

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 0A1 / Noyau 0A1
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
THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS SECURITY
REQUIREMENTS.

Vendor/Firm Name and Address
Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Science Procurement Directorate/Direction de
l'acquisition de travaux scientifiques
11C1, Phase III
Place du Portage
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet ARMOUR TDP	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W7714-115274/E	Amendment No. - N° modif. 007
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W7714-115274	Date 2013-05-23
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$\$V-051-25450	
File No. - N° de dossier 004sv.W7714-115274	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-05-30	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Kate Mulligan	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 004sv
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-1325 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 997-2229
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

This solicitation amendment is raised to:

- i. address any new questions received; and
- ii. incorporate applicable amendments into the solicitation document.

Questions and Answers

Q224.

Amendment 004 Clarifications (p.2/42) says

After further evaluation of the points allocated for achieving various levels of Canadian Content, Canada has decided that awarding points for Canadian Content ... does not provide any significant value to Canada. ... The appropriate sections of the solicitation are amended in the amendments to the solicitation in this solicitation amendment.

Please confirm that the amendments should have included deletion of Canadian Content Evaluation Criteria on RFP p.40/76.

A224.

Yes, the deletion of Canadian Content Evaluation Criteria on page 40 of 76 in the RFP should have been included in a solicitation amendment. The appropriate section of the solicitation is amended in the Amendments to the Solicitation section in this solicitation amendment.

Q225.

Upon review of the STS v2.2, we have noted that statement GR 29 appears to be more of an information statement as opposed to a requirement. Can the following statement be clarified? "The Data Presentation component provide an interface to various "Effectors" (interfaces to technologies that effectuate COAs)."

A225.

GR 29 from the STS table v2.2 should read as follows:

" The Data Presentation component **SHOULD** provide an interface to various "Effectors" (interfaces to technologies that effectuate COAs) "

An updated STS spreadsheet has been posted to the project sharepoint site. The STS spreadsheet is now at V2.3, dated May 23, 2013.

Q226.

RE: Question and Answer 220

The provision of a single blade server for ARMOUR in the CyberOps lab (question 220) and the statement from section 1.13 of Appendix A for the SoW: "Dependent vendor software that is not

part of the ARMOUR TD project development (e.g., COTS products integrated into the ARMOUR TD project solution) will be included as executable code only and contained in the VM image" indicates that the envisioned deployed architecture for ARMOUR is as a single VM (i.e. "the VM image"). Can DRDC confirm that the turnkey ARMOUR solution is meant to be a single VM?

A226.

The turnkey ARMOUR solution is required to be delivered as a virtual machine solution as specified by the RFP. This does not need to be a single VM system, but could span multiple systems, VM's or image files to deliver the complete solution. This architectural decision is left to the bidder to decide.

Q227.

Expectations for the ARMOUR project are leading to significant risk to both the Contractor and Canada.

These risks include the cost for labs on the bidders site; as well as the need to provision and support to 2 different environments for Canada and lastly lack of access DRENET until there is a demonstration planned date.

This then imposes bidders' assumptions about the target environment; including, estimates about the simulation of source data/effectors and behaviour that will be encountered in that environment; non available architecture and configuration details and simulation of the source data and effector behavior.

Given that integration is a complex yet critical step in the maturing of the solution and is essential for the success of the demonstrations, will DRDC reconsider allowing access to a production environment earlier in the project schedule? Meeting this need is deemed to be essential for risk management for the contractor and a critical success factor for DRDC. As well, permitting industry to leverage existing labs at DRDC would further reduce risk for all.

A227.

The ARMOUR project team has currently been granted use of the DREnet for the 3 demonstrations for the project as outlined in the RFP. Changes to the access to the DREnet are possible over the almost 4 year duration of the project, but these changes (if any occur) and what changes are needed to this access cannot be predicted at this time and are outside the control of the ARMOUR project team.

Provisioning and licenses for two labs was answered in **Q131** in Solicitation Amendment 005.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W7714-115274/E

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

007

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

004sv

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

W7714-115274

File No. - N° du dossier

004svW7714-115274

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

DRDC has permitted access to the labs and existing equipment on-site - please refer to **Q221** and **Q222** in Solicitation Amendment 006. Access to non-DRDC labs on-site was addressed in **Q220** in Solicitation Amendment 005.

Bidders have not been provided with details regarding the architecture and configuration of the DREnet in the bid process, as these items are Controlled Goods. The successful bidder will have access to this type of information prior to any demonstrations performed on the DREnet.

Amendments to the Solicitation

- 1) **Reference:** Attachment 4, Mandatory and Point Rated Criteria, Point Rated Evaluation Criteria on pages 39 and 40 of 76 of the solicitation
- Delete:** the Point Rated Evaluation Criteria Summary Table in its entirety; and
- Insert:** the following Point Rated Evaluation Criteria Summary Table to replace the above deletion:

Evaluation Criteria	Points	Min
<u>Technical, Management and Corporate Experience Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>90</u>
1.0 Architectural Design (Draft Architectural Design Document)	60	40
1.1 Understanding of the vision, objectives and scope	10	6
1.2 Adequacy of the technical solution	50	32
a) How solution meets capability requirements stated in System Technical Specification	20	14
b) How solution meets performance requirements stated in System Technical Specification	3	0
c) How solution aligns with open standards	4	0
d) How solution aligns with identified security standards	4	0
e) Ability to meet technology challenges	10	5
f) Level of COTS incorporated into the proposed solution	5	0
g) Level of risk associated with technical aspects of the solution	4	0
2.0 Management Proposal	40	30
2.1 Project Management Plan	18	12
a) Development Approach and Risk Mitigation	5	0
b) Work plan and schedule	6	0
c) Quality Management System	4	0
d) Resource Allocation and Control	3	0
2.2 Personnel	22	16
2.2.1 Project Manager	7	4
a) Experience	3	0
b) Education and Credentials	2	0
c) Technical Expertise	2	0
2.2.2 Key Technical Personnel	15	10
a) Relevant IT Security experience	3	0
b) Education and Credentials	2	0
c) Computer Network Defence Experience	4	0
d) Experience developing open architectures and using relevant technology standards	3	0
e) Experience using relevant security standards	3	0
3.0 Corporate Experience	30	8

3.1 Corporate Experience of the Bidder	17	0
3.1.1 Relevance of Bidder's core business lines	4	0
3.1.2 Establishing and managing integrated project teams involving subcontractors	4	0
3.1.3 Demonstrated Experience in IT or CND Software Development and Integration Projects	5	0
3.1.4 Demonstrated Experience in IT Project Deployment	4	0
3.2 Corporate Experience of Proposed Team	13	0
3.2.1 Test Environment Setup and Data Population	5	0
3.2.2 Demonstrated Experience providing Certification and Accreditation Support Services	4	0
3.2.3 Demonstrated Experience providing Open Source Software Project or Open Architecture Promotion and Support	4	0

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.