



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

Title - Sujet NSFRV RFID Propulsion System	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation F7013-200032/C	Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client F7013-200032	Date 2020-10-16
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$SMC-040-27904	
File No. - N° de dossier 040mc.F7013-200032	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2020-11-02	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Deslauriers(MC Div), Stephane	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 040mc
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 420-2899 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-0897
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

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

NSFRV – RFID Propulsion solicitation amendment # 2 - Q and A

Q1. Due to confidentiality reasons, it may not be possible to provide the “proof of delivery” documentation that is requested in the RFID. Can the vendor’s proof be presented through past project summaries, including specific references to key technologies in the rated technical criteria, along with a customer contact should this need to be confirmed? Would that suffice?

A1. You may redact confidential information such as prices or product information. However, you still need to demonstrate proof of delivery as required by EX2.

Q2. Please provide a dimensioned and labeled drawing for layout purposes to demonstrate how our equipment will fit

A2. The equipment list is part of the drawing. Specific equipment has not been selected so current sizes are indicative based on industry consultation and general VFI provided. Dimensions can be lifted directly from dwg drawing if required.

Q3. The Autodesk Design Review file provided is not conducive to developing the general arrangement and machinery arrangement drawings requested. Can the designer provide a DWG file for both general and machinery arrangement drawings for the vendor to use for developing layout drawings?

A3. Yes the drawings will be available in DWG format on a request basis the same as the other drawings of Annex C.

Q4. What is the intention behind specifying a C-rate of 1.85. Is this to be used by vendors for sizing converter outputs, or simply stated as a nominal value?

A4. The C-Rate of 1.85 was used by CCG in initial design work as a realistic value was needed to determine how fast batteries could charge/discharge to support our calculations in the ELA.

We are not tied to this value and as per section 1.8.7 of the RFID “The following system requirements are based on the vessel concept design. It is anticipated that the system requirements may evolve as the design progresses as a function of the collaborative work between CCG, RAL, and the propulsion SSI. As such, many the powering values are approximations based on the vessel concept design.”

Q5. Will the Baseline Requirements Document (BRD) and the baseline technical design package developed by CCG be provided to the vendors?

A5. Not required as all relevant requirements are in RFID.

Q6. Is there a preference for liquid vs. air cooling of equipment?

A6. No preference.

Q7. Will alternate architectural configurations be considered if sufficient technical justification is provided? If so, referring to Criteria SD 2, Drawing Package as shown on page 28, should the concept drawing package include drawings for all solutions or the final recommended solution?

A7. Alternate configurations will be considered. Proposal should include final recommended solution.

Q8. The electric load analysis and the RFID specification have indicated different values for propulsion motor output. Which one should be used for the proposal?

A8. The RFID specification.

Q9. Pages 31 and 32 of the RFID includes a table of contents that PSPC encourages all proponents to follow when structuring their response document. The sections are laid out in numerical order from 1 to 5, suggesting our responses should be laid out in that order. However, for Section 3 – System Design, the table asks for the section to be presented as a report. Further, SD 1 is to be presented as an “Annex”, while SD 2 and SD 3 are to be presented as “Appendices” to the Annex. “Annex and appendices” seems to suggest that this section should be presented at the end of our proposal document, instead of between

Sections 2 and 4 as suggested in the table of contents. We would like to know if you would prefer Section 3 to be presented at the end of the proposal response, or between Sections 2 and 4 of our response as the table of contents would suggest. To better illustrate our question, we have reproduced the RFID's proposed table of contents below, and below that we show how the table of contents would look if the System Design section is attached as an Annex with Appendices.

A9. The numerical chronology should be followed and Section 3 should be between Sections 2 and 4. SD 1 does not need to be labelled as an Annex nor do SD 2 and SD 3 be labelled as appendices.

Q10. We would like to request a 2 week extension to the closing date for the NSFRV RFID from October 20th to November 3rd.

A10. Canada will grant a time extension for the RFID. The new closing date will be on November 2, 2020 at 14:00 EST as indicated on the first page of the RFID amendment #2.

Q11. Regarding the proof of delivery or installation (RTC item 1), is it acceptable to provide a letter from vessel owner confirming the status of the project as proof?

A11. It is acceptable as long as the letter confirms proof of delivery or installation. It must also cover in details all the items listed in the "Note" section of RTC EX 1-7.