



**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**

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**

Raison sociale et adresse du  
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**

Ship Construction, Refit and Related  
Services/Construction navale, Radoubs et services  
connexes

11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier

6C2, Place du Portage

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Nav Arch and Engineering Services	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> F7044-190233/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 001
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> F7044-190233	<b>Date</b> 2020-07-02
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$SMC-037-27789	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 037mc.F7044-190233	<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 2020-08-14</b>	<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Gandolfini, Gianmarco	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 037mc
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 271-6136 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**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> Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
<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>

Amendment 001 is raised to: extend the RFI closing date to August 14, 2020, make administrative changes, amend Annex B – Procurement Discussion and add Annex D - Industry Questions and CANADA Responses.

1. At the RFI document header and at the Registration section on page 4  
**DELETE:** “Engineering Support Services RFI F7013-190233”  
**REPLACE WITH:** “Engineering Support Services RFI **F7044-190233**”
2. At Annex B – Procurement Discussion  
**DELETE** in its entirety  
**REPLACE WITH** the attached Annex B – Procurement Discussion
3. **ADD** Annex D Industry Questions and CANADA Responses to RFI

#### **Annex D**

#### **Industry Questions and CANADA Responses – As of July 2, 2020**

#### **F7044-190233**

#### Questions and Answers:

Q1. Is it open for non-Canadian companies?

A1. The subsequent procurement will be subject to the Canadian Free Trade Agreement (CFTA). Since there are more than 2 suppliers that could offer Canadian services for this requirement, we are considering applying the Canadian Content Policy (solely limited to Canadian suppliers of services). For more information on the Canadian Content Policy, please refer to the PSPC Supply Manual (<https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/supply-manual>) Section 3.130 Canadian Content Policy.

Q2. Do you require local presence in Canada?

A2. Yes, according to the Canadian Content Policy. “A service provided by an individual based in Canada is considered a Canadian service. Where a requirement consists of only one service, which is being provided by more than one individual, the service will be considered Canadian if a minimum of 80 percent of the total bid price for the service is provided by individuals based in Canada.”

Q3. Are the specifications available?

A3. No, we are in the beginning phases of planning the procurement and defining the requirement. The specifications will be developed for the Request for proposal stage.

Q4. What's the process for qualification?

A4. Qualification requirements will be discussed during the consultation period with Industry.

Q5. Could you please clarify that organizations should be able to provide services for 1 or 2 or all 3 services (Naval Architecture, Electrical Engineering and Mechanical Engineering) as described in the RFI?

A5. Engineering Support Services is intended to be a 'one stop' contracting mechanism where the Canadian Coast Guard (CCG) can receive naval architecture, marine/mechanical, and electrical engineering services from a single supplier under one contract. As a result, suppliers will need to provide services for all three services/disciplines.

Q6. What impacts will this requirement have on the Technical Investigation and Engineering Support (TIES) Supply Arrangement?

A6. Engineering Support Services (ESS) is intended to be a 'one stop' contracting mechanism where Canadian Coast Guard can receive naval architecture, marine/mechanical, and electrical engineering services from a single supplier under one contract. The work contracted under ESS is anticipated to be more complex in nature, affecting multiple systems across an entire vessel, and in some cases, for an entire class of vessels. The work performed under each contract will require coordination of activities across all three disciplines, is likely to be more iterative in nature, will require more dialogue between the supplier and CCG, and will likely be longer in duration, thus having a higher dollar value associated with them as opposed to most low and medium complexity TIES contracts.

TIES will continue to be used to support feasibility studies, technical investigations, repair activities, minor modifications, and configuration changes for existing CCG vessels, which tend to be less complex and less iterative in nature, and typically do not require support from all three engineering disciplines.

## Annex B

### Procurement Discussion

*Note: This is notional and is for discussion purposes.*

**The preferred method of supply for this requirement is a Supply Arrangement (SA) which includes predetermined conditions that will apply to bid solicitations and resulting contracts. A key point of discussion will be the overall evaluation and selection methodology options/considerations captured below.**

#### 1. Overall objectives to the ESS procurement

- Create a procurement process that facilitates awarding contracts quickly as specific project needs arise.
- Create a Supply Arrangement that simplifies the bidding process for suppliers and reduces the complexity of bid evaluation.
- Create a Supply Arrangement that will encourage distribution of work amongst a number of qualified suppliers.

#### 2. Evaluation Process and Method of Selection for the request for standing arrangement (RFSA)

We anticipate using the following method of selection to qualify for the SA: minimum Combined Rating of Technical Merit [70% or 60%] and Price [30% or 40%].

#### 3. Evaluation process for pricing for RFSA

Cost proposals at the time of the RFSA will be based on hourly rate including overhead and profit for the following resource categories. For example:

<b>Resource category</b>
Sr Naval Architect
Intermediate Naval Architect
Jr Naval Architect
Sr Electrical Engineer
Intermediate Electrical Engineer
Jr Electrical Engineer
Sr Mechanical Engineer
Intermediate Mechanical Engineer
Jr Mechanical Engineer

Note: These are just examples of resource categories. The approach will be similar to the TIES supply arrangement, however, the breakdown of personnel will be modified to have both standardized personnel levels (ex. Senior engineers, etc.) and the flexibility for companies to reflect their own resource definitions specific to their organization.

#### 4. Technical Evaluation for the SA

For the technical evaluation, we propose using a combination of mandatory and point rated criteria to evaluate corporate and personnel experience. To be considered responsive, a bid must meet all specified mandatory requirements and obtain the required minimum score on the point rated criteria. Since the work required from the contractors will require inputs from the following disciplines: naval architecture, mechanical and electrical, each discipline will be evaluated.

Previous experience on VLEs, major refits, MLMs and conversions will likely be key criteria to the technical evaluation.

#### 5. Proposed Procurement Strategies

##### Request for Supply Arrangement (RFSA) - Phase 1 Pre-Qualify Bidders

##### 5.1 Anticipated structure options pre-qualifying bidders for work on:

*A. Supply Arrangement with multiple streams*

This would see a single supply arrangement divided into multiple streams with bidders bidding on certain stream associated with vessel characteristics (large vs small, icebreaking hull vs non, etc).

*B. Supply Arrangement with no streams*

This would be a supply arrangement and all successful bidders would be included. This would result in a single pool of qualified bidders that have capabilities in all disciplines (naval architecture, mechanical and electrical engineering).

*C. Ranked Supply Arrangement*

This would rank successful bidders at the time of the RFSA qualification. That ranking would then inform how future contracts under the SA are distributed.

##### 5.2 Possible Evaluation Process and Method of Selection for the RFSA

We anticipate using the following method of selection to qualify Bidders for the SA: minimum combined rating of Technical Merit [70% or 60%] and Price [30% or 40%].

For example, there may be 3-6 sub-elements per discipline. Bidders would have to achieve a minimum score for each discipline and a minimum overall score to be considered responsive.

An example of point rated technical evaluation with a ratio of 60:

Evaluation criteria	Bidder A	Bidder B
Nav Arch (NA)		
- Sub-element NA1	5/10	9/10
- Sub-element NA2	6/10	10/10
- Sub-element NA3	8/10	7/10
- Sub-element NA4	9/10	8/10

- Sub-element NA5	4/10	9/10
Total (Max points 50, Min 30 points)	32/50	43/50
Mechanical (M)		
- Sub-element M1	9/10	10/10
- Sub-element M2	8/10	10/10
- Sub-element M3	7/10	7/10
- Sub-element M4	5/10	8/10
Total (Max points 40, Min 24 points)	29/40	35/40
Electrical (E)		
- Sub-element E1	10/10	10/10
- Sub-element E2	7/10	9/10
- Sub-element E3	6/10	5/10
- Sub-element E4	9/10	7/10
Total (Max points 40, Min 24 points)	32/40	31/40
GRAND TOTAL (max 130 pts, min 78 pts)	93/130	109/130
Scoring for Technical Merit (60%)	$93/130=0.72*60=$ <b>43.2 pts</b>	$109/130=0.84*60=$ <b>50.4 pts</b>

**Question to respondents:** What criteria is necessary for an Engineering Services firm to possess for each discipline, to be successful in developing a technical data package?

Determining the Price score with a ratio of 40:

Resource category	Price per hour (\$/hour)	
	Bidder A	Bidder B
Sr Naval Architect	\$160/hr	\$140/hr
Intermediate Naval Architect	\$120/hr	\$100/hr
Jr Naval Architect	\$90/hr	\$80/hr
Sr Electrical Engineer	\$170/hr	\$140/hr
Intermediate electrical Engineer	\$125/hr	\$100/hr
Jr Electrical Engineer	\$95/hr	\$80/hr
Sr Mechanical Engineer	\$160/hr	\$140/hr
Intermediate Mechanical Engineer	\$120/hr	\$100/hr
Jr Mechanical Engineer	\$90/hr	\$80/hr
Total (for simplicity reasons, all resource categories are weighted equally in this example)	\$1130	\$960
Scoring for Price (40%)	$\$960/\$1130=0.85*40=$ <b>34pts</b>	$\$960/\$960=1*40=$ <b>40pts</b>

Evaluation and Selection using the 60/40 scenario:

	Bidder A	Bidder B
Technical Score	43.2/60	50.4/60
Price Score	34/40	40/40
Total Score	<b>77.2/100</b>	<b>90.4/100</b>

An alternative method would be to evaluate the pricing from the technically responsive bids and declaring bids non-responsive if x% higher than the mean or the median.

For the ranked SA, ranking of the qualified suppliers would be done by highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit [70% or 60%] and Price [30% or 40%].

**Question to respondents:** How can the ranked order of qualified suppliers be applied in a Supply Arrangement?

## **6. SA – Phase 2 contracts**

### *A. Supply Arrangement with multiple streams*

Only bidders in a particular stream would be solicited for bids when a Request for Proposal (RFP) arises. As the Supply Arrangement would be separated in multiple streams, we anticipate that this option will have an enhanced upfront (RFSA qualification) technical evaluation due to the streams narrowing the type of work required. As a result, we anticipate that this option would allow for minimal technical evaluation at the time of bid solicitation which should expedite the contract award process.

### *B. Supply Arrangement with no streams*

All bidders would be solicited for an RFP. As the Supply Arrangement would not be separated in multiple streams, we anticipate that the upfront (RFSA qualification) technical evaluation will be more generic in nature. As a result, we anticipate that this option would require a detailed technical evaluation at the time of bid solicitation.

### *C. Ranked Supply Arrangement*

Bidders would be solicited as per their place in the ranking. As this is a ranked Supply Arrangement, we anticipate this option will have an enhanced upfront (RFSA qualification) technical evaluation. As a result, we anticipate that this option would have minimal or non-existent technical evaluation during the bid solicitation. Focus would be on confirming bidder's pricing in response to the RFSA and confirming the bidder's ability to meet the delivery requirements.