and implications of a failure (per the handgun mention above) is fraught with risk and it also puts bidders' resources that have extensive military experience at a disadvantage.</p> <p>We respectfully request that the change to allow experience with government organizations at the same level as military experience be removed. Alternatively, can you modify the related requirements to include point rated evaluations to both allow more experienced bidders to compete fairly as well as ensure that the Crown ends up with a far more risk-free solution?</p>			
BQ-46	BQ-32 (Amendment #4) Attachment 4.1 Technical Evaluation Criteria	<p>BQ-32 was identified as a response in development. The question follows:</p> <p>"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. In the defense industry it is very uncommon for entities to publicly outline their processes or strategies to third parties (sic), especially where clearances are required. In addition, to formally put their contact information on any document or receive permission to talk to 3rd party entities require an extensive legal review</p>	<p>We feel that the fact that we were able to secure all corporate signed references (and virtually all resources' requirements) that the least Corporate projects remain as is, particularly as there is no doubt that they are in the words of the author of question BQ-32, "the best projects for each requirement listed."</p>	<p>In this instance, if the Bidder has obtained references for their proposed resources' experience, they may submit them with the bid.</p> <p>The mandatory component of the Bidder providing project references for the proposed resources' experience has been removed.</p> <p>The mandatory component of the Bidder providing corporate references for their experience remains.</p> <p>Refer to BQ-26 and BQ-32.</p>	

		<p>from those organizations as well. Finally, in some cases, the POC is no longer in that position due to job change, retirement, etc. 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> <p>While we appreciate the challenges in obtaining such references, we have in fact been able to obtain such (signed) references for all our corporate projects (and many of our resources' projects) without any issues. Furthermore, these are for military solutions which speaks to our ability related to the phrasing in the question under consideration regarding "the best projects". Given the fact that the difficulties described in the question were relatively easily overcome and achieved, and that they reflect the "best projects" we would respectfully request that the request is denied. Alternatively, that all related requirements have substantial points associated with the number of signed references.</p>		
BQ-47	BQ- 30 (Amendment #4)	<p>The following question was posed and replied as in development:</p> <p>"BQ-30 RFP PLEM1, 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</p>	<p>As stated in the question itself, we believe that allowing Resources that do not understand the unique and demanding defence/military standards and implications of a failure is fraught with risk – <i>not only for the Crown but for serving CF members.</i></p>	Refer to BQ-45.

		<p>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."</p> <p>We would request the consideration of the addition of government organizations and industrial equipment for two reasons:</p> <p>First – we are not aware of any standards that equal or exceed STANAG 2290 or Military Standard 130 (MIL-STD-130) compliant Unique Identification (UID) program standards (certainly none that are more rigorous). Given this understanding, there would appear to be no way to evaluate/confirm that a government (or industry) project equaled that of the very detailed, complex, demanding and documented STANAG 2290 or Military Standard 130 (MIL-STD-130).</p> <p>Second: the nature (differences) of military equipment versus government equipment is extreme. This is the reason DND has a robust set of Data Item Descriptions (DID) that apply to every defence contractor. As the end client for this RFP is aware, the DID specifically defines the data content, format, and intended use of the data with a primary objective of achieving</p>	



		<p>standardization objectives by DND. The content and format requirements for DIDs are further defined within MIL-STDs. The use of DIDs underline the unique and demanding nature of military and defence requirements. In keeping with this rigour, as an example, MIL-STD-130 describes the Identification Marking of Military Property, and is a specification used for giving directions on how to mark Defence items (including unique identifier data matrix machine-readable information (MRI) requirements as well as the materials allowed, minimum text size and fonts, format, syntax and rules for identifying marks on a part, where to locate this marking plus exceptions and unique situations.</p> <p>Applying an identification label to a keyboard is in no way similar to the unique requirements relating to for example, adding a permanent UID to a handgun or combat vehicle that will be subject to the most extreme conditions. The implication of miscounting keyboards versus handguns is profound.</p> <p>Allowing Resources that do not understand the unique and demanding defence/military standards and implications of a failure (per the handgun mention above) is fraught with risk and it also puts bidders' resources that have extensive military experience at a disadvantage.</p> <p>We respectfully request that the request to allow experience with government organizations at the same level as military experience</p>	

BQ-48	BQ- 31 (Amendment #4)  RFP C-R2, C-R3, C-M3, and AMD 0002 BQ-08 And BQ-24	<p>be denied. Alternatively, can you modify the related requirements to include point rated evaluations to both allow more experienced bidders to compete fairly as well as ensure that the Crown ends up with a far more risk-free solution?</p> <p>Question BQ-31 asks: "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."</p> <p>Our question applies to BQ-31 and it also applies to the almost identical question for BQ-24.</p> <p>We agree with the change made in response to BQ-08, as well as the rationale. It occurs to us that it would be fairer to all bidders to introduce a point rating to be applied for projects larger than 50K records up to 200k records for all record count requirements across the board. Can you make this change?</p>	To ensure that experience for larger projects is taken into account.	<p>At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 3.2;  AMEND C-R2 to include:</p> <p>DELETE: "Substantial in this context is defined as the UID labelling and marking, item reconciliation, data capture, and related information systems updates of at least 100,000 discrete items."</p> <p>REPLACE BY: "Substantial in this context is defined as the UID labelling and marking, item reconciliation, data capture, and related information systems updates of at least <b>50,000</b> discrete items."</p> <p>CM-3 and C-R3 have already been amended (see BQ-24).</p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd005_W6381-170008.D (Item F)</b></p>
BQ-49	Solicitation Closing Date	<p>Is it possible to introduce an additional extension for this RFP?</p>	<p>We are indeed finding it difficult/slower to get responses together from our supply-chains during this COVID-19 Pandemic. Other than the advisory on the Canada Buy and Sell website we have not received an Amendment for the first extension which brought it to a close date of 202-05-19. That being said we would respectfully request a further extension to 2020-06-26 to allow us to be able to pull together a complete RFP.</p>	<p>Canada is extending the bid closing date to <b>June 02, 2020</b>. No further extension will be approved. Bidders are also notified that no further questions will be entertained beyond May 23, 2020. Canada requests that any outstanding questions be submitted by 5PM EDT on May 23, 2020 to allow time to respond and post final responses.</p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd007_W6381-170008.D (Item A)</b></p>

BQ-50	PM-R4	Can you remove this statement from the requirement as it contradicts the requirement to describe 4 projects?  "If the Bidder submits more than two (2) referenced projects, only the first two (2) in order of presentation will be evaluated."	Contradictory statement	At Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, Table 4.3:  AMEND PM-R4 as follows:  DELETE: "If the Bidder submits more than two (2) referenced projects, only the first two (2) in order of presentation will be evaluated."  REPLACE BY: "If the Bidder submits more than <b>four (4)</b> referenced projects, only the first <b>four (4)</b> in order of presentation will be evaluated."  <b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd006_W6381-170008.D (Item A)</b>
BQ-51	7.5.2	This is a question unrelated to the RFP evaluated requirements but about our security clearance requirements and to facilitate the post contract award process in the event that we are the successful bidder. We understand from our review of RFP 7.5.2 that we are already covered from the standpoint of all required security requirements as we hold the equivalent security clearances in the US.	In order to ensure there are no delays can you advise what documentation we should provide to demonstrate our security equivalency?"	Information is available at the following link from RFP Section 7.5.2 <a href="https://www.tpsgc-international-contract-security-requirements">International contract security requirements (https://www.tpsgc-international-contract-security-requirements)</a> .
BQ-52	6.3.1	We would like to apply for our Canadian company through the Canada Controlled Goods Act and our US Facility Security Officer asked if you would be our sponsor as the contracting officer so we can begin the application process.	This would give us ample time to complete the application and have Security Clearance in the event we are the successful bidder.	Under section 6.3.1 of the RFP, "Details on how to register under the Controlled Goods Program (CGP) are available at: <a href="https://www.tpsgc-ptsgc.gc.ca/pmc-cgp/enregistrement-register-eng.htm">https://www.tpsgc-ptsgc.gc.ca/pmc-cgp/enregistrement-register-eng.htm</a> "
BQ-53	Amendment #5 Q&A BQ-43 & 44 RFP 5.2.3.1	We have noted in Q&A BQ-43 & 44 that a bidder need only have "plans" to use a named subcontractor per the following:  "First tier subcontractor: a subcontractor with whom a bidder, offeror or supplier or contractor plans to have or has a direct contractual relationship to perform a portion of the work pursuant to a contract between the contractor and Canada	To clarify the circumstances related to the possibility of replacing proposed subcontractors.	If a bidder is proposing a first tier subcontractor to be evaluated against any technical evaluation criteria detailed in Attachment 4.1: Technical Evaluation Criteria, then the named first tier subcontractor is subject to the same replacement conditions as detailed in RFP Section 5.2.3.1 Status and Availability of Resources and RFP Section 7.20.c Replacement of Specific Individuals.

		(meaning all the activities, services, goods, equipment, matters and things required to be done, delivered or performed by the contractor under the contract), unless the subcontractor merely supplies commercial-off-the-shelf goods to the contractor."		
BQ-54	RFP 5.2.3.1	Should a proposed Resource not be available, the RFP requires that under 5.2.3.1 Status and Availability of Resources, any replacement resource must have similar qualifications and experience.  Can you confirm that similar requirements will apply to any proposed first tier subcontractor, and that any replacement subcontractors will have to have had similar project experience and credentials as described in the RFP?  We would like to know how long member(s) of the proposed Core Team must remain in their positions?	We are asking this question to understand prospective suppliers' latitude regarding bidding given resource(s) and shortly thereafter replacing them.	As per Annex A - Statement of Work (SOW), Section 5.2.1, the DRM-SM Core Team is required throughout the duration of the Contract (subject to renewal of option periods). Replacement of any individual for reasons detailed in RFP Section 5.2.3.1 shall be in accordance with RFP Section 7.20.c Replacement of Specific Individuals.
BQ-55	RFP 5.2.3.1	With respect to the replacement of resource(s), we have seen in other RFPs that in order to replace resources; that the replacement resource must be of equal or superior qualifications and experience to the originally bid resource. Will the word "similar" as used in 5.2.3.1 be interpreted in this fashion?  We see in 5.2.3.1 Status and Availability of Resources the following:	To understand the definition of "similar".	As per RFP Section 7.20.c the replacement must have qualifications and experience that meet or exceed those obtained for the original resource.
BQ-56	RFP 5.2.3.1		To understand the impact of changing proposed resources.	As per Annex A - Statement of Work (SOW), Section 5.2.1, the DRM-SM Core Team is required throughout the duration of the Contract (subject to renewal of option periods). Replacement of any individual for reasons

		<p>"The Bidder must advise the Contracting Authority of the reason for the substitution and provide the name, qualifications and experience of the proposed replacement. For the purposes of this clause, only the following reasons will be considered as beyond the control of the Bidder: death, sickness, maternity and parental leave, retirement, resignation, dismissal for cause or termination of an agreement for default."</p> <p>Can you advise if and how this restriction will be applied throughout the term of the contract?</p>		<p>detailed in RFP Section 5.2.3.1 shall be in accordance with RFP Section 7.20.c Replacement of Specific Individuals.</p>
BQ-57	<p>Annex A – SOW section 7.3.4.1.b and pricing table Part 9 on page 127.</p>	<p>The SOW for 7.3.4.1.b calls out a "Private cloud" versus 7.3.4.1.a and the License model. Are the physical/Hardware/Server infrastructure and security requirements different for this model as opposed to the stand-alone license model? Can you please define "Private Cloud" in detail?</p> <p>Secondly, if the cloud model is a different architecture does the prime contractor need to provide the resources (Hardware and/or support) to stand the cloud up onsite at the DND premises or will this infrastructure and support already be provided by DND?</p>	<p>The phrase cloud model implies a different architecture than a stand-alone license model on a private server. We are looking for clarity on whether the difference is strictly a pricing option of a one-time license cost versus an annual subscription cost based on the quantities of UID items registered. Or is there an actual infrastructure difference as implied with a cloud application versus a stand-alone application.</p>	<p>The intent of the difference between the "license model" and the "private cloud" model is that one represents a program, installed on computers that may or may not communicate to a central database. The "Cloud" model represents a web based distributed system where all data and computation is generally performed on the server, and the web client just passes the info back and forth with the only locally installed program being the web browser.</p> <p>The intent of adding "private" was to originally differentiate it from a "public" cloud. Where the difference is that in the "private" cloud the system is only accessible on the defence network. A "public" cloud would be accessible from any general internet connection. The "public cloud" option has been removed for security reasons.</p> <p>The roll out and approval details of the license vs private cloud models are handled slightly differently in DND, but are conceptually very similar. Both require detailed explanations of the workings of the programs, the data passed etc., along with some testing to ensure compatibility with the defence network.</p> <p>Assuming that the system is "software only" and can run on most relatively modern (last 10 years) operating systems and servers, then DND should be able to provide the appropriate hardware. If anything "special" is required, then it should be included in the price.</p>

BQ-58	Follow up to question BQ34. Part 6.2.4.4, 7.1.1.16, Appendix 1 (page 69, 74, 89)	<p>The crown has responded the contractor will be required to furnish all necessary printers, scanners, and consumables for the UII package labels to facilitate on-demand printing capability.</p> <p>The pricing tables on page 126 for hardware buy and lease options do not include a line item for label printers or consumables. Should the crown include those line items as hardware options for purchase?</p>	<p>For the second question, we are trying to gauge any additional resources needed beyond a typical server installation of the application provided.</p> <p>The UII package labels are essentially thermal printed labels and marked with a thermal printer. Nowhere in the SOW does it ask the bidder to provide pricing for the thermal printers or the consumable labels and ribbon required to create the on-demand labels.</p>	<p>DND will not retain the package labels and consumables (except consumables provided as part of the "take away" kits, or when the labels are applied to packaging).</p> <p>This equipment (i.e. printers, scanners, and consumables) is for use by the contractor's resources in completing their tasks under the contract. The priced tools listed in the SOW, Basis of Payment, etc. are for DND use by DND personnel.</p>
BQ-59	N/A	<p>We are aware of the subsequent request for extension by other bidders and subsequent extensions. We are asking for pending responses from our last questions. Those questions will drive required responses from our supply base. The current COVID 19 situation is slowing down the response time in ensuring we have the most accurate data.</p> <p>There are also significant challenges in recruiting and receiving responses in our search for talent. With these issues in mind we are asking for an extension till June 9th as requested by other potential bidders.</p>	<p>We have had a series of questions for clarity on the leave behind capability and the requirements of printers and consumables. There is one more key question open to the DND to determine the additional hardware elements which may be required in the pricing tables. The logistical challenges with COVID 19 require additional time for pricing, lead time, and feedback. Assuming we get a timely response from your team on the pending question, this would allow us the proper time to get pricing on those additional elements.</p> <p>Secondly, as noted by others the recruiting process is hampered a great deal to track the best talent. This is the</p>	<p>Canada is extending the bid closing date to <b>June 02, 2020</b>. No further extension will be approved. Bidders are also notified that no further questions will be entertained beyond May 23, 2020. Canada requests that any outstanding questions be submitted by 5PM EDT on May 23, 2020 to allow time to respond and post final responses.</p> <p><b>Changes addressed in Solicitation Amendment: Amd007_W6381-170008.D (Item A)</b></p>

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation  
W6381-170008/D

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.  
008

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur  
624xg

BQ-60	N/A	Are there any more questions to be answered by the DND before the bid ends on Tuesday?	N/A	<p>first major implementation for IUID in Canada and all personnel requirements require IUID experience. We are expanding the search globally as Canadian IUID experience is limited. The additional time would allow us to find the most effective talent that can meet those requirements and can support the contract long term in Canada.</p> <p>All the bidders' questions have been answered and no new questions were raised since the release of Solicitation Amendment 007.</p>

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.