



**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> Engineering Support Services Engineering Support Services	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> F7044-190233/C	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 002
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> F7044-190233	<b>Date</b> 2021-09-29
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$MC-037-28317	
<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> Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT <b>on - le 2021-11-12</b> Heure Avancée de l'Est HAE	
<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) 420-1547 ( )	<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> <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>

Amendment 002 is raised to make the following changes to the solicitation and to answer Bidders' questions. Please note that questions regarding Restrictions on Bidding and Exclusivity will be answered in Amendment 003 posted in the near future.

1. **DELETE** the following section:

#### **4.1.3.3 Mark-up**

The Bidder's proposal must provide a Mark-up<sup>1</sup>, to be applied to the laid-down costs reasonably and properly incurred during the performance of the Work. The proposed Mark-up will be applied against:

- External/additional resources and specialists - Table 3
- Technical Data Package (Drawings) – Other Direct Charges, (Material etc.)

Mark-up has a maximum value of 5 points out of a total 100 overall points. The Bidder will be evaluated against point rated financial criteria as outlined in Annex B.

#### **REPLACE WITH:**

#### **4.1.3.3 Mark-up**

The Bidder's proposal must provide a Mark-up<sup>1</sup>, to be applied to the laid-down costs reasonably and properly incurred during the performance of the Work. The proposed Mark-up will be applied against:

- External/additional resources and specialists - Table 3
- Technical Data Package (Drawings) – Other Direct Charges, (Material etc.)

Mark-up has a maximum value of 5 points out of a total 100 overall points. The Bidder will be evaluated against point rated financial criteria as outlined in Annex B. **The maximum allowable mark-up is 20%.**

2. At Annex B, **DELETE** the following section:

#### **2. Mark-up<sup>1</sup>**

This part has a maximum of 5 points out a total 100 overall points.  
The Bidder must identify mark-up rate \_\_\_\_%

#### **REPLACE WITH:**

#### **2. Mark-up<sup>1</sup>**

This part has a maximum of 5 points out a total 100 overall points. **The maximum allowable mark-up is 20%.**

The Bidder must identify mark-up rate \_\_\_\_%

3. ADD the following section as an Annex to the solicitation:

**Annex J**

**Bidder Questions and CANADA Responses**

**F7044-190233 – Engineering Support Services Questions and Answers:**

**Q1:** TM2 requires “significant knowledge of the Classification Society requirements for vessel stability and hull structures”. TM2 pass describes that “the knowledge is demonstrated ... for work related to the modification of the hull and hull structure of a Class approved steel hull vessel.” It appears that this does not necessarily demonstrate significant knowledge of vessel stability. Can Canada confirm that vessel stability analysis work can be used to demonstrate TM2?

**A1:** Either vessel stability, hull structures or a blend of the two can be used to demonstrate TM2.

**Q2:** LCC#1. Lifecycle costing. Lifecycle costing for new construction and for in service vessels over 40m in length requires the same skills and experience, and is more commonly delivered in a new build program than for an in service program where major equipment is already installed. Would Canada consider allowing life cycle costing for new construction references count as well?

**A2:** Only in-service vessels will be accepted for this criteria.

**Q3:** We are considering submitting a Proposal for Services to meet the requirements of this RFP. Our question is that our engineering support services are based in another country. Can we still submit a bid? We do not know the ratio of work between our two companies, as the technical requirements have not been defined. All field inspections and vessel attendance will be carried out by our Canadian employees across Canada as needed from our Canadian Offices. Support (engineering) services (drawings etc) would be from our parent company in another country. Would this be acceptable to CANADA?

**A3:** As this solicitation is limited to Canadian services, the bid must meet Canadian content requirements.

Article 4 of the SACC Manual Clause A3050T Canadian Content Definition states that:  
Variety of services: For requirements consisting of more than one service, a minimum of 80 percent of the total bid price must be provided by individuals based in Canada.

**Q4:** Could you please provide a Word copy of the RFP.

**A4:** No. Bidders will need to use the PDF document released on buyandsell. But Bidders can ask the Contracting Authority for the Word version of the Engineering Changes Form and the On Site Support Form.

**Q5:** Capacity Plan, Clause 6 Annex A. Please clarify what 'available resources' are meant to include. Very few companies have employees waiting idly for work and ideally all employees of a company are gainfully employed for some period. What makes a person available?

**A5:** 'Available resources' refers to any resource from the Bidder organization/ Bidder team that has relevant experience with in-service vessels that may be called upon during the course of the contract, it does imply a commitment that the resource is immediately available at the time of bid submission.

**Q6:** Page 6 of 14 of the Technical Evaluation Plan (PDF page 65/81) references vessels with an 'Icebreaking Notation'. This term is not one that is recognized in any IACS set of rules that we know about. Common terminology is a 'icebreaker' notation or an 'ice class' notation. The icebreaker notation is fairly recent and very few if any vessels with this notation have been modified by any country. Please clarify what "icebreaking notation" is referring to.

**A6:** Icebreaker notation or ice class notation may be used, as applicable, for this response.

**Q7:** We note that any reference to new construction experience that was evident in the draft RFI phase has been removed. A company with extensive new construction experience but little repair or modification experience would probably not qualify for this contract. Please confirm if this is Canada's intent.

**A7:** As per the SOW, work on new builds will be outside of the scope of the ESS contracts. In alignment with this, technical evaluation criteria focuses on in-service vessels as that is the work that will be required.

**Q8:** The Engineering Changes Forms to be submitted are limited to a maximum of 10 vessels over 40 meters in length. Each form includes all the Naval Architecture/Structural, Mechanical and Electrical attributes identified by the Canadian Coast Guard. It is highly unlikely that any one vessel that is considered suitable for submission will meet all of these requirements. Is this Canada's intent?

**A8:** It is not anticipated that all vessel examples submitted for the EC criteria will meet every single sub-criteria. As indicated in the Engineering Changes Point rated criteria: *The Bidder should strive to use reference projects that contain as many of the task criteria as possible within the 10 project limit.*

**Q9:** Based on a potential 9-year contract duration including options, a resource initially identified as Junior may be promoted to an Intermediate position (or Intermediate to Senior etc.) during that time period.

- a. How will their rates be adjusted with this contract? Will the rate table be updated at each contract renewal date?
- b. Can it be updated if an employee is promoted?
- c. Can a contractor change personnel at each option renewal?

**A9:**

- a. Rates will be adjusted yearly as per article 7 and 7.1 of the Annex B - Basis Payment.
- b. Yes. The Contractor will be able to update the rate of pay of named resources when they get promoted. The Contractor will need to follow the same instructions in article 8.1 (Internal Resources) to update pay rates after a promotion.
- c. If a Contractor needs to change personnel during the Contract period, they must comply with article 08 (Replacement of specific individuals) in SACC clause 2035 (General Conditions - Higher Complexity - Services).

**Q10:** Clause 6.8.3 on Page 27 of 49 deals with progress payments and states that monthly payments will be made no more frequently than monthly. Item 7, page 8 of 9 of the Scope of work refers to bi-monthly payment (every 2 months) of invoices. Please confirm what is the frequency of progress payments Canada will make.

**A10:** This is to reflect flexibility. Canada can make progress payments monthly if invoiced, and if it is preferred by the contractor to provide invoices bi-monthly (every two months) as it is administratively easier for the Contractor, then the payments would accordingly become bi-monthly.

**Q11:** Annex C – Technical Evaluation Plan - EC1 states:

“The Bidder may use up to a maximum of 10 different vessel \*projects to earn the total of 180 points”

The only definition of “Project” in the RFP is provided in Part 1 as:

“Project is defined as a number of engineering changes to a specific vessel performed concurrently during a fixed period of time”

Please confirm that this is restricted to one vessel per contract?

**A11:** This is one vessel per contract.

**Q12:**

Part 1: CO#1 evaluation criteria suggests that the reference vessels has to be 40m in length. Is this an error? Should it be like the other criterion and be “over 40m”? (Ref: Annex C, Rated Technical Criteria, Government Contracting, pg 64 of 81)

Part 2: Do max points under CO#1 require 2 projects?

**A12:**

Part 1: Yes, the criterion should read 'over 40m'.

Part 2: Yes.

**Q13:** Is there a max permissible mark-up?

**A13:** Yes. 20% is the maximum allowable mark-up rate.

**Q14:** The mandatory core team in Part 1 must:

"substantiate their proposal reflecting each category of resource, the Bidder must use the referenced Instructions (template) for each named resource."

The only resource template provided is in Part 2 of the RFP. Is it intended that the mandatory core team use the same resource template? which for project references simply identifies the "project name and year only".

**A14:** This was included in error. There is no specific template for the mandatory criteria.

**Q15:** The Point Rated requirements for additional resources under CAP#2 do not specify any minimum levels of qualifications or experience; nor do they require bidders to demonstrate that this team covers the range of disciplines needed to fulfil the scope of work described under Annex A. All individuals listed will score the same number of points. Can CCG clarify how bids will be compared to ensure that a highly qualified multi-disciplinary team will be favoured over a minimally-qualified single-discipline team? Note that project examples could potentially have been undertaken technically entirely through the use of subcontractors.

**A15:** CAP#2 has sub-categories for the disciplines of marine mechanical, naval architecture, and marine electrical. Note as well that as per EC1 "All engineering work presented must have been performed by the Bidder team (resources from TM#1-4 and CAP#2), work by sub-contractors that are not part of the proposed 'Bidder Team' for the ESS will not be accepted and no points will be awarded for any such projects cited".

**Q16:** The mandatory core team in Part 1 Marine Mechanical SME description states:

"which the marine mechanical SME led or oversaw work related to the modification of the marine mechanical system"

However, the pass criteria states:

"SME in the last ten (10) years that were led or overseen by the marine mechanical SME for work related to the modification of the propulsion system"

Please confirm that the pass criteria includes work related to marine mechanical systems.

**A16:** The description should read: "SME in the last ten (10) years that were led or overseen by the marine mechanical SME for work related to the modification of the propulsion system" as aligned with the pass criteria.

**Q17:** The RFP requires that Contractors offer a core team of 7 personnel, and a resource pool of up to an additional 28 technical personnel. The RFP also states:

"The Contractor must provide an updated Capacity Plan at the time of the Kick-off meeting (described at section 8) and update it at least once annually for the duration of the Contract to indicate the Contractor's list of available resources. The Capacity Plan is not meant to reflect all personnel to be immediately assigned to tasks, but rather the full breadth of available resources on the Contractor's core team that may be used to complete tasks under the Contract."

However, no indication is provided of the expected level of effort for any or all bundles, and this makes it difficult to develop any form of meaningful Capacity Plan. Will Canada please provide its estimates for the level of effort under each of the three bundles for at least the initial period of the contract?

**A17:** The Capacity Plan is to be provided at Kick-off meeting for record keeping purposes to confirm its standing. It is understood that the Capacity Plan may or may not have changed from the time of Bid submission.

The annual update of the Capacity Plan is merely intended to be a cumulative roll-up of all resources added over the course of the year.

**Q18:** Annex C – Technical Evaluation Plan - EC1 defines the "Project" as such: "Project is defined as a number of engineering changes to a specific vessel performed concurrently during a fixed period of time". Would Canada accept a "Project" that consisted of a number of separate EC projects that were all implemented in a single refit/drydock period? The requirement to have all engineering changes completed as a single engineering project would penalize companies that have extensive experience in working with CCG due to CCG's typical procurement process for engineering services.

**A18:** Yes, work culminating in multiple engineering changes being implemented in a single refit/drydock period would constitute a 'fixed period of time'.

**Q19:** Both "Engineering Changes" Form and "On Site Support" Form provided in Annex C – Technical Evaluation Plan - require to indicate the date the vessel returned back to service. Due to COVID-19 situation, there have been some major refit projects that experienced significant delays. Can Canada clarify whether the vessel returning to service after a refit is a mandatory requirement and thus such projects cannot be used as reference for this RFP? Or would completion of the engineering work (including regulatory approvals, acceptance by client, award of implementation work to the shipyard) be considered as an acceptable project completion?

**A19:** For work affected by the Covid-19 situation, the vessel does not have to be returned to service. Completion of the work can be indicated by a minimum of one of the following proposed

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

F7044-190233/C

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

F7044-190233

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

002

File No. - N° du dossier

037mc.F7044-190233

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

037mc

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

---

items: acceptance by client and/or award of the implementation work to the shipyard (note that regulatory approvals are already a requirement within the criteria). The Bidder must indicate for these particular projects that they were impacted by Covid-19.

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME**