



**RETURN BIDS TO:**

**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions  
→ TPSGC  
Place du Portage, Phase III  
Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2  
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier  
Gatineau  
Quebec  
K1A 0S5

**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**

W8476-206313  
PW-\$BLC-003-28215

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**

Raison sociale et adresse du  
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**

Light Armoured Vehicles Specialists Variants and Light  
Utility Vehicle Projects (LAV SVE & LUV)  
Portage III 9C2 - 11, rue Laurier  
Gatineau  
Gatineau  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Light Utility Vehicle (LUV)	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> W8476-206313/E	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 003
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> W8476-206313	<b>Date</b> 2022-07-18
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$BLC-003-28678	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 003blc.W8476-206313	<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 2022-07-29</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Da Costa, Jason	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 003blc
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (613) 863-2719 ( )	<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>

---

This Request for Information (RFI)/E amendment 003 is raised to:

1 – answer all questions submitted by Industry; and

2 – extend the date for submission of responses to the Request for Information (RFI) – Round 3 for the Light Utility Vehicle (LUV) requirement.

\*\*\*\*\*

The RFI Round 3 is amended as follows:

**1. Questions and Answers**

**Question 1**

What is the crew requirement on Cable Layer / Utility variant ? RFI says minimum 2, but is more preferred?

**Answer to question 1**

The cable layer usually has a crew of 3 personnel and the utility variant will have a crew of 2.

**Question 2**

Does Canada have an estimate of weight / dimensions of current CLAK system when loaded, without crew.

**Answer to question 2**

The current CLAK system weighs 1372kg and is approximately 2010mm wide (width of carrying vehicle), 1890mm high, and 3600mm long. The system fit on the back of an LSVW.

**Question 3**

Are all variants required to tow the trailer ?

**Answer to question 3**

All variants should be able to connect to the trailer. This is still open for review with internal stakeholders.

#### Question 4

To better understand load space on the Utility Cargo variant, what is the largest type of Palletized Cargo envisaged to be carried ?

#### Answer to question 4

The utility variant is not required to accept a palletized container. It is meant to carry loose cargo that can be secured to the bed by either tie down points or connection racks.

#### Question 5

The RFI introduces DEF-STAN 23-6 and later asks about ground pressure. The Improved Medium Mobility threshold is 350Kpa, ground pressure being one of 2 Major Factors that define mobility in DEF-STAN 23-6. Does this mean that a vehicle would be excluded if the ground pressure is greater than 350Kpa?

#### Answer to question 5

Currently the intent is to keep the ground pressure under 350kpa. As with all specifications this will be reviewed and adjusted as required during definition and when further stakeholder and industry engagement occurs.

#### Question 6

We have a question on the RFI, it has the following statement "Combat variant must have a minimum capacity of 800 kg for crew, kit & equipment". Our interpretation is this is the payload the vehicle must have to carry crew, kit and equipment? Put another way, the total weight of the crew, kit and equipment CAF will put in the vehicle is 800 KG? What about a weapon mounted to the weapons ring and the associated ammunition, is that included in the equipment?

#### Answer to question 6

800kg is the weight of the soldier, their personal kit to include, fighting equipment, weapons , ammunition, basic vehicle equipment and radios. Below includes the weights used, however, equipment listed below is subject to change. The capacity total of 800kg will also be reviewed as per question 17 for the C&R variant, will likely rise to 1000kg to account for the larger sized crew served weapon systems. This also helps answer question 16 below. The weight used does not include the weights for spare tires, winch equipment etc.

Item	NSN	Description / Dimensions (cm)	Qty	Unit Weight (kg)	Total Weight (kg)
1	N/A	Personnel A	4	86	344
2	N/A	IECS, Fighting Order, Winter	4	21.88	87.52
3	N/A	pers kit ( rucksack w/sleeping bag)	4	20.30	81.2
4	1005-21-898-7044 or 1005-21-909-7599 or 1005-21-898-7045 or 1005-21-897-0690	C7 Rifle or C7A1 Rifle w/Scope or C8 Rifle or C9 Machine Gun	4	4.03 4.6 3.23 6.83	16.12 (C7A1s)
5	N/A	Rifle cleaning & maintenance kit 5.56mm Ammo (mags)	4 20	1.0 0.48	4.0 9.6
6	1005-13-112-5223	C6 Machine Gun, Flex (C6 MG)	1	11	11
7	1005-21-912-8999	C6 Cleaning & Maintenance Kit	1	2	2
8		C6 Barrel Assembly (spare)	1	3	3
9	1005-01-394-1173	MG Buffered Mount	1	3.5	3.5
10	1005-01-251-9692	MG Spade Grip	1		
11	1005-01-394-1928	Trigger Assembly			
12		48 hours of IMP rations for 3 personnel;	18	.82	14.8
13	7310-21-899-3982	Stove, Naphtha	1	4.2	4.2
14	6260-21-908-7987 w/6260-21-863-9325	Lantern, Naphtha w/Carrying Case	1 1	2.7 1.5	2.7 1.5
15	7240-21-874-4113	Can, Naphtha, 5L	1	3	3
16		OP kit plus NODLR			
17	6145-00-243-8466	WD1 wire spool;	1	25	25
18		2 sets of night vision goggles	2		
19		Box, Ammunition, 7.62mm (located within easy reach of the gunner) / L: 28, W: 10, H: 19	3	8.0	24
20		2 radiac meters, C2 detection kit and chemical agent monitor.	1	3.8	3.8
21		Smoke grenades	8	.5	4

Item	NSN	Description / Dimensions (cm)	Qty	Unit Weight (kg)	Total Weight (kg)
21		Hand grenades	8	.45	3.6
22		M72 Light Anti-tank Weapon(LAW)	3	2	6
23		Vehicle Standard Kit & Equipment (From Annex "A")			124.7
24	N/A	IRIS Radio Kit(s) w/GPS System Allocation Codes: 7, 11, 12 and 48.	1		95.0 (max)
25		.50 Cal Machine Gun (38.2 kg) w/ Ammo (2 Boxes @ 15.5kg ea) w/ Spare Barrel (13 kg)	1	82.2	
26		C16 Grenade Launcher (33 kg) w/ Ammo (2 Boxes @ kg)	1		
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>868.24</b>

### Question 7

Para 1.1 a : COTS. There was discussion on the configuration of the COTS vehicle with respect to configuration, capacity, and any requirement for militarization such as 24 V systems.

### Answer to question 7

Canada confirmed there would be no militarization requirement and that it would be a crew cab type configuration.

### Question 8

The question of fuel vs hybrids etc. was touched on. Though, there is no point/scoring system for the project as yet it is anticipated that hybrids or green solutions may be awarded more points than a standard gasoline engine vehicle. From our Company perspective that is an important detail that will shape the proposal strategy so advance information would be appreciated.

### Answer to question 8

Canada is looking for the least emissions possible for the COTS fleet. This does not necessarily mean HYBRID as there are some diesel engines that have lower emissivity rates than hybrids. The point scoring criteria has yet to be determined and will be developed in definition.

## Question 9

Para 2.1.c : Trailers. Our Company requested confirmation on the trailer requirement and strongly recommends that a purpose built SMP trailer be considered rather than re-purposing obsolete legacy trailers. Our Company can provide tech data to the project staff to further explain the advantages.

### Answer to question 9

Acknowledged. Canada does not anticipate procuring a trailer with drive capacity or the like.

## Question 10

Paragraph 2.2.2.a.ii. : Minimum Speed. The RFI specifies a minimum speed of at least 5 km/h: This seems exceptionally low threshold for a military vehicle and may be a typo. Consider specifying a greater minimum cross-country speed.

### Answer to question 10

This is noted and will be reviewed and adjusted once the project gets into definition and further stakeholder and industry engagement occurs.

## Question 11

2.2.2.e: Turning Capability. The turning diameters called out in the RFI are unachievable for the JLTV. Our experience has shown that the turning diameters for this class of vehicle and performance requirements are as a rule larger than the legacy vehicles they are replacing. In this case were the turning diameters from the G Wagon ? Our response to the RFI will show the turning diameters for both the Direct Support and Utility variants.

### Answer to question 11

This is noted and will be reviewed and adjusted once the project gets into definition and further stakeholder and industry engagement occurs.

## Question 12

Paragraph 2.2.3.b. : Parking brakes. The requirement asks for parking brakes to hold on 60% grade. This is an unrealistically high value and contradicts paragraph 2.2.8.b. which specifies 30% slope. The 30% holding value for parking brakes is realistic and practical.

### **Answer to question 12**

This is noted and will be reviewed and adjusted once the project gets into definition and further stakeholder and industry engagement occurs.

### **Question 13**

Paragraph 2.2.7.a. : Snow traverse. this is the first time our Company has seen the requirement to traverse up to 400 mm deep snow in any competition. There is a need to quantify the snow characteristics (wet vs. powdery etc.) to establish a standard performance baseline. The ability to produce a fair and repeatable test is exceptionally difficult. Quantifying the parameters and results would be equally difficult. It is recommended that this be removed.

### **Answer to question 13**

Acknowledged. There will be internal stakeholder discussion to review this requirement.

### **Question 14**

An additional discussion was held on the requirement to equip every vehicle with chains. Based on experience our Company recommends that the Project consider procuring a limited number of chains after contract to avoid unnecessary expense to the project.

### **Answer to question 14**

This is noted and will be reviewed and adjusted once the project gets into definition and further stakeholder and industry engagement occurs.

### **Question 15**

Paragraph 2.2.9.a.ii. : Fording. specifies a fording depth greater than 1000 mm. Please recognize that many military vehicles, especially when fitted with a fording kit, can traverse depths of 1500 mm. If this is a desirable feature that may be awarded points, we suggest the range for 100% points be increased to 1500 mm.

### **Answer to question 15**

This is noted and will be reviewed and adjusted once the project gets into definition and further stakeholder and industry engagement occurs.

## Question 16

Paragraph 2.2.11.d.i. : Armor installation. During the discussion the project team indicated the “two soldiers” were the crew. It is not realistic to expect untrained soldiers to install armour. For efficiency, safety, and surety of the protection levels of the installation trained maintenance technicians with additional STTE and power tools are more appropriate to install armour.

## Answer to question 16

The discussion of 2 soldiers being able to install armour plating refers specifically to an add-on-armour type solution that has light weight panels that can be added to existing protection. The soldiers will be trained and given the appropriate tooling to complete the job. This will not apply for solutions that require the use of a crane or other lifting mechanism to install the armour or solutions that come fully armoured.

## Question 17

Paragraph 2.2.11.d.v. : Mounted Weapons. On the topic of the .50 Cal Machine Gun mount the project team indicated this was considered the worst-case recoil force. Our Company suggested they should specify a specific recoil force (newtons) and identify the number of expected rounds to be fired throughout the vehicle life cycle as a design criterion for the LUV.

## Answer to question 17

This is noted and will be reviewed and adjusted once the project gets into definition and further stakeholder and industry engagement occurs.

## Question 18

Paragraph 2.2.12 : Carrying Capacity/Payload. More detailed definitions are required for Payload, Curb Weight (CW) and Gross Vehicle Weight (GVW) to ensure consistent responses from bidders. As an example: is the “800 kg for crew” part of the payload, part of the curb weight, or neither? This definition varies from project to project. Below is an example of the weight calculations used in other programs that should clarify the curb weight definition:

Configuration/component Description	Direct Action Vehicle (HGC) Weight
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Vehicle baseline configuration with:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Integral (A-kit) survivability package</li> <li>o Full compliment of fuels, fluids, lubricants, and coolant</li> <li>o Push bumper</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	6187 kg (13,640 lbs.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Common Basic Issue Items (BII) – Per US Army                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Emergency ingress tool</li> <li>o Jack support plate</li> <li>o Extension handle</li> <li>o Axe and axe head sheath</li> <li>o Wheel chocks</li> <li>o Highway warning kit</li> <li>o Tool satchel bag (includes pry bar, extension set, extension wrench, machinist hammer, sliding tee handle, socket wrench handle, slip-joint pliers, screwdrivers, socket set, lug nut socket, key, socket, head screw, combo wrenches, shackles, and links)</li> <li>o Tool kit max carry bag with attachments</li> <li>o Suspension braces including U-bolt and wing nuts</li> <li>o Hydraulic jack</li> <li>o Medium tow bar adapters</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	80 kg (176 lbs.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Spare tire with associated mount &amp; tire davit</li> </ul>	175 kg (386 lbs.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Self-recovery winch and winching equipment</li> </ul>	200 kg (441 lbs.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Vehicle Curb Weight (CW)</li> </ul>	6642 kg (14,643 lbs.)

**Answer to question 18**

A more fulsome description will be developed to better define weigh requirements as Canada moves forward into definition.

### Question 19

Paragraph 2.4 : Trailer Payload. A minimum payload of 1000 kg is identified. This value doesn't align with either the 800 kg payload requirement for the 4-door variants or the 2,000 kg payload requirement for the 2-door variant. Is there a standard configured load that could be interchangeably hauled on both the Utility variant and the trailer?

### Answer to question 19

There is no configured load other than standard crew and vehicle equipment. See question 6 for an itemized list (subject to refinement). Cargo is not intended to have a standardized configuration as it is all loose cargo and not on a palletized system.

### Question 20

Regarding our questions on breakover angle and turn circle we brought forward during CANSEC has there been any resolution on those? Further to the breakover maximum angle we would like to ask how Canada has calculated this?

### Answer to question 20

The point has been noted however, those specifications have not yet been re-assessed. Canada will review all the requirements noted in this RFI and how they are calculated to meet mobility requirements. Further refinements will be updated as the project moves towards definition.

### Question 21

I know that some of these requests may be covered by CDRLs and DIDs so we ask your indulgence in providing them to us. If these items are not available, please provide a brief note on the LUVP team's expectations.

Para 9.4 - Material Identification System

Para 11.1 – Preventative and Corrective Maintenance Program

Para 12.7 – Commercial part number listing

Para 14.1 - Conduct First Article Inspection

Para 14.2 - Conduct Pre-Delivery Inspection

Para 14.3 - Conduct Functional Configuration Audit

Para 14.4 – Conduct Physical Configuration Audit

Para 16.1 – Major STTE Requirement/STTE Package

## Answer to question 21

The quality control activities 14.1-14.4 will depend on many factors and for now, there are many unknowns with respect to technical bid evaluation, scope of the RAMD activities, design modification to the chosen LUV platform (radio/wpn system, other mods?), location of the winning contractor. As a result, Canada is unable to provide more detailed information at this time.

Para 9.4 - Material Identification System. The Materiel Identification System provides a method of gathering together the required set of data needed to conclusively identify an item, equipment, weapons system, or materiel. It is part of the preliminary work for the Provisioning Documentation (9.5). Canada will require an extensive number of information on all the LUV parts to initiate necessary actions within DND's system of record itself (DRMIS, Defence Resources Management Information System) and trigger the flow of material identification cataloguing data to the Canadian Government Cataloguing System.

Para 11.1 – Preventative and Corrective Maintenance Program. The contractor is expected to take an active role in the development of the maintenance program with regards to multiple aspects (e.g. levels of repair, repair times, system reliability/maintainability/testability characteristics, support equipment needs, establishment of maintenance programs using condition-based maintenance or reliability-centered maintenance, etc). This work will be based on the result of the Logistic Support Analysis.

Para 12.7 – Commercial part number listing. This refers to the parts that are non-unique/non-proprietary to the Original Equipment Manufacturer.

Para 14.1-14.4 – Canada's intention is to obtain confirmation that the first full production and subsequent vehicles meet the project requirements through these quality control activities. The specific scope/duration/location of these activities will vary depending on the winning contractor/chosen LUV as it will include confirmation that any requested modifications after bid evaluation are completed, functional and captured in the technical documentation.

Para 16.1 – Major Specialized Tool and Test Equipment (STTE) Requirement/STTE Package. This includes the identifying, planning and ensuring the availability of equipment required to support the operation and maintenance of the LUV. Examples of support and test equipment are: diagnostic test tool, scanners, software support and calibration equipment. The contractor is expected to provide and maintain its STTE solution throughout the life cycle of the LUV fleet.

## Question 22

As we are trying to finalize our proposal to the RFI, we would like to know if DND has an existing template for ILS. For the sake of argument, let's say either the MSVS-SMP or the MSVS –

MILCOTS projects. We are just trying to understand any level of benchmarking that you had or may have in mind. An example would go a long way to help all parties involved.

The other alternative is whether your LUVP is following the guidelines in "NATO GUIDANCE ON INTEGRATED LOGISTICS SUPPORT FOR MULTINATIONAL ARMAMENT PROGRAMMES ALP-10 - EDITION 2 - MARCH 2011". I believe that this volume is the most recent version of this publication.

## Answer to question 22

### Guidance on the ILS requirements for the LUV project.

Canada's intention is to compete the LUV requirement and as a result, award the acquisition and the initial in-service support (ISS) contracts to one contractor. This contractor will take an active role in the development and the delivery of support elements which will be included in both contracts. At this early project stage, the contract deliverables are not fully developed, but here are some clarifications:

Acquisition contract. The current RFI's costing questions at Table 1 Acquisition/Integrated Logistics Support (ILS) Services/ Item 4.0 to 19.1. provide the detailed list of the type and number of deliverables that will be necessary to set-up the LUVP's ILS program. The NATO GUIDANCE ON INTEGRATED LOGISTICS SUPPORT FOR MULTINATIONAL ARMAMENT PROGRAMMES ALP-10 - EDITION 2 - MARCH 2011 is a reference that is, in essence, very similar to the process that the project intends to follow. The steps and terminology are slightly different, but address broadly the same ILS elements in an order that mostly follows the LUV project stages.

Sustainment contract. The current RFI's costing questions at Table 2 In Service Support/Sustainment requirement/Item 1.0 to 3.2. provide an overview of what will be expected by the contractor to support the LUV program management. For the maintenance of the fleet, military operators and technicians will perform operator, first and second-line maintenance tasks, including recovery in domestic, deployed operations and training. Further maintenance support opportunities will be explored by Canada with industry to augment the support available to Primary Reserve units where possible depending on the available sustainment budget still to be determined. Sub-system or component Repair & Overhaul (R&O) and major repairs will be contracted. The publication Canadian Forces Land Equipment Management System (LEMS), B-GI-342-001/FP-000 defines the levels of repair and is accessible on the internet.

## Question 23

Can you send out an estimated program schedule including RFP release and any TCP (Technical Compliancy Program – vehicle head to head testing)?

**Answer to question 23**

Canada is unable to provide this information at this time.

**Question 24**

We have a question in regards to Costing questions/Initial Acquisition/Table 1: Acquisition on page 16 -17 of the attached solicitation document. Could you please provide a description or more information in regards to economy of scale pricing? Sections A and B define specific quantities so we were questioning what the expectation is for economy of scale pricing.

**Answer to question 24**

Economies of scale is Canada asking industry to provide specific quantity range that would trigger further discounted price of the vehicles. Canada has provided firm quantities however, Canada would like to know if it could further benefit from cost advantages on the vehicles if a certain quantity is procured. For example, if Canada wishes to procure 1000 vehicles, the cost per vehicle would be \$XX. If Canada decides to procure 1500 vehicles, would that favorably change the cost per vehicle? What if Canada requested 2000 or 2500, etc.

\*\*\*\*\*

**2. At Submission of Responses:**

**DELETE:** 22 July 2022

**INSERT:** 29 July 2022

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