



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

Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer

Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes

National Master Standing Offer (NMSO)

Offre à commandes principale et nationale (OCPN)

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Offer remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'offre demeurent les mêmes.

Comments - Commentaires

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Munitions Division (BK) / Division des munitions (BK)

11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier

8C2, Place du Portage, Phase III

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet 40X46mm blunt impact projectiles 40x46mm - less than lethal Low Velocity Sponges blunt impact projectiles	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation M7594-196874/A	Date 2021-03-17
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client M7594-196874	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
File No. - N° de dossier 382bk.M7594-196874	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$BK-382-28068	
Date of Original Request for Standing Offer 2021-01-25 Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale	
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT on - le 2021-04-30 Heure Avancée de l'Est HAE	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Fisher (bk div), John	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 382bk
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 402-8674 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	
Security - Sécurité This revision does not change the security requirements of the Offer. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de la présente offre.	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Acknowledgement copy required Accusé de réception requis	Yes - Oui <input type="checkbox"/>	No - Non <input type="checkbox"/>
The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer. Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.		
Signature	Date	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant. (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)		
For the Minister - Pour le Ministre		

RFSO M7594-196874/A – 40x46 mm less than lethal Low Velocity Sponges BIP

Amendment 003 – Questions and Answers:

Question 1) Can testing be conducted with an alternate launcher? The HK269 is not readily available. We have an ALSTAC-40 with a barrel length of 356 mm. We at Biokinetics are currently participating in NATO and ASTM committees with draft standards for 40 mm non-lethal precision and blunt trauma assessments. There is a proposal to use a universal receiver with a test barrel to ensure less variability between test facilities - for your consideration. Note that for MT6, the pressure data is obtained with a universal receiver and instrumented test barrel.

Answer 1) Yes, blunt trauma assessment can use whatever equipment is suitable to that task; this would include instrumented or specialized equipment. Projectile velocity and accuracy for the purposes of this tender will be performed using the proposed launcher.

Question 2) Please clarify/confirm that for MT13, a total of 75 rounds are required (25 ambient, 25 cold, and 25 hot) and that the target is to be rigid (plywood or steel) to evaluate fragmentation.

Answer 2) Yes, MT13 requires 75 rounds as indicated. Fragmentation in flight prior to the target is primarily what is of concern. In the case of a specific target/media a less lethal mannequin consisting of a rubberized human figure wearing a heavy nylon coverall is used ("Less Lethal Larry", Dummies Unlimited Inc. product). Hard or rigid surfaces are not representative of the intended task hence are not specified.

Question 3) For MT3, do you require blunt trauma information for all of the temperatures defined in MT13? I suspect that the foam projectile's firmness or softness at various temperatures could influence blunt trauma data for safe use at 5 m (MT4).

Answer 3) Blunt trauma information at all stated temperatures is ideal, this requirement however is not specifically stated. The manufacturer must provide the temperature range recommended for its products pertaining to blunt trauma. Additional testing and/or operational limitations can be explored if the temperatures specified fall outside existing blunt trauma data presently available (will not render a bid non-compliant).

Question 4) MT13- What is the method use to evaluate the capability to impact the target nose first and without fragmentation? Is it through observation or is video/photography required?

Answer 4) Video and/or high-speed photography may be used, particularly if fragmentation or stability issues are observed in flight. A witness target is also used to observe any keyhole or other similar impact discrepancies.

Question 5) For Technical Requirement 2.1e we have 3rd party laboratory testing and reports showing groupings of the rounds conditioned to temperatures of 0 degrees Celsius, 21 degrees Celsius and 52 degrees Celsius. Please advise if this would be sufficient documentary evidence to show accuracy at various temperatures.

If not, please advise if the required -40 degrees Celsius testing can be conducted by the internal laboratory and signed off by an internal engineer, as obtaining 3rd party laboratory testing would take approximately 6-8 weeks to obtain at this time.

Answer 5) In the case of cold temperature testing, the manufacturer must attest that its products can function at these temperatures. As far as third party testing, 2.1e is being evaluated under MT13. An attestation from the manufacturer (internal engineer) would be acceptable vs. the need for an extension requests for third party testing on this specific parameter.

Question 6) Mandatory Requirements, MT1, please advise if a Certificate of Conformance from the Manufacturer will suffice as literature demonstrating the proposed projectile meets all the Technical Specifications of Article 2.1?

Answer 6) Yes, further information as it pertains to blunt trauma requested thereafter.

Question 7) Mandatory Requirements, MT2, please advise if 3rd Party Laboratory Test Data that demonstrates compliance with Technical Specifications 2.1.a., 2.1.d., 2.1.e. and 2.1.f. will suffice as all other Technical Requirements can be attested to by the manufacturer and also confirmed with samples provided to the RCMP with bid submission.

Answer 7) Yes

Question 8) Mandatory Requirements, MT3, please advise if a peer-review published paper will suffice?

Answer 8) Any peer-review must meet the requirements of sections 3.1 and 3.2, this includes signature and endorsement of an accredited reviewing entity.

Question 9) Mandatory Requirements, MT4, please advise if 3rd party Laboratory Testing for clay penetration would be sufficient to demonstrate safe use at a minimum distance of 5m?

Answer 9) Yes, however laboratory testing data must ensure clay calibration information is also included. The test apparatus, calibration and test methods must mimic National Institute of Justice standards i.e. Ballistic Resistance of Body Armor NIJ Standard-0101.06

Question 10) Mandatory Requirements, MT5, please advise if a Letter of Attestation from the manufacturer that the proposed projectile is spin stabilized will suffice?

Answer 10) Yes

Question 11) Mandatory Requirements, MT6, this section is referencing Technical requirement 2.1.d which refers to the projectiles velocity however the criteria in this table refers to pressure data. Can you please advise if it is velocity data and not pressure data the customer is looking for here? Section 2.0 – Technical Specifications does not refer to any specification for pressure.

Answer 11) Yes, 2.1.d refers to projectile weight vs velocity data. The pressure developed by either of these options must be safe for use within the launcher as described under MT6. Manufacturer must attest the product is safe for use and be able to provide relevant pressure data to support these claims i.e. how is the pressure verified or measured to ensure product is safe for use in such a launcher and within the temperature range recommended for the product.

Question 12) Mandatory Requirements, MT7, please advise if manufacturer's letter of attestation would suffice to demonstrate compliance with requirement 2.1.g. that the round consists of a staked and waterproof sealed standard lead styphnate primer? This can also be demonstrated with the samples provided.

Answer 12) Yes, the manufacturer may attest to the type of sealant and primer type used. A visual inspection will be performed with regard to the presence of sealant. Fluorescent additives are recommended for any clear/hard to observe sealant i.e. so it can be observed under black light if necessary.