

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 A SECURITY
REQUIREMENT

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
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
11C1, Place du Portage
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Mercury Global Anchor Stations	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W8474-14MG25/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 016
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8474-14MG25	Date 2013-10-24
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ST-006-26331	
File No. - N° de dossier 006st.W8474-14MG25	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-10-31	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: Thorsley, Mark	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 006st
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-1772 ()	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 amendment is raised to address the following:

- To respond to questions received during the solicitation period; and
- To revise the solicitation accordingly, as applicable.

Questions and Answers

Q140 IRB Requirements, Section 5.1.3; Amendment #9, A67 Direct IRB Transactions

- In light of Canada's response A67, it is clear that the ISS contract is not a pure service contract; A67 requires significant non-Canadian hardware content. In light of that concept, the requirement to provide 80% Canadian content is not realistic.
- We note that there are differing amounts of potential Canadian content in the ISS baseline contract vs. the ISS options. A67 further amplifies the amount of non-Canadian content in the baseline ISS contract (including price line item E option periods). The majority of the potential ISS Canadian content will only be achieved if Canada exercises the Operating Support options. We recognize that Canada is not in a position to guarantee exercising of those options.

In light of the above, we recommend that Canada revise the Direct IRB transaction requirement to 50%.

A140 Industry Canada sets a Direct IRB requirement after seeking input from industry, conducting a market and potential bidder analysis and consulting with government stakeholders. The 80% direct requirement on the ISS contract can be achieved through Direct and /or Global Value Chain (GVC) transactions . GVC is an indirect transaction on an approved platform that can be counted towards the direct IRB requirement. For further information on GVC, please visit our website at www.ic.gc.ca/irb.

Q141 1.8.2 Provide supply support services "Sourcing i.e. finding sources of supply of required parts" and "Purchasing (or obtaining from DND), receipt, acceptance and issue of items"

We recommend that you re-write this section to clearly define the contractor obligation to deliver required parts. We recommend that you delete and re-write the phrasing that refers to "services", "sourcing", "finding sources of supply", and "purchasing".

A141 This section has been amended as per items 9 and 10 below to clarify the Contractor requirements to deliver required parts.

Q142 1.8.3 Obligation to Hold Inventory

We recommend that you delete this requirement. It is sufficient that you intend to hold the contractor to an availability requirement.

A142 This section has been amended as per item 11 below to clarify the support requirements.

Q143 Attachment 2 (Rev 2) -Financial Bid Presentation Sheet, Amendment #9, Amendment #10 A75 and Solicitation Revision 11

Price Line Item for ISS RMC Support option

Please clarify whether ISS Option 1 (RMC support) is to be included in line item E or line item F. We have recommended a clarifying course of action below, and explanation of the cause of the current ambiguity.

The Amendments appear to contradict one another and create ambiguity with respect to the price presentation of the RMC Support option.

The following items appear to indicate that as an option, it should be priced in Line Item (F), per Attachment 2, paragraph I2:

- a. Amendment 9, ISS Paragraph I2 (RMC, per ISS SOW Sec 1.13.1) identifies that the annual price is to be extended for 6 years (years 2-7 of the initial contract period) under Price F.
- b. Amendment 10 A75 states that Option 1 for RMC (1.13.1) may be exercised any time after anchor stations are accepted.

However, the following items appear to indicate that the same option should be included as CORE work in Line Item (E), per Attachment 2, paragraph I1:

- c. Amendment #10, Solicitation Revision paragraph 11 states that 1.13.1.1 RMC support is to be provided as Core work.
- d. Amendment #9, A70(c) indicates that Basis of Payment for ISS (Item E) includes Core RMC (Section 1.4.3) in the years 2 through 7.

If our understanding of your intent is correct, then we recommend that you clarify as follows:

- None of RMC Support (SOW 1.4.3), Mission Planning Support (SOW 1.4.4), or Early Access Operating Support (SOW 1.5.1) should be priced in Line Item E. (Attachment 2, Para I1)
- RMC Support (SOW 1.4.3), Mission Planning Support (SOW 1.4.4), and Early Access Support (SOW 1.5.1), for the Initial Contract Period, should be priced in one (or more) as-yet non-existent but separate line item(s).
- Existing paragraph I2, in Attachment 2, should be corrected to describe the RMC option (SOW Para 1.13.1) starting at Year 8, with ISS Option Period 1, and then evaluated over 10 years (similar to paragraph I3).

A143 ISS SOW 1.13.1.1 was amended in item 12 of Amendment 14 to remove the reference to "Core". It is noted however that A70(a) indicated that the optional work in 1.13.1 "...begins after the option is exercised by Canada during the contract period, including options if exercised...". The optional work in 1.13.1 will not be exercised during the option periods. The table in Q163 below provides additional clarity.

Q144 Amendment #10, Solicitation Amendment Para 11 - Typographical error wrt RMC reference

In Solicitation Revision Paragraph 11, the revision to ISS SOW sec 1.13.1.1 erroneously makes reference to Section 1.4.4.3 (Mission Planning). We recommend that you correct the reference to point to Section 1.4.3 (RMC).

A144 This was corrected in Amendment 14.

Q145 Amendment #13, A113

Canada contacts at ARSTRAT for WGS Certification Testing Fee

Please provide appropriate contacts at ARSTRAT who can provide Bidders with firm-fixed price quotes for the WGS certification and testing.

- A145 As previously indicated, the full cost of certification is to be borne by the contractor. Canada is the point of contact for industry to obtain certification cost quotes from US ARSTRAT once in contract. For the purposes of bid preparation it is difficult to provide a single cost estimate that covers all circumstances as price varies dependent on several factors including the current level (phase) of certification of the bidders solution, possible variance of design from anchor station to anchor station, and unforeseen technical challenges encountered in the certification process. Of note, once a terminal type has been certified, all other terminals in the same configuration are granted Type Certification at no additional cost. Any technical variance from a certified configuration requires a "Delta Certification", which is a fraction of the cost of a full terminal certification dependent on the level of technical variance from the previously certified terminal type.

At a minimum it is anticipated that bidder solutions will require a delta certification (if fully certified terminal solution). The typical cost for a full single terminal certification is in the order of US\$250K. Actual cost will vary on a case-by-case basis in accordance with the bidders proposed design.

- Q146 ISS SOW, Section 1.5.1.1; Amendment #10, A76, Early Access Monitoring and Control Infrastructure

Amendment #10, A76 states that Canada will provide the requested information after contract award. That leaves bidders having to make assumptions in their firm-fixed price bids, which leaves Canada exposed to ECPs after contract award. Please provide the requested information so that Bidders may provide complete and accurate FFP bids.

For convenience, original request repeated here:

"The ISS SOW requires the contractor to provide a SATCOM Operator to provide SGT remote monitoring and control for two years. Please provide all of the necessary background details of the Crown's existing local (SGTs at three sites) and remote (SCOC in Ottawa) monitoring and control infrastructure."

- A146 This configuration is currently under definition and has not been implemented at this time. By the start of the Early Access phase contractor personnel will be expected to work at an existing opp center in Ottawa using existing equipment and monitoring tools. Current configuration cannot be modified and no new hardware or new software can be added to the site.

- Q147 ISS SOW, Section 1.5.1.3; Amendment #10, A77, Early Access Security Architecture

Amendment #10, A77 states that Canada will provide the requested information after contract award. That leaves bidders having to make assumptions in their firm-fixed price bids, which leaves Canada exposed to ECPs after contract award. Please provide the requested information so that Bidders may provide complete and accurate FFP bids.

For convenience, original question is repeated here:

"The ISS SOW requires that the Contractor must not compromise the security architecture and C&A of the system as a whole or any individual information systems supporting the MGAS. Please provide all of the necessary information on the SGT security architecture such that an assessment may be made."

- A147 The current configuration cannot be modified and no new hardware or new software can be added to the sites.
- Q148 ISS SOW, Section 1.5.2; Amendment #10, A79, Early Access GFE for Maintenance Support Amendment #10, A79 states that Canada will provide the requested information after contract award. That leaves bidders having to make assumptions in their firm-fixed price bids, which leaves Canada exposed to ECPs after contract award. Please provide the requested information so that Bidders may provide complete and accurate FFP bids.

For convenience, original question is repeated here:

"The ISS SOW requires that the Contractor provide maintenance support for Early Access. Please outline the details of any GFE related to the L-3 Com terminals, such as system configuration, and existing Crown-owned spares and consumables."

- A148 Canada currently maintains three L3 LMMA Terminals; one in each DND site at Halifax, Esquimalt and Kingston. DND currently has three sets of OEM recommended Spare sets for these terminals.

- Q149 ISS SOW Appendix 4; Amendment #9, A67, ISS DIDs to address scope of A67
Further to earlier suggestions to clarify the ISS SOW with respect to Canada's intent as described in A67, we further recommend that Canada update some of the ISS DIDs to specifically address, or reflect, the scope of A67. Specifically we recommend the following:

a. ISS Management Plan (ISS-PM-001)

We recommend that you expand the ISS MP DID to specifically address the contractor obligations for lifecycle costs and expected deliverables as described in A67.

b. Contract Status Report (ISS-PM-002)

In light of the intent that the Contractor has complete responsibility for lifecycle costs, and in particular those associated with Maintenance Support and Supply Support, those sections of the DID seem misaligned with Canada's intent. We recommend that you consider deleting or simplify.

c. Obsolescence Management Report (ISS-SE-004).

The intent of this report, as described by the DID, does not seem consistent with Canada's intent, as expressed in A67. The Obsolescence Management Report requires tradeoff analyses and DND involvement in obsolescence management decisions, whereas A67 intends that the contractor is responsible for obsolescence management and more importantly, the related life cycle costs. Given the intent of A67, we believe the Contract Status Report (above) provides a sufficient mechanism for reporting on the Contractor plans; we recommend that you delete ISS-SE-004.

- A149 a. Canada confirms that the content of the ISS Management Plan (ISS-PM-001) DID is correct and no update is required.
- b. The Contract Status Report (ISS-PM-002) DID has been amended as per item 12 below to better align with the support requirements.
- c. The Obsolescence Management Report (ISS-SE-004) DID has been amended as per item 13 below to clarify the requirements. Note that the Contractors obsolescence

management issues are to be discussed with Canada during the ISS phase in order to coordinate and plan any future potential technology insertions.

Q150 Amendment #9, Q/A67; DAB SOW Sec 6.2; DAB Spec Sec 2.3; ISS SOW Sec 1.7.6; RFP W8474-14MG25/A Part 7, Para 2 and Part 8, Para 2

Warranty

In light of your response A67:

1. Please confirm that warranty is not a relevant concept, as the ISS contractor is required to repair or replace any malfunctioning equipment, regardless of cause or time frame, or clarify that the warranty applies until the end of the ISS contract, and any additional exercised options as applicable.
2. We recommend that you modify DAB SOW Sec 6.2 to remove references to the warranty period (4 references).
3. We recommend that you modify DAB Spec Sec 2.3 to remove references to the warranty period (4 references).
4. We recommend that you remove ISS SOW Sec 1.7.6 in its entirety.
5. In Part 7, we recommend that you clarify the applicability of SACC 2030 22 (Warranty) and SACC 4001 14 (Warranty) as it applies to the DAB contract and the following 17 years.
6. In Part 8, if you require the contractor to deliver goods that are not covered under the DAB contract, then we recommend that you also use SACC 2030 in concert with the clarification above
7. In Part 8, we recommend that you clarify the applicability of SACC 4001 14 (Warranty) as it applies to the ISS contract through it 17-year life.

A150 Canada can confirm that the warranty is not relevant as the ISS Contractor is required to repair or replace the MGAS equipment throughout the ISS contract period.

The contractor is to incorporate any MGAS equip warranties into their ISS Solution. Solicitation amendment 14 incorporated many of these clarifications regarding warranty. The solicitation has been further clarified as amended as per items 2, 3 and 4 below.

Q151 Part 8; ISS SOW; Amendment #9, Q/A67

Clarify ISS SOW

The ISS SOW and Ts&Cs as written do not describe Canada's intent as you described in your A67. We believe that this will leave Canada prone to getting a wide range of responses, based on variable interpretations of the ambiguities in the SOW, leaving Canada prone to ECPs from the winning contractor. We believe that it will be in Canada's best interest, and that of all bidders, for Canada to amend the ISS SOW to clarify the contractor's responsibilities per A67.

We have previously provided detailed recommendations that we believe would bring more clarity to the ISS SOW. The main concepts and principles are:

- a. Use language that clearly and unambiguously describes contractor's obligation to
 - repair & overhaul repairable equipment
 - replace non-repairable equipment
 - provide consumables
 - replace equipment at end of life
 - provide replacement equipment for obsolete items

- provide software upgrade

b. In Section 4, Deliverables, identify, at the high-level, the contractor deliverable obligations. E.g.:

- Replacement equipment, whether for non-repairables, end-of-life, or obsolete equipment replacement
- Consumables

c. Delete references to warranty from the SOWs (both DAB and ISS)

d. In the Ts&Cs, clarify applicability of warranty.

A151 In response to this comment, please refer to the various questions and subsequent amendments included in this amendment and previously in Amendments 14 and 15.

Q152 ISS Basis of Payment; Amendment #10, Q/A81

Operational Availability Adjustments based on Propagation Link Availability

We respectfully disagree with Canada's response A81, and assert that it is not reasonable for the Government of Canada to expect industry to absorb financial risks that are clearly beyond the contractor's control. Contractors may have provided a system that meets or exceeds all system performance criteria, yet be penalized due to propagation problems (e.g., bad weather). Canada is at risk of bidders including the monthly penalty in their bid price (as a cost to Canada) because of the unmanageable and unpredictable risk in the propagation link. The method of link analysis is a statistical measure, widely accepted as an objective standard by which to estimate and assess performance of an RF system, but not considered to be a method of accurately predicting real-world performance.

There are a number of problems with trying to use a statistical model as real-world performance criteria. We have described some of the problems inherent in such approach.

A152 It is Canada's intent at this time to retain the status quo with respect to Operational Availability (including the impact from RF propagation effects) and performance-based payment. This key performance-based criterion will be evaluated as part of the bidding process and, subsequently, is required to be monitored on an on-going basis. Canada understands that there are technical challenges to maintaining RF communication services due to atmospheric effects; and that the ITU-R RF statistics are empirical in nature with its own set of practical interpretation. However, this is considered an industry-accepted approach for analysis and agreement of SATCOM service availability. Note that Canada's objective is not to be unreasonably demanding with respect to applying the impact of abnormal circumstances to operational availability.

Q153 ISS Basis of Payment; Amendment #10, Q/A81

Minimum-of-minimums for Availability Adjustment

We recommend that Canada reconsider the minimum-of-minimums approach of determining payment thresholds and assessing performance. The Minimum-of-minimums method has unintended consequences for Canada that work against DND's overall operational goals. Because the contractor is only paid based on the worst performing station, the Contractor is not incentivized to maximize the availability of the other stations. Nor is there an ability for the contractor to make up for lost availability on one station by outperforming at another. The net result may be reduced availability across the network.

We recommend an approach that assesses performance across the entire ground segment.

- A153 Canada notes the concern; however, the resulting contractor's objective is to ensure that the minimum performing Anchor Station meets the contracted guaranteed Availability. It is Canada's expectation that the resulting contractor is obligated to ensure that all other Anchor Station will perform better than the minimum performing station.

- Q154 ISS Basis of Payment; Amendment #10, Q/A81

Calculation of thresholds for Availability Adjustment

If Canada uses the Minimum-of-minimums method, then the proposed roll-up method is mathematically incorrect. If each of 7 anchor stations achieves 99.5% operational availability (i.e. meets the mandatory requirement), then the overall ground segment will inherently have a lesser operational availability of approximately 99.18% for payment threshold. 99.18% would become the minimum threshold for the 10% threshold, and the 5% threshold should be derived from the actual contractor bids, but in any case would be less than the bid operational availability for any single anchor station.

- A154 Noted. Canada is satisfied with the current approach and will make no changes.

- Q155 Amendment 13, A112; RFP Annex B - DAB Basis of Payment; DAB SOW Milestone Payments in Table 8-1

Aligning DAB work, payments, and evaluation criteria

We recommend that Canada tie RFP Annex B DAB Milestone Payments I1, I2, and I3 to DAB SOW Table 8-1 Gate Deliverables I1.2, I2.2, and I3.2, respectively. Note this is contrary to A112 which might be interpreted as simply completing Gate Deliverables I1, I2, and I3 – i.e., where the contractor would get paid these three significant DAB milestone payments by simply completing the TERR (largely delivering boxes of equipment to site). For clarity to bidders, we recommend updating the Annex B Milestone No. column to read I1.2, I2.2, and I3.2 (rather than I1, I2, and I3).

We believe that this proposed Milestone Payment/Gate Deliverable alignment matches what Canada had intended – that the contractor would receive these significant DAB milestone payments when the sites are complete, including Site Construction, Equipment Installation, and Integration.

- A155 Noted. The associated milestone tables in the DAB SOW and Basis of Payment have been updated as per items 5 and 8 below

- Q156 Amendment #14, contains the following new text for Annex G, In-Service Support - Statement of Work, section 3.0, subsection 1.13.1.1:

"The Contractor must provide this operational support (see Section 1.4.3 of this Annex) beginning after the Anchor Stations have been accepted by Canada. This is an additional 24/7/365 resource requirement to that identified in 1.4.3."

This new version of 1.13.1.1 is a conflicting sentence. It says the Contractor must provide operational support 1.4.3 in addition to the requirement identified in 1.4.3. Does this mean that the optional item 1.13.1.1 would require double remote monitoring and control? Does Canada require

two sets of M&C staff, one for section 1.4.3 and a second for 1.13.1.1 during the same time period or are they in different time periods?

Also, the financial bid instructions requests a CORE ISS price for each year (1-7) and then an optional Remote Monitor & Control price for Year 2 only which is multiplied by 6 (i.e. Years 2-7). During Years 2-7, how many M&C personnel are required, how many are contained with the CORE ISS price, and how many are contained with the optional price (Year 2)?

A156 The intent of this sentence is to provide Canada with an option for an additional M&C resource. The option may be exercised at some point after the Anchor Stations have been accepted by Canada. Furthermore, the intention of this option is to provide Canada with an additional operational support resources over and above that included in the core contract identified in section 1.4.3. The references were intended to clarify that this option is to provide Canada with an additional resource to that identified in core. Therefore, Canada does not believe the sentence is conflicting.

Q157 Part 7 – DAB Resulting Contract Clauses; Para 2.2 – Supplemental Conditions; SACC 4006 04

Extent of Canada's right to Background IP

Please confirm that Canada's rights to Background IP, as described in SACC 4006 04, Clauses 3 and 4, is limited to "the Background Information to the extent that it is reasonably necessary for Canada to exercise fully all its rights in the deliverables and in the Foreground Information", as stated in Clause 1.

In particular, please confirm that in the case of this project, with respect to the COTS equipment, the Background Information reasonably necessary to meet this requirement is limited to:

- Operations and maintenance manuals
- Training Materials
- External interface specifications

A157 Noted. Canada assesses it is too early to make that determination at this time. Canada maintains its rights to Background IP as per the Terms and Conditions.

Q158 Part 6, Amendment #2

Bid Security Requirement for names

In light of your clarification as part of Amendment #2, whereby you require the listed conditions of Paragraph #1 before award of contract, please confirm that bidders are no longer required to provide names of individuals with their bids, per item 1(c).

A158 Correct. The applicable text has been amended as per item 1 below.

Q159 SACC 4001 10 (2008-05-12) Acceptance

Duplicate/conflicting requirements and schedules for Acceptance create ambiguity

Given that the process and testing for Acceptance of DAB deliverables is provided for in the DAB SOW, we recommend that SACC 4001 10 (2008-05-12) Acceptance be deleted.

A159 Partially agreed. The referenced SACC clause has been amended as per items 3 and 4 below.

Q160 SACC 4001 Part V - Additional Conditions

Duplicate/conflicting requirements for Maintenance create ambiguity

Given that the Maintenance Requirements are specified in the ISS SOW, we recommend that SACC 4001 Part V - Additional Conditions: Maintenance be deleted.

A160 Partially agreed. The referenced SACC clause has been amended as per items 3 and 4 below.

Q161 Evaluation Plan Table A4.2.6: Delivery Date evaluation Clearly defining "Complete" for purposes of DAB evaluation We note that the Evaluation Plan DAB Rated Criteria in Table A4.2.6 does not contain a clear definition of "Complete" nor any direct linkage with the DAB SOW and milestone payments. This leaves bidders with responsibility to define "complete" for themselves, creating challenges for Canada to fairly evaluate compliant bids.

We recommend that Canada clearly tie the evaluation of a bidder's ability to be "complete" as fulfilling the requirements of Gate Deliverables I1.2, I2.2, and I3.2. (If Canada concurs with Q51 above, it would also then correctly align the Evaluation Plan to both the DAB SOW and the DAB milestone payments.)

This could be as simple as adding a note to Table A4.2.6 that "Complete" is defined as having achieved I1.2, I2.2, and I3.2 for the respective sites.

A161 An Anchor Site is considered complete when all milestones in accordance with DAB SOW Table 8-1 for each Anchor Site have been achieved.

Q162 Part 6, Para 1(c); Part 7, Section 3; SRCL

Security - Classified or protected information and sensitive work sites

Please confirm that system logs, error reports, diagnostic results, and other information required for system maintenance and related monitoring will not be classified.

A162 Information required for system maintenance and monitoring is not expected to be classified; however, the potential always exists for some information to become operationally sensitive at a future time - System Logs often fall into this category. If this occurs, Canada will work with the contractor to develop appropriate processes and procedures.

Q163 Attachment B; ISS SOW; Amendment #9 A70 & Attachment 2; Amendment #10 A75-79; Amendment #14

Operations Support - Options, Baseline, and Evaluation

For the purposes of clarity for all bidders, please confirm that the table below accurately and completely summarizes the scope and price evaluation for the operations support services that bidders are to provide in their proposals.

In summary, Price Line Item E includes RMC support 24/7/365 and Mission Planning support 8/5, for the full 17 years, and the two options provide additional support on top of that.

If not, please provide clarifications.

Baseline/ Option	Price Line Item	References	Service	Level of Effort	Evaluate d Price Time Period	Price Line Item
CORE (Baseline)	E	a. ISS SOW Sec 3, Subsection 1.5.1 - Early Access - Operating Support; b. Amendment #10, SR Para 9.	MC	24/7/365	2 years, starting at 3 MACA	FFP
CORE (Baseline) - Initial Contract Period		a. ISS SOW Sec 3, Subsection 1.4.3 - CORE RMC b. Amendment #9, A70	RMC	24/7/365	Initial Contract Period, starting at MGAS Acceptance	
CORE - Option Period 1			RMC	24/7/365	Option Period 1 (5 years)	
CORE - Option Period 2			RMC	24/7/365	Option Period 2 (5 years)	
CORE (Baseline) - Initial Contract Period		a. ISS SOW Sec 3, Subsection 1.4.4 - CORE Mission Planning b. Amendment #9, A70	MP	8/5	Initial Contract Period (7 years)	
CORE - Option Period 1			MP	8/5	Option Period 1 (5 years)	
CORE - Option Period 2			MP	8/5	Option Period 2 (5 years)	
Option 1 - Initial Contract Period	F	a. ISS SOW Sec 3, Subsection 1.13.1 - Additional RMC Support b. Amendment #9, A70 c. Amendment #14 #14, SR Para 12	RMC	24/7/365	6 years	Annual EPA from Year 2 price
Option 2 - Option Period 1 and Option Period 2	G	a. ISS SOW Sec 3, Subsection 1.13.2 - Mission Planning b. Amendment #9, A70	MP	8/5	Option Periods 1 and 2 (10 years)	Annual EPA from Year 8 price

MC - Monitoring and Control

RMC - Remote Monitoring and Control

MP - Mission Planning

EPA - Economic Price Adjustment

A163 The table that describes the scope and price evaluation for the operations support services that bidders are to provide in their proposals is correct as it stands from the contractor.

Q164 DAB SOW 7.4; Amendment #14 Q/A122 and SR Para #8 (ISS SOW Section 1.3.1, Table 1-1)**Provision of Spares**

In light of Amendment #14, please clarify DAB SOW Paragraph 7.4, please confirm that, given that all spares and consumables are to be Contractor-owned, per the amended ISS SOW, then the items identified in Paragraph 7.4 of the DAB SOW are not deliverables to Canada under the DAB contract.

Further, given Canada's concept in A67, and contractor ownership of spares and consumables, we recommend that you delete Paragraph 7.4 from the DAB SOW. The ISS SOW should be sufficient to address contractor obligations in this regard.

A164 Noted. Sub-section 7.4 and related CDRL and DID DAB-ILS-002 have been removed from the DAB SOW as per items 6 and 7 below.

Solicitation Revisions**1. At Part 6 - Security, Financial and Other Requirements, item 1(c)**

DELETE: bid

INSERT: contract award

2. At Part 7 - Resulting Contract Clauses - Design and Build, clause 2.1 General Conditions:

DELETE: 2030 (2013-06-27), General Conditions, Higher Complexity - Goods, apply to and form part of the Contract.

INSERT: 2030 (2013-06-27), General Conditions, Higher Complexity - Goods, apply to and form part of the Contract with the following modifications:

DELETE: Section 22 - Warranty

3. At Part 7 - Resulting Contract Clauses - Design and Build, clause 2.2 Supplemental General Conditions

DELETE: 4001 (2013-01-28), Hardware Purchase, Lease and Maintenance, with the following modifications:

Section 08 - Minimum Availability Level Requirement - DELETED

Section 09 - Availability-Level Testing Before Acceptance - DELETED

INSERT: 4001 (2013-01-28), Hardware Purchase, Lease and Maintenance, with the following modifications:

DELETE: Section 08 - Minimum Availability Level Requirement

DELETE: Section 09 - Availability-Level Testing Before Acceptance

DELETE: Items 3 and 4 of Section 10 - Acceptance

DELETE: Section 14 - Warranty for Purchased Hardware

-
- DELETE: Items 1.a, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of Section 25 - Hardware Maintenance Service,
 INSERT: Item 1.a of Section 25 - Hardware Maintenance Service as follows:
 a. for Hardware purchased under the Contract, the complete contract period;
 DELETE: Section 26 - Classes of Hardware Maintenance
4. At Part 8 - Resulting Contract Clauses - In-Service Support, clause 2.2 Supplemental General Conditions
- DELETE: 4001 (2013-01-28), Hardware Purchase, Lease and Maintenance, with the following modifications:
 Section 08 - Minimum Availability Level Requirement - DELETED
 Section 09 - Availability-Level Testing Before Acceptance - DELETED
- INSERT: 4001 (2013-01-28), Hardware Purchase, Lease and Maintenance, with the following modifications:
 DELETE: Section 08 - Minimum Availability Level Requirement
 DELETE: Section 09 - Availability-Level Testing Before Acceptance
 DELETE: Items 3 and 4 of Section 10 - Acceptance
 DELETE: Section 14 - Warranty for Purchased Hardware
 DELETE: Items 1.a, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of Section 25 - Hardware Maintenance Service,
 INSERT: Item 1.a of Section 25 - Hardware Maintenance Service as follows:
 a. for Hardware purchased under the Contract, the complete contract period;
 DELETE: Section 26 - Classes of Hardware Maintenance
- DELETE: 4012 (2013-07-16), Goods - Higher Complexity
 DELETE: Section 3 - Warranty
5. At Annex A - Statement of Work - Design and Build, Table 8-1:
 DELETE: In its entirety
 INSERT: Table 8-1 attached hereto.
6. At Annex A - Statement of Work - Design and Build, subsection 7.4:
 DELETE: In its entirety
7. At Annex A - Statement of Work - Design and Build, Appendix 4, DID DAB-ILS-002:
 DELETE: In its entirety
8. At Annex B - Basis of Payment - Design and Build:
 DELETE: In its entirety
 INSERT: Annex B - Basis of Payment - Design and Build (Rev. 2) attached hereto.

9. At Annex G, Statement of Work - In-Service Support, Section 3.0, subsection 1.8.1

DELETE In its entirety

10. At Annex G, Statement of Work - In-Service Support, Section 3.0, subsection 1.8.2:

DELETE: The Contractor must provide supply support services, including:

INSERT: The Contractor must provide supply support, including:

DELETE: Subsections 1.8.2.2 and 1.8.2.3 in their entirety

11. At Annex G, Statement of Work - In-Service Support, Section 3.0, subsection 1.8.3

DELETE: Subsection 1.8.3 and all subsections in their entirety

12. At Annex G, Statement of Work - In-Service Support, Appendix 4, DID ISS-PM-002

DELETE: Subsections 10.2.2.4.1.2, 10.2.2.4.1.3, 10.2.2.4.1.3.1, 10.2.2.4.1.3.2, 10.2.2.4.1.3.3 and 10.2.2.4.1.4 in their entirety

DELETE: Subsections 10.2.2.5.1.2, 10.2.2.5.1.2.1, 10.2.2.5.1.2.2, 10.2.2.5.1.2.3, 10.2.2.5.1.3, 10.2.2.5.1.4 and 10.2.2.5.1.5.

13. At Annex G, Statement of Work - In-Service Support, Appendix 4, A4.13 DID - Obsolescence Management Report, Item 3. Description:

DELETE: In its entirety

INSERT: The following

3. DESCRIPTION

The Obsolescence Management Report must provide a summary of all the significant obsolescence management issues, mitigation strategies and associated operational impacts that occurred during the reporting period.

DELETE: Section 10.2 - Content

INSERT: The following:

10.2 Content

The Obsolescence Management Report must include a report on the Contractor's obsolescence management issues for the MGAS and EIE.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME

Table 8-1: Milestone and Approval Gates

Milestone	Approval Gate	Gate Entrance	Gate Deliverable
Design			
D1	SRR	Agenda	Functional Systems Requirements Document
D2	PDR	Agenda	System Acceptance Process/Philosophy Document
D3			Preliminary System Design Document
D4			Initial Requirements Traceability Matrix Document
D5	CDR	Agenda	Final System Design Document
D6			Final System Design Specification Document
D7			Anchor Segment System Acceptance Test Plan Document
D8			Updated Requirements Traceability Matrix Document
D9			Establish Product Baseline
D10			Any outstanding actions or deliverables
Implementation and Testing			
I1	Central Canada Anchor Site	Technical Readiness Review (TERR)	Technical Readiness Report and/or Checklist
I1.1			Site Preparation
I1.2			Site Equipment Delivery
I1.3			Site Equipment Installation
I1.4			Site System Integration
I1.5		Test Readiness Review (TRR)	Anchor Station and NMS Acceptance Test
I2	Western Canada Anchor	Technical Readiness	Technical Readiness Report

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W8474-14MG25/A

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

W8474-14MG25

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

016

File No. - N° du dossier

006stW8474-14MG25

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

006st

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

	Site	Review (TERR)	
I2.1			Site Preparation
I2.2			Site Equipment Delivery
I2.3			Site Equipment Installation
I2.4			Site System Integration
I2.5		Test Readiness Review (TRR)	Anchor Station and NMS Acceptance Test
I3	Eastern Canada Anchor Site	Technical Readiness Review (TERR)	Technical Readiness Report
I3.1			Site Preparation
I3.2			Site Equipment Delivery
I3.3			Site Equipment Installation
I3.4			Site System Integration
I3.5		Test Readiness Review (TRR)	Anchor Station and NMS Acceptance Test
I4	MG Anchor Segment	Agenda	
I4.1		Anchor Segment Test Readiness Review (TRR)	Integrated 3-site System Acceptance Test, e.g., site diversity, site redundancy, and local and remote NMS testing Test Readiness Report
Acceptance	FCA/PCA - Acceptance Conference	Agenda	Any outstanding previous deliverable
A1			WGS Certification for all Anchor Stations
A2			System Acceptance Test Report
A3			Final Requirements Traceability Matrix Report

ANNEX B (Rev. 1)

DESIGN AND BUILD BASIS OF PAYMENT

The schedule of milestones for which payments will be made in accordance with the Contract is as follows:

Milestone No.	Approval Gate	Description	Firm Amount*	Due Date**
D1	SRR	Requirements Reviews	5%	
D2	PDR	System Acceptance Process/Philosophy	10%	
D5	CDR	Final System Design	10%	
I1		<i>Central Canada Anchor Site</i>		
I1.1		Site Preparation	2%	
I1.2		Site Equipment Delivery	3%	
I1.3		Site Equipment Installation	5%	
I1.4		Site System Integration	5%	
I1.5		Site Acceptance	5%	
I2		<i>Western Canada Anchor Site</i>		
I2.1		Site Preparation	2%	
I2.2		Site Equipment Delivery	3%	
I2.3		Site Equipment Installation	5%	
I2.4		Site System Integration	5%	
I2.5		Site Acceptance	5%	
I3		<i>Eastern Canada Anchor Site</i>		
I3.1		Site Preparation	2%	
I3.2		Site Equipment Delivery	3%	
I3.3		Site Equipment Installation	5%	
I3.4		Site System Integration	5%	
I3.5		Site Acceptance	5%	
A1	Acceptance Conference	WGS Certification	15%	

OPTIONAL WORK

Milestone No.	Approval Gate	Description	Firm Amount**	Due Date**
TS1		Telecom Shelter Facility (DRDC Shirley's Bay, ON)		
TS2		Telecom Shelter Facility		

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W8474-14MG25/A

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

016

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

006st

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

W8474-14MG25

File No. - N° du dossier

006stW8474-14MG25

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

		(CFB Esquimalt, BC)		
TS3		Teelcom Shelter Facility (CFB Masstown, NS)		

** Firm milestone amounts are to be determined at the indicated percentage of the bid price*

*** To be determined in accordance with the bid*

No increase in the total liability of Canada or in the price of the Work resulting from any design changes, modifications or interpretations of the Specifications will be authorized or paid to the Contractor unless such design changes, modifications or interpretations have been approved, in writing, by the Contracting Authority prior to their incorporation into the Work.