



200-2024 ADDENDUM 1

Supply and Delivery of Uniform Footwear

URGENT

**PLEASE FORWARD THIS DOCUMENT TO
WHOEVER IS IN POSSESSION OF THE
BID/PROPOSAL**

ISSUED: March 13, 2024
BY: Diane Westra-Hanaback
TELEPHONE NO. 204 986-2293

**THIS ADDENDUM SHALL BE INCORPORATED
INTO THE BID/PROPOSAL AND SHALL FORM
A PART OF THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS**

Template Version: Add 2024-02-01

Please note the following and attached changes, corrections, additions, deletions, information and/or instructions in connection with the Bid/Proposal, and be governed accordingly. Failure to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in Paragraph 10 of Form A: Bid/Proposal may render your Bid/Proposal non-responsive.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q1: A couple of the products that you have specified will be discontinued by (Supplier XX) in 2025.
- A1: The City recognizes that the nature of Retail Business is that styles are often discontinued and/or updated. Where an item will be discontinued *at a future date*, the Contract Administrator will work with the Contractor on a regular basis to replace any item that will be discontinued at the time this occurs. The tender is based on the *current availability* of each particular item/style that is required.
- Q2: Agility Peak Tactical 17763 is no longer in line, it was replaced by the Nova 3 Tactical 005043/W which is a gender-neutral style.
- A2: E2.3 indicates that the Nova 3 Tactical is acceptable.
- Q3: Sample Provision Requirements (Paragraph B6.7) - The directive to supply samples within a three-day window poses significant logistical and financial challenges, particularly considering the diverse range of sizes and styles required. We propose a reconsideration of... an extension of the submission timeline.
- A3: The City recognizes that this timeline is tight. However, the sample provision requirement timeline is consistent with other City of Winnipeg tenders. It will not be adjusted.
- Q4: The obligation to provide multiple pairs for potential wear testing by The Winnipeg Police Services and The Winnipeg Fire and Paramedic Service introduces substantial costs without a guaranteed return on investment. We propose a reconsideration of the sample quantity.
- A4: Samples that are requested and provided by the Bidder will only be tested for specification compliance as well as fit and comfort and will not be worn beyond this. Samples will be returned to the Bidder in the same condition they were received. This would be no different than trying on a pair of shoes at a retail outlet prior to making a purchase.
- Further, only 2 pair (size to be determined) will be required for sample evaluation. The City will attempt to request an average size for the evaluation. Additional information regarding the delivery and return of samples is found in B6.7(c).

Further, the bidder should take note of B6.4 addressing the City's requirement to have multiple styles/brands of similar footwear. Each style/brand required by the City is independent from other styles/brands identified on the required list of items.

Q5: Confidentiality Assurance (Paragraph B10.2) – (Bidder XX) seeks confirmation that the details of our proposal, including product specifications, pricing, and any clarifications furnished to the City of Winnipeg, will not be disclosed to, or evaluated by the incumbent provider. We consider this assurance as crucial for maintaining the integrity of the bidding process and the relationships with our suppliers.

A5: See B10.1 for the intent of the Disclosure clause. Further, any information provided by a bidder during the bidding period is not shared with anyone: before, during or after the bidding period including after award of contract, and includes the Person's identified in B10.2.

Q6: We are aware that several of the items requested within the RFP are discontinued or soon to be discontinued by the manufacturer.

A6: See response to Q1 above. Further, if a specific item is *currently* discontinued, it should be brought to the attention of the Contract Administrator immediately.

Q7: In anticipation of submitting our proposal, we wish to... highlight the challenges posed using proprietary specifications rather than performance-based criteria.

A7: The bidder should note the information provided in E1.2.2.

Further, the City recognizes that performance-based criteria would be ideal for most tenders. However, due to a user's individual and unique foot features, and in an effort to comply with "fit and comfort" for that user, it is necessary for the City to have multiple styles of similar footwear to accommodate this. As a result, the City has developed this tender based on the styles of the existing contract. Requests for substitutes should include how the approved proprietary feature is met by the substitute requested.

Q8: This contract still has many brand specific technologies. The reality of this is any single substitution can be thrown out because it does not meet the technology specs listed in the documents. Below is what (Bidder XX) had written in a previous email in regards to this. The only thing that seems to have changed is we as suppliers have to give additional reasoning.

A8: See response to Q7 above.

Further, this tender is totally separate from the one that was cancelled and should be treated as such. Nothing has changed regarding the request for substitutions. The current tender makes it clearer as to what is expected when a bidder requests a substitution. Further to this, it is *the responsibility of the bidder* to provide sufficient information for the City to determine whether or not a substitute meets or exceeds the specifications outlined in the tender document.

Q9: I did not receive an answer (regarding a specific feature of an item from the tender that was cancelled).

A9: This tender is totally separate from that one that was cancelled. It should be treated as such. Nothing has changed regarding the request for substitutions. The current tender makes it clearer as to what is expected when a bidder requests a substitution. Further to this, it is *the responsibility of the bidder* to provide sufficient information for the City to determine whether or not a substitute meets or exceeds the specifications outlined in the tender document.

Q10: This contract is built around boots offered by (the current contractor), specked (sic) by (the current contractor)

and cannot be acquired by anyone else but (the current contractor). Merrell Tactical is only sold at (the current contractor). New Balance will not open new dealers and therefore alongside these brands no one will be able to bid on this contract and cover the widths in shoes. 5.11 has only one dealer in Winnipeg.

A10: The tender is based on the EXISTING CONTRACT and is not based on any one bidder or retail supplier. The City is open to substitution requests where a bidder is unable to source specific brands. If a manufacturer is not opening new dealers, that is not a reason to remove that item from the City's requirements of this tender. A bidder may still request a substitution of a brand you *are* able to source. Bidders are further reminded to review B6 in its entirety regarding substitution requests.

Q11: The (tender) is full on product specific terminology that will always allow a "does not meet specification" disclaimer. Terms like Abzorb, Rollbar technology, Fresh Foam X, Monowrap, Omni Heat, Climasalomon and comfortbase to name a few."

A11: See the response provided in Q7.