

Government of Bermuda

Ministry of National Security

Royal Bermuda Regiment

Addenda

For

Patrol/Interceptor Vessel Procurement - RBR Coast Guard

Procurement No.: **RBRCG2026**

Issued: **Friday 2 October 2026**

Submission Deadline: **Friday 13 November 2026 1700hrs Atlantic Standard Time**

Addenda No, **1**

Addenda Type: Questions and Responses

The following addendum supersedes information contained in the solicitation document issued for this procurement to the extent referenced. This Addendum forms part of the solicitation documents and will be subject to all of the conditions set out in the contract conditions.

Questions and Reponses to Questions

Question 1:	Certifications & Standards Compliance – Proponent shall provide proof of compliance and certification in relevant standards, including ISO 9001. - Please clarify whether ISO 9001 certification is a mandatory requirement for the shipyard itself, or whether demonstrated compliance with recognized marine construction, safety, and classification standards will be considered acceptable. ISO 9001 certification is not universally required of U.S. shipyards constructing vessels in accordance with applicable U.S. Coast Guard regulations, ABYC standards, and the requirements of an IACS member classification society. U.S. shipyards may maintain established quality assurance and quality control systems while constructing vessels to these recognized regulatory, technical, and classification requirements without holding ISO 9001 certification. Would the RBRCG consider a shipyard's documented Quality Management System, together with demonstrated compliance with applicable ABYC, USCG, and IACS classification requirements, as an acceptable equivalent to ISO 9001 certification?
Answer 1:	The Royal Bermuda Regiment Coast Guard (RBRCG) notes that ISO 9001 certification is not a mandatory requirement for shipyards constructing vessels in accordance with applicable United States Coast Guard (USCG), American Boat and Yacht Council (ABYC), and recognised classification society standards. While ISO 9001 certification is preferred, proponents may propose an alternative Quality Management System (QMS) provided they demonstrate an equivalent level of quality assurance and quality control. To be considered acceptable, proponents must provide evidence of: • A documented and implemented QMS covering vessel design, construction, inspection, testing, and delivery; • Compliance with applicable USCG, ABYC, and classification society requirements; • Quality assurance and quality control procedures, including material traceability, inspections, testing, and management of non-conformances; • Successful delivery of comparable vessels; and • Independent third-party inspections, certifications, or classification society oversight, where applicable. It is a Mandatory Submission Requirement to provide copies of such certifications. RBRCG reserves the right to assess the adequacy of any proposed QMS and require clarification during the evaluation process. The absence of ISO 9001 certification will not, by itself, disqualify a proponent, provided satisfactory evidence of an equivalent QMS is submitted, and all other mandatory RFP requirements are met. Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria set out in the RFP.

Question 2:	1.1.3 Deadrise: approximately 25 degrees at the transom. - Will you accept a Deadrise of 22 degrees at the transom?

Answer 2:	The RBRCG will consider a hull design incorporating a deadrise angle of 22 degrees at the transom, provided the proponent can demonstrate that the proposed hull meets or exceeds the operational, performance, stability, and seakeeping requirements specified in the RFP. The proposed design must provide suitable performance for the RBRCG's intended operational environment, including offshore patrol, search and rescue, personnel transfer, and operations in adverse sea conditions. The proponent shall provide relevant technical specifications, performance data, and evidence of comparable vessels demonstrating the suitability of the proposed hull design. Acceptance of a 22-degree deadrise will be subject to technical evaluation and confirmation that all applicable mandatory performance and safety requirements are satisfied.

Question 3:	1.1.10 Hull colour: Proponent standard grey, or equivalent approved by RBRCG. - Is this referring to the Collar Colour?
Answer 3:	Section 1.1.10 refers to the colour of the vessel's hull and not specifically to an inflatable or foam-filled collar. The RBRCG's preferred hull colour is grey, with the final shade and finish subject to approval by the RBRCG. The collar colour shall also be grey or an alternative colour approved by the RBRCG to ensure a consistent operational appearance. The final hull and collar colour scheme, including any required markings, identification numbers, and RBRCG insignia, will be confirmed with the top ranked proponent.

Question 4:	2.1.1 The hull shall be constructed from 5083-H116 marine-grade aluminum or approved advanced composite providing equivalent strength and durability. - Will you accept 5086 Marine Grade Aluminum for the entire build?

Answer 4:	The RBRCG notes that 5083-H116 marine-grade aluminium is the specified material for vessel construction under the RFP. However, RBRCG recognises that 5086 marine-grade aluminium is also widely used in marine vessel construction and may be considered an acceptable alternative, subject to demonstrating equivalent suitability for the intended operational requirements. While 5083-H116 aluminium remains the preferred material, proponents may propose the use of 5086 marine-grade aluminium, provided they demonstrate that the proposed alloy, temper, and material thicknesses meet the required standards for structural strength, corrosion resistance, fatigue performance, and durability. To be considered acceptable, proponents must provide evidence of: • The proposed aluminium alloy, temper, material specifications, and applicable marine construction standards; • Compliance with applicable USCG, ABYC, and recognised classification society requirements, where applicable; • Structural design calculations demonstrating that the proposed material and construction methods provide adequate strength, rigidity, and fatigue resistance for the vessel's intended operational profile; • Appropriate material thicknesses, structural arrangements, and reinforcement to ensure suitability for sustained offshore operations; • Documented welding procedures, including applicable welding standards and quality control measures; • Suitable corrosion protection measures and evidence of the material's durability in a marine environment; and • Successful construction and operational performance of comparable vessels using the proposed aluminium alloy, where such evidence is available. It is a Mandatory Submission Requirement that proponents proposing 5086 marine-grade aluminium provide the relevant material specifications, structural design documentation, and supporting evidence demonstrating compliance with the applicable construction standards and performance requirements of the RFP. RBRCG reserves the right to assess the suitability of the proposed aluminium alloy, temper, structural design, and construction methods and to request additional technical documentation or clarification during the evaluation process.

Question 5:	1.1.1 The Contractor shall provide all applicable certificates, including: a. ISO 12217 stability certification, - While we build to these standards, we do not have Certificate Certifications. Will our submission be considered non-compliant and not accepted without the Certificates (documentation)?

Answer 5:	The RBRCG acknowledges that some established vessel manufacturers design and construct vessels in accordance with ISO 12217 stability and buoyancy requirements without routinely obtaining independent third-party certification. While formal ISO 12217 certification is preferred, proponents may propose an alternative method of demonstrating compliance, provided they submit sufficient technical documentation verifying that the proposed vessel meets the applicable stability, buoyancy, and safety requirements. To be considered acceptable, proponents must provide evidence of: • Compliance with the applicable requirements of ISO 12217 relating to vessel stability, buoyancy, and operational safety; • Documented stability calculations, design assessments, and supporting engineering analyses demonstrating compliance with the applicable requirements; • Stability test results, technical reports, or equivalent documentation verifying the vessel's stability and buoyancy characteristics; • Confirmation that the vessel's design, loading conditions, personnel capacity, and intended operational profile are consistent with the applicable stability requirements; • Details of the manufacturer's internal design verification, inspection, and testing procedures used to demonstrate compliance; and • Independent third-party assessments, certifications, or classification society verification, where available. It is a Mandatory Submission Requirement that proponents provide copies of relevant ISO 12217 certifications or, where formal certification is unavailable, equivalent technical documentation demonstrating compliance with the applicable stability and buoyancy requirements. Where formal ISO 12217 certification is not available at the time of tender submission, proponents must clearly identify this in their proposals and provide details of the alternative compliance documentation submitted. RBRCG reserves the right to assess the adequacy of the proposed compliance documentation, request additional technical information or clarification, and require independent third-party verification of stability and buoyancy compliance prior to final vessel acceptance and delivery. The absence of formal ISO 12217 certification will not, by itself, disqualify a proponent, provided satisfactory evidence demonstrating compliance with the applicable requirements is submitted and all other mandatory structural, safety, and performance requirements of the RFP are met. Final acceptance will remain subject to RBRCG's technical evaluation and approval, and proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria set out in the RFP.

Question 6:	Rated Criteria, Section 5. Training, Documentation & Support , Sub-Question 10 - The final design of the vessel, including the hull, console/cabin, and installed components, are not typically available until a design review with the procurement office has been completed. As per the requirement in "Rated Criteria, Section 5. Training, Documentation & Support, Sub-Question 10. Are wiring diagrams, network diagrams, component maps, and 3D hull models included?" is it acceptable that such diagrams, drawings, and models are provided after Detail Design Review?

Answer 6:	Yes, it is acceptable for the final wiring diagrams, network diagrams, component maps, and 3D hull models to be provided following the completion and approval of the Detailed Design Review. However, bidders must confirm in their proposal that all required diagrams, drawings, and models will be included as part of the final vessel documentation package at no additional cost to the Government. Bidders should also provide preliminary drawings and technical information, where available, to demonstrate compliance with the vessel specifications and support the technical evaluation process. All final documentation must accurately reflect the approved vessel configuration and installed equipment and must be provided prior to final vessel acceptance and delivery.

Question 7:	May a proponent bid one variant only (Interceptor or Patrol), or must both variants be offered?
Answer 7:	The RBRCG confirms that the RFP requests proponents to submit proposals for both the Interceptor and Patrol vessel variants, as outlined in Section 1.1 of the RFP. The intention is to establish a common vessel platform that supports fleet standardisation, interchangeable components, simplified maintenance, and potential future procurement.

Question 8:	Must the 50-knot top speed be achieved at the full 3,500 lb payload with 300 gallons of fuel? Would an offer at 45 knots or more be considered or partially scored?
Answer 8:	The RBRCG confirms that the minimum specified maximum speed of 50 knots remains a technical requirement for both vessel variants, as outlined in Annexes C and D. The RFP also specifies a minimum payload capacity of 3,500 lb and a minimum fuel capacity of 300 US gallons.

Question 9:	Is twin outboard propulsion mandatory, or would an alternative such as inboard diesel or waterjet be considered as an alternative offer?
Answer 9:	The RBRCG confirms that the RFP specifies outboard propulsion and requires proponents to provide separate Yamaha and Mercury propulsion proposals.

Question 10:	Is the maximum 24-inch draft measured with engines raised and at light displacement?
Answer 10:	The RBRCG confirms that the maximum specified draft of 24 inches is measured under light-ship displacement conditions with the outboard engines raised, as outlined in Annexes C and D.

Question 11:	Will CE certification (Directive 2013/53/EU, Category B) be accepted as evidence of ISO 12217 and ISO 12215 compliance?

Answer 11:	The RBRCG acknowledges that vessels manufactured in accordance with Directive 2013/53/EU and certified under CE Design Category B may have been designed and assessed against applicable harmonised marine construction and safety standards. While CE certification is recognised as relevant supporting evidence, it does not automatically establish compliance with every requirement of ISO 12217 and ISO 12215. Proponents may submit CE certification documentation as part of their technical compliance submission, provided sufficient supporting evidence is included. To be considered acceptable, proponents must provide evidence of: • CE certification and the applicable design category; • The specific editions and parts of ISO 12217 and ISO 12215 used in the vessel's design and assessment; • Relevant stability, buoyancy, and structural compliance documentation; • Manufacturer declarations of conformity and supporting technical assessments; • Applicable independent conformity assessment documentation, where available; and • Confirmation that the proposed vessel satisfies the intended operational requirements specified in the RFP. It is a Mandatory Submission Requirement to provide evidence demonstrating compliance with the applicable ISO 12217 and ISO 12215 requirements. The RBRCG will consider CE certification as supporting evidence of compliance, subject to technical evaluation and verification of the applicable standards. The absence of separate ISO certification documents will not, by itself, disqualify a proponent, provided satisfactory equivalent documentation is submitted and all mandatory structural, stability, safety, and performance requirements are demonstrated. The RBRCG reserves the right to require additional technical information or independent verification before final vessel acceptance.

Question 12:	May an exclusive distributor (Colnago USA) submit the proposal with the shipyard (Colnago Marine, Split, Croatia) as builder, and in that case may the builder's experience and references be used to meet the qualification requirements?

Answer 12:	The RBRCG confirms that proposals may be submitted by an authorised distributor or representative acting in conjunction with an established vessel manufacturer. Section 1.3 of the RFP permits joint submissions, provided the proposal clearly identifies the party acting as the prime contractor. The relevant manufacturing experience, technical qualifications, and previous project references may be submitted as supporting evidence of the proposed team's ability to fulfil the contract. To be considered acceptable, proponents must provide: • Formal documentation confirming the distributor's authority to represent the manufacturer; • Identification of the legal entity acting as the prime contractor; • Details of the contractual relationship between the distributor and shipyard; • Evidence of the manufacturer's relevant vessel construction experience; • At least three comparable vessel projects, including verifiable client references; • Details of the manufacturer's technical capabilities, quality management procedures, and relevant certifications; and • Confirmation of the respective responsibilities for construction, delivery, commissioning, warranty, and after-sales support. The RBRCG will evaluate the combined capabilities of the proposed delivery team while ensuring that the prime contractor accepts responsibility for fulfilling the contractual requirements. The Government intends to enter into an agreement with one legal entity, as specified in Section 1.3 of the RFP.

Question 13:	Is there a target delivery date or a budget ceiling for the contract?
Answer 13:	The RBRCG confirms that the RFP does not establish a fixed vessel delivery date or disclose a maximum contract budget. Under Section 1.4, the anticipated execution of the agreement is scheduled for 5 February 2027, subject to the completion of the procurement and negotiation process. Proponents are required to provide a realistic project delivery schedule identifying all major stages of vessel construction and delivery. The budget is confidential and that proponents are to submit their most competitive pricing based on the requirements in Appendix D.

Question 14:	What payment schedule is expected (advance payment, factory acceptance, delivery and final acceptance milestones)?

Answer 14:	The RBRCG acknowledges that vessel construction contracts commonly incorporate milestone-based payment schedules linked to measurable project progress. The RFP does not prescribe a fixed percentage allocation for advance payments, construction milestones, Factory Acceptance Testing, delivery, or final acceptance. Payment arrangements will be addressed during contract negotiations with the selected proponent, consistent with the Government's procurement and financial requirements. Proponents may include a proposed milestone-based payment schedule within their commercial submission for consideration.

Question 15:	Which activities qualify as Local Benefits (for example a local partner, local labour, training or a local spare-parts store), and how are they scored?
Answer 15:	The RBRCG confirms that Local Benefits account for 30% of the total evaluation score, as outlined in Appendix D, Section F, of the RFP. The published evaluation criteria include the proponent's local business status, Bermudian workforce participation, use of local businesses and subcontractors, health and safety performance, and environmental policies.

Question 16:	Beyond US DOT compliance, what maximum trailer width and weight apply on Bermuda roads?
Answer 16:	The RBRCG confirms that compliance with US DOT requirements alone does not establish that a trailer is suitable for operation on Bermuda's public roads. Appendix D of the RFP requires the supplied trailer to be suitable for Bermuda's road network, including applicable restrictions relating to road width, bridge loading, and vehicle dimensions. The proposed 33–38-foot vessels are likely to exceed one or more of the standard dimensional or weight limits. Accordingly, proponents must not assume that a US DOT-compliant trailer or a conventional road permit will automatically authorise transportation of the completed vessel in Bermuda. Proponents are required to provide: • Trailer overall length, width, height, and unladen weight; • Maximum authorised trailer gross weight; • Vessel weight in the proposed transportation configuration; • Overall combined transportation dimensions; • Axle configuration and individual axle loading; • Towing vehicle requirements; and • Details of any special transport arrangements or permits anticipated. The RBRCG will assess the proposed trailer arrangement against operational requirements and applicable local transportation restrictions.

Question 17:	Are the stated deadlines 5:00 PM Bermuda local time (ADT), or Atlantic Standard Time?

Answer 17:	The RBRCG confirms that all submission deadlines are to be interpreted as 5:00 PM Bermuda local time on the dates specified in Section 1.4 of the RFP. Bermuda observes Atlantic Daylight Time (ADT) during the daylight saving period and Atlantic Standard Time (AST) during the remainder of the year.

Question 18:	Are minutes or a recording of the October 16 pre-proposal meeting available to proponents who did not attend?
Answer 18:	Webex meeting recording: RBRCG2026 - Vessel Procurement Pre-bid Meeting and Q&A-20261016 1724-1 Recording link *here* Password: cYRcq3YN

End of Addenda No, 1