



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

Electronics, Simulators and Defence Systems Div.
/Division des systèmes électroniques et des systèmes de
simulation et de défense
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
8C2, Place du Portage
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Dark Vessel Detection Service Service de détection de vaisseaux obscurs	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation F521A-220646/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client F521A-220646	Date 2023-01-09
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$QF-120-28881	
File No. - N° de dossier 120qf.F521A-220646	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM Eastern Standard Time EST on - le 2023-02-15 Heure Normale du l'Est HNE	
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: Johnston, Charlene	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 120qf
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (873) 469-3859 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
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

Amendment 003 is raised to answer Bidder questions as follows:

QUESTION	DFO RESPONSE
The wording of the Statement of Work and the mandatory evaluation criteria are very restrictive and will result in a competition with only one qualified bidder. We believe it would be in the Crown's interest to broaden the evaluation criteria to be more inclusive of a broader range of solutions while maintaining equivalent or better requirements for experience and capabilities.	The Statement of Work has been crafted to reflect DFO's concept of operations. Please provide specific examples of which requirements are being referred to.
The Point Rated Criteria awards points for a specific implementation and does not recognize the performance and functionality adequately. As a result the Crown is inadvertently favouring one particular solution and penalizing different implementations with similar or superior performance and functionality.	Please provide specific examples.
In mandatory requirement M3; why would the crown limit itself to vendors with existing service arrangements with MAXAR when the Pleiades NEO constellation can provide equally high resolution imagery with the benefit of not being controlled by any other nation's interests?	Bidders are encouraged to include Pleiades NEO (paragraph 5.2.3 of the Statement of Work).
Bidder recommends that the crown allow bidders to suggest the User Test Protocol and perhaps have that as a point rated criteria as well.	Bidders are encouraged to guide the conduct of the user test (paragraph 2.2 of the User Test Protocol).
It may be in the Crown's interest to eliminate the mandatory criteria and make the whole bid point rated. This may better recognize superior technical attributes that may not have been known to the client.	Please provided specific examples.
Another restriction that may not be in the Crown's interest is why would an existing service arrangement be needed in the case of the ageing RadarSAT-2 Satellite when other, more modern, SAR sources may prove to be superior? It is understandable that RCM data needs to be supported by any bidder but if that can be proven without a pre-arranged service arrangement would that not be acceptable?	Bidders are encouraged to propose other SAR sources (paragraph 5.2.2 of the Statement of Work). It is not anticipated that data access for RCM will be a challenge https://www.asc-csa.gc.ca/eng/satellites/radarsat/access-to-data/about.asp is there a specific challenge Canada should be considering?
We request that the RFP close date be extended by 6 weeks to allow for bid preparation.	The Government of Canada agrees to grant a 3 week extension at this time.

All other terms and conditions remain the same.