

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

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Informatics Professional Services Division / Division
des services professionnels en informatique
11 Laurier St., / 11, rue Laurier
3C2, Place du Portage
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

| | |
|--|--|
| Title - Sujet SIMULATION ENGINE/GUI DEVELOPMENT | |
| Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W7714-125376/A | Amendment No. - N° modif. 004 |
| Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W7714-125376 | Date 2013-07-18 |
| GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZM-613-26040 | |
| File No. - N° de dossier 613zm.W7714-125376 | CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME |
| Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-08-02 | |
| Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT | |
| 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: Pierre, Anoule | Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 613zm |
| Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-2137 () | FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-1207 |
| Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE NDHQ - DRDC - CORA MAJOR GENERAL GEORGE R. PEARKES BLDG 101 COLONEL BY DRIVE, 8 FLR CBC OTTAWA, ON K1A0K2 | |

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 |

SOLICITATION No.: W7714-125376/A**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)****FOR CONTRACT AGAINST A SUPPLY ARRANGEMENT****FOR SOLUTIONS-BASED INFORMATICS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES (SBIPS)****REQUIRED BY****DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE (DND)****AMENDMENT NO. 4**

This amendment is raised to answer bidder's questions and to extend the closing date to August 2nd, 2013.

1. BIDDER'S QUESTIONS:

| Question No. | Question | Response |
|---------------------|---|---|
| 11 | Can the crown validate that the Software User Manual needs to be written in both English and French? | The language of this contract is English only. All communications and deliverables, including documentation, must be in English only. |
| 12 | Can the crown validate that the Computer Programming Manual needs to be written in both English and French? | Same as response # 11 above. |
| 13 | Can the crown validate that the existing prototype currently implement import and export of Table part data from a MS SQL Server database? | No, both import and export of Table part data from a MS SQL Server database are not yet implemented in the prototype. |
| 14 | Can the crown validate that the existing prototype currently implement import and export of Table part data from a MS Access database? | Yes, both import and export of Table part data from a MS Access database have been implemented in the prototype. |
| 15 | Will the crown allow access to an instance of Target 3 (an HPC Cluster) for the purposes of development and testing of the Application, as well as for the final demonstration? | Direct access to the crown HPC Cluster will not be granted to the contractor. The crown HPC cluster will not be available for development of the Application. All testing of the Application and demonstrations using the crown HPC Cluster |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | | will be conducted by the crown. At the discretion of the crown, arrangements can be made for the contractor to observe testing and demonstrations at crown facilities. |
| 16 | The simulation engine must be implemented using Python such that it can be run either independently or via a GUI. However, the GUI performance, stability, test coverage, and extendibility could be greatly improved – and implementation cost decreased – if the GUI were implemented using a statically typed object-oriented language such as C# and a modern windowing library such as Windows Presentation Foundation instead of in Python. Many options exist to integrate Python and C# in the same simulation environment. Would the Crown deem such an approach acceptable? | Yes, we are open to another approach on the conditions that the contractor can demonstrate that the alternatives do not introduce disadvantages (technical or otherwise) and that the research team agrees to the alternatives. |
| 17 | According to the answer to Question 8 in Amendment No 2, the performance state of the R4 HR prototype against the acceptance criteria Measure SE-3 on p50 is unknown. Will the crown be open to reducing the pass criteria factor (0.75) in Measure SE-3 during SRR, PDR or CDR if an analysis of the performance of the R4 HR prototype indicates that it will be technically difficult or impossible to achieve Measure SE-3 using the mandated development language? | We have considered that the pass factor of 0.75 in Measure SE-3 is a reasonable and conservative value. Therefore, we do not intend to reduce the value. If the contractor can demonstrate that the pass factor is impossible to achieve during implementation, the pass factor could be adjusted. |
| 18 | Will the crown be able to make the various test scenarios and logically equivalent scenarios in Arena and Simio specified in Measure SE-3 on p50 available on or before the kickoff meeting to allow an assessment as to whether it will be technically difficult or impossible to achieve Measure SE-3 using the mandated development language prior to SRR? | No. Test scenarios and logically equivalent scenarios will not be provided in advance of or during the kickoff meeting. The appropriate dates for provision of such files will be determined at the kickoff meeting. |
| 19 | Will the crown be able to make copies of Arena and Simio available on or before the kickoff meeting to allow an assessment as to whether it will be technically difficult or impossible to | No. We will not provide copies of third party licensed software to the contractor. If a bidder anticipates a requirement for |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | achieve Measure SE-3 using the mandated development language prior to SRR? | copies of Arena and Simio, the costs to procure and maintain such licenses for the duration of the contract must be borne by the bidder. The bidder may include such anticipated costs in the bid price. At our discretion, arrangements may be made for the contractor to observe execution of Arena and Simio at crown facilities. |
| 20 | Is the existing R4 HR prototype considered to pass each of the subjective acceptance test measures MG-1, MG-2, MG-3, MG-5, MG-6, RG-1, RG-2, RG-3 and RG-4? For each case in which it does not, can an example application that does pass be provided as per the answer to Question 9 in Amendment No. 2? | The existing R4 HR prototype passes the following acceptance test measures: MG-1, and MG-2. For MG-3, model integration in the presence of multiple clocks and model verification have not been tested; the prototype passes all other MG-3 sub-measures. MG-5 and MG-6 have not been evaluated due to the very limited debugging and help capability in the existing R4 HR prototype. Measures RG-1 through RG-4 have not been evaluated due to the very limited reporting capabilities within the existing R4 HR prototype. No example application can be provided. |
| 21 | The SOW indicates that events are queued as a result of Code parts calling the signal() function, but it does not indicate any mechanism to generate the first event, ie to determine what is the first Code part to call, before any Code part has been executed. For instance, does the sim engine automatically queue an event for each Code part of the root actor; is one of the code parts of the model marked as "main"; etc. | In the current prototype you manually choose one function, right click to bring up a menu, and choose "run" to generate the first event. There is no requirement to identify one function as a special "main" function. |
| 22 | The SOW does not specify how to decide when | In the current prototype, a |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | a simulation ends: when the event queue is empty, when some built-in function is called, etc. Please clarify | simulation which is running in response to a "run to completion" instruction (chosen from a menu item) will continue until the event queue is empty, or a significant error is encountered which halts execution. |
| 23 | Will the Crown accept a schedule for the Fixed Price portion that is longer than 12 months if it results in an overall reduction in the cost of the Fixed Price portion? | No. We do not wish to extend the Fixed Price portion. |
| 24 | Can Crown confirm that when the user saves a scenario, in current prototype, and selects which model version to save to, the prototype creates a completely new copy of the model in the scenario file (such that existing versions of the model can still be edited later)? | If an existing model name is used, any older version of the model with the same name is overwritten when the new model is saved to the same location. If a model is saved to a new location where there is no model having the same name, then no model is overwritten. Any existing versions of a model, which have not been overwritten, can be accessed and edited later. |
| 25 | With respect to Mandatory Criteria 2.2, can the crown confirm that the primary resources are the same list of resources in table 1, Part II of Annex B? | Using a fixed-price approach, we are asking the bidder to realize Build 1 with whatever resources the bidder deems necessary. We are not specifying the composition of the team for Build 1. Therefore, the team that the bidder assembles may or may not be the same as the list of resources outlined in table 1, Part II of Annex B. |
| 26 | Can the crown confirm that the per diem rates requested in Annex B are daily per diems based on a 7.5 hour work day? | Yes, the per diem rates are based on a 7.5-hour work day. |

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED.