



**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**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL**  
**DEMANDE DE PROPOSITION**

**Proposal To: Public Works and Government Services Canada**

We hereby offer to sell to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada, in accordance with the terms and conditions set out herein, referred to herein or attached hereto, the goods, services, and construction listed herein and on any attached sheets at the price(s) set out therefore.

**Proposition aux: Travaux Publics et Services Gouvernementaux Canada**

Nous offrons par la présente de vendre à Sa Majesté la Reine du chef du Canada, aux conditions énoncées ou incluses par référence dans la présente et aux annexes ci-jointes, les biens, services et construction énumérés ici sur toute feuille ci-annexée, au(x) prix indiqué(s).

**Comments - Commentaires**

**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

<b>Title-Sujet</b> <b>Integrated S&amp;T capabilities accessible to the CSSP</b>	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> W7714-135838/B/001/SV	<b>Date</b> 2014-06-03
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> W7714-135838/B	
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-14-00638867	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 035sv. W7714-13838/B	<b>CCC No./N° CC - FMS NO. / N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b>  <b>at - à 2:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2014-07-15</b>	<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Standard Time EST
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B</b>  <b>Plant-Usine :</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Joseph Hulse	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 035SV
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> 819-956-3356	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> 819-957-2229
<b>Destination of Goods, Services and Construction:</b> <b>Destinations des biens, services et construction :</b>  Specified Herein Précisé dans les présentes	

**Instructions : See Herein**

**Instructions : voir aux présentes**

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b> See Herein	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>   <b>Telephone No. - N° de telephone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b>  <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>   <b>Signature</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Date</b></span>	



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### **PART 1 - GENERAL INFORMATION**

1. Reissue of Bid Solicitation
2. Introduction
3. Summary
4. Debriefings
5. Communications
6. Conflict of Interest

### **PART 2 - BIDDER INSTRUCTIONS**

1. Standard Instructions, Clauses and Conditions
2. Submission of Bids
3. Enquiries - Bid Solicitation
4. Applicable Laws
5. Improvement of Requirement During Solicitation Period
6. Basis for Canada's Ownership of Intellectual Property

### **PART 3 - BID PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS**

1. Bid Preparation Instructions

### **PART 4 - EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION**

1. Evaluation Procedures
2. Basis of Selection
3. Attachment 1 – Evaluation of Price
4. Attachment 2 - Mandatory and Point Rated Criteria

### **PART 5 - CERTIFICATIONS**

1. Mandatory Certifications Required Precedent to Contract Award
2. Additional Certifications Precedent to Contract Award and Certifications Required with the Bid
3. Attachment 3 – Certifications

### **PART 6 – SECURITY REQUIREMENTS**

1. Security Requirement

### **PART 7 - RESULTING CONTRACT CLAUSES**

1. Statement of Work
2. Standard Clauses and Conditions
3. Security Requirement
4. Term of Contract
5. Authorities
6. Proactive Disclosure of Contracts with Former Public Servants
7. Payment
8. Invoicing Instructions
9. Certifications
10. Applicable Laws
11. Priority of Documents
12. Defence Contract



13. Insurance
14. Canadian Forces Site Regulations
15. Controlled Goods Program

**List of Annexes:**

Annex "A"	Statement of Requirement
Annex "B"	Basis of Payment
Annex "C"	Security Requirements Check List
Annex "D"	DND 626, Task Authorization Form
Annex "E"	Evaluation Criteria for secondary resources categories



## PART 1 - GENERAL INFORMATION

### 1. Reissue of Bid Solicitation

This bid solicitation cancels and supersedes previous bid solicitation number W7714-135838/A dated 2014-03-13 with a closing of 2014-05-05 at 2:00pm EDT.

Reasons for cancelling RFP W7714-135838/A:

On Friday April 22, 2014 Canada canceled the RFP (W7714-135838/A) in order to incorporate improvements that will better align the RFP (W7714-135838/b) with the following 3 key government priorities:

- Improving the Value Proposition;
- Enhancing competition through a change in Bidder definition; and
- Enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of the contract and outcomes.

Therefore, to accomplish these benefits, the following areas of the RFP were changed:

1. The 50% conditional Canadian Content certification was changed to 80% Mandatory Canadian Content; aligning the new RFP with SPD's Best Practices (the old RFP was 50% and that was based on the 50% Canadian Content required in the CSSP program that this requirement will support. Also, the old RFP was Conditional limited and the new RFP is not.)
2. Bidder's affiliates' and subcontractors' experience will now be accepted. The previous standard bidder definition clause only accepted the bidder itself (which includes the experience of any companies that formed the Bidder by way of a merger but does not include any experience acquired through a purchase of assets or an assignment of contract)
3. Resulting Task Authorizations basis of payment was expanded to include (firm price ceiling price, and limitation of expenditure). The previous Basis of payment only identified a limitation of expenditure as per the client's instructions / requirements.

These are the main changes to the original RFP (W7714-135838/A). The reissued RFP (W7714-135838/B) includes other clarifications. The other clarifications directly resulted from bidders questions during the original RFP (W7714-135838/A) solicitation period. These clarifications are as follows:

1. Changing the Basis of Selection - Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit and Price scoring to a 70/30 split (previous RFP was 80/20). A bidder requested that the score be adjusted to provide a chance to better position bids on price. The bidder felt that a high weighing on technical score would favor the incumbent. It is our intention to give the bidders an opportunity to put their best foot forward and not provide a favorable position to the incumbent; however, the question did make sense and so the client agreed to change the scoring.
2. A bidder requested clarification on required resources' security clearances at time of contract award. The client wishes that the core resources be cleared to a minimum of secret at time of contract award; however, this is not mandatory. Upon contract award, the contractor will begin to have resources' cleared to the appropriate security clearances, up to NATO Secret. Resources required security clearance levels will be determined by the operational requirements of the resulting Task Authorizations. Resources will not be able to working until the appropriate security clearances are received in terms of the Resulting Task authorizations.
3. Clarifications on minimal pass score required for corporate rated criteria and resource rated criteria. A bidder requested clarification if the minimum pass score was for each individual criterion or the overall combined criteria score. Bidders are required to obtain 60% on each corporate rated criterion and 60% cumulative score for each core resource category.



4. Correction to 3 evaluation criteria regarding in-house corporate experience. A bidder asked what would be accepted as in-house research and development project/experience. While providing a response to the bidder, it was determined that in-house experience could not be accepted as valid experience. The client would rather the bidders demonstrate they have experience working on R&D contracts that they have co-invested / provided an in-kind contribution on for their own benefit and advancement. This is now reflected in the new RFP.
5. Clarification regarding evaluation criteria – evaluation methodology A and B. A bidder wanted to know if it was possible to receive points in methodology B without receiving points in A. The answer was no and it is now clarified in the new RFP.
6. A mandatory evaluation criterion was clarified due to a bidders question regarding TRL levels. Bidders required to have experience maturing an innovative technology or methodology from a minimal of 3 different TRL levels (ranging from TRL levels 3 to 9). It was not clearly stated before that the range was from TRL levels 3-9.
7. A bidder wanted clarification if previous CSSP experience was required on some evaluation criteria. The wording on some criteria somewhat suggested that CSSP experience was required however, this was not the intention and the evaluation criteria wording was corrected.

## **2. Introduction**

The bid solicitation is divided into seven parts plus attachments and annexes, as follows:

- Part 1 General Information: provides a general description of the requirement;
- Part 2 Bidder Instructions: provides the instructions, clauses and conditions applicable to the bid solicitation;
- Part 3 Bid Preparation Instructions: provides bidders with instructions on how to prepare their bid;
- Part 4 Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection: indicates how the evaluation will be conducted, the evaluation criteria that must be addressed in the bid, and the basis of selection;
- Part 5 Certifications: includes the certifications to be provided;
- Part 6 Security, Financial and Other Requirements: includes specific requirements that must be addressed by bidders; and
- Part 7 Resulting Contract Clauses: includes the clauses and conditions that will apply to any resulting contract.

The Annexes include the Statement of Work, the Basis of Payment, the Security Requirements Checklist, the DND 626 Task Authorization Form.

## **3. Summary**

The resulting contract is for a 2 year period with 2, 1 year option periods.

The requirement is solely limited to Canadian services.

This procurement is subject to the Controlled Goods Program



The Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) Centre for Security Science (CSS), requires on an “as and when requested” basis, 29 different Scientist, Subject Matter Experts, and Administration resources to support all aspects on the Canadian Safety and Security Program (CSSP) including, research, technology and analysis in studies and projects, as well as in concept development, experimentation and experiments in the following five (5) domain areas:

1. CBRNE and Natural hazards,
2. Critical, physical and digital infrastructure
3. Border security, Biometrics for national security and Surveillance Intelligence and Interdiction
4. Emergency Management, Communications Interoperability, Operational decision support, Psycho Social aspects
5. Tri-Services, which includes Law enforcement (LE), Fire, Emergency Medical Services (EMS)

The Contractor may be required to provide a range of transactions to the CSSP team. Work will be defined and authorized by Canada in form of a task authorization that is raised on an “as and when requested” basis. After having accepted a task authorization, the Contractor will then execute the task, mostly at the Contractor’s facilities. The Contractor will perform such work in an iterative and incremental fashion, to ensure adherence to requirements and standards, access to first responders and to ensure the influence on Outcomes is reached.

It is expected that these tasks may include any of the following classes of support as shown below. To assist in the planning and the development of the CSSP portfolio areas, work tasks will be required to focus support within the following S&T areas of interest:

- 1) Chemical;
- 2) Biological;
- 3) Radiological/Nuclear;
- 4) Explosives;
- 5) Forensics of CBRNE;
- 6) Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP), Risk, Dependencies and Interdependencies;
- 7) eSecurity, focused on bolstering Critical Digital Infrastructure for Industrial Control Systems (ICS) and Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) systems, as well as focusing on augmenting the Capability to identify, mitigate, neutralize cyber threats (i.e.: combating cyber crime) mainly at the national level..
- 8) Border & Transportation Security, including Cargo security, Traveller security and Transit security
- 9) Biometrics for national security,
- 10) Intelligence-led Surveillance & Interdiction,
- 11) Emergency Management including Disaster resilience, Emergency Operations Centres (EOC), Situation Awareness, Operational decision support,
- 12) Communications Interoperability,
- 13) Psycho-Social including Community Resilience, as well as Radicalization & Extremism,
- 14) Risk Assessment, Consolidated Risk Assessment (CRA) and All Hazards Risk Assessment (AHRA),
- 15) Capability Based approach: capabilities to Anticipate, Prevent, Prepare, Respond and Recover from emergencies and disasters.
- 16) Visual Analytics, predictive analytics as well as video analytics,
- 17) Tri-services analyses (LE, Fire, EMS),
- 18) Public Safety and Security Policy,
- 19) Business Development, market analysis and Technology transition,
- 20) Operational Research & Analysis;



- 21) Advanced Strategic analysis; evidence based Policy analysis
- 22) Test and Evaluation (T&E) analysis.

## 1. **Resource Categories**

### **Core Resource Categories** (Resources required with bid submission)

- 1) Account Manager
- 2) Chief S&T Advisor
- 3) Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME
- 4) Senior Cyber SME in ICS and SCADA
- 5) Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats
- 6) Senior Strategist
- 7) Senior Modelling & Simulation SME
- 8) Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME
- 9) Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME

### **Secondary Resource Categories** (Resources that are not required with bid-submission that may be required by future Task-authorizations)

- 10) Senior Project Manager
- 11) Intermediate Project Manager
- 12) Intermediate Capability Engineering and Architecture SME
- 13) Senior Security Risk Assessment SME
- 14) Intermediate Security Risk Assessment SME
- 15) Senior Chemical Biological Agent SME
- 16) Senior Radionuclear Agent SME
- 17) Senior Explosives SME
- 18) Intermediate Modeling & Simulation SME
- 19) Senior Test & Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations
- 20) Intermediate Test & Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations
- 21) Border Security SME
- 22) Biometrics SME
- 23) Emergency Management SME
- 24) Communications Interoperability SME
- 25) Community Resilience SME
- 26) Radicalization & Extremism SME
- 27) Modeling & Simulation and Visualization Technologist
- 28) Facilitation and Workshop Specialist
- 29) Technical Writer

## Background to the CSSP

The Canadian Safety and Security Program (CSSP) is a federally-funded program to prevent/mitigate, prepare for, respond to, and recover from natural disasters, serious accidents, crime and terrorism through the convergence of science and technology (S&T) with policy, operations and intelligence.

The CSSP is led by the Defence Research and Development Canada, Centre for Security Science on behalf of the Government of Canada and its partners across all levels of government, response and emergency management organizations, non-governmental agencies, industry and academia. Some of the testing and evaluation component of the CSSP may be delivered through the Emergency Responder Test and Evaluation Establishment in Regina (ERTEE).

CSSP investments enable DRDC, Centre for Security Science to coordinate and support projects and activities that respond to Canadian public safety and security priorities and address capability gaps. These gaps are identified through risk and vulnerability assessments, and consultation with



communities of practice, as well as central agencies, and policy, operational and intelligence entities.

Ultimately, these efforts contribute to achieving the CSSP's primary strategic goal of ensuring that Canada's people and institutions have a greater resilience to global and domestic public safety and security threats and hazards.

<http://www.drdc-rddc.gc.ca/en/science-tech/safety-security.page>

#### **4. Debriefings**

Bidders may request a debriefing on the results of the bid solicitation process. Bidders should make the request to the Contracting Authority within 15 working days of receipt of the results of the bid solicitation process. The debriefing may be in writing, by telephone or in person.

#### **5. Communications**

As a courtesy and in order to coordinate any public announcements pertaining to this contract, the Government of Canada requests that successful Bidders notify the Contracting Authority 5 days in advance of their intention to make public an announcement related to the recommendation of a contract award, or any information related to the contract. The Government of Canada retains the right to make primary contract announcements.

#### **6. Conflict of Interest**

The Work described herein and the deliverable items under any resulting Contract specifically exclude the development of any statement of work, evaluation criteria or any document related to a bid solicitation. The Contractor, its subcontractor(s) or any of their agent(s) directly or indirectly involved in the performance of the Work and/or in the production of the deliverables under any resulting Contract will not be precluded from bidding on any potential future bid solicitation related to the production or exploitation of any concept or prototype developed or delivered under any resulting Contract.



## **PART 2 - BIDDER INSTRUCTIONS**

### **1. Standard Instructions, Clauses and Conditions**

All instructions, clauses and conditions identified in the bid solicitation by number, date and title are set out in the *Standard Acquisition Clauses and Conditions Manual*(<https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual>) issued by Public Works and Government Services Canada. Bidders who submit a bid agree to be bound by the instructions, clauses and conditions of the bid solicitation and accept the clauses and conditions of the resulting contract.

The 2003 (*2014-03-01*) Standard Instructions - Goods or Services - Competitive Requirements, are incorporated by reference into and form part of the bid solicitation.

Subsection 5.4 of 2003, Standard Instructions - Goods or Services - Competitive Requirements, is amended as follows:

Delete: 60 days  
Insert: 120 days

### **2. Submission of Bids**

Bids must be submitted only to Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) Bid Receiving Unit by the date, time and place indicated on page 1 of the bid solicitation.

Due to the nature of the bid solicitation, bids transmitted by facsimile to PWGSC will not be accepted.

### **3. Enquiries - Bid Solicitation**

All enquiries must be submitted in writing to the Contracting Authority no later than ten (10) calendar days before the bid closing date. Enquiries received after that time may not be answered.

Bidders should reference as accurately as possible the numbered item of the bid solicitation to which the enquiry relates. Care should be taken by bidders to explain each question in sufficient detail in order to enable Canada to provide an accurate answer. Technical enquiries that are of a proprietary nature must be clearly marked "proprietary" at each relevant item. Items identified as "proprietary" will be treated as such except where Canada determines that the enquiry is not of a



proprietary nature. Canada may edit the questions or may request that the Bidder do so, so that the proprietary nature of the question is eliminated, and the enquiry can be answered with copies to all bidders. Enquiries not submitted in a form that can be distributed to all bidders may not be answered by Canada.

#### **4. Applicable Laws**

Any resulting contract must be interpreted and governed, and the relations between the parties determined, by the laws in force in Ontario.

Bidders may, at their discretion, substitute the applicable laws of a Canadian province or territory of their choice without affecting the validity of their bid, by deleting the name of the Canadian province or territory specified and inserting the name of the Canadian province or territory of their choice. If no change is made, it acknowledges that the applicable laws specified are acceptable to the bidders.

#### **5. Improvement of Requirement During Solicitation Period**

Should bidders consider that the specifications or Statement of Work contained in the bid solicitation could be improved technically or technologically, bidders are invited to make suggestions, in writing, to the Contracting Authority named in the bid solicitation. Bidders must clearly outline the suggested improvement as well as the reason for the suggestion. Suggestions that do not restrict the level of competition nor favour a particular bidder will be given consideration provided they are submitted to the Contracting Authority at least 10 days before the bid closing date. Canada will have the right to accept or reject any or all suggestions.

#### **6. Basis for Canada's Ownership of Intellectual Property**

The Department of National Defence has determined that any intellectual property rights arising from the performance of the Work under the resulting contract will belong to Canada, on the following grounds: the main purpose of the contract, or of the deliverables contracted for, is to augment an existing body of Canada's background information as a prerequisite to the transfer of the augmented background to the private sector, through licensing or assignment of ownership (not necessarily to the original Contractor), for the purposes of commercial exploitation.



## **PART 3 - BID PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS**

### **1. Bid Preparation Instructions**

Canada requests that bidders provide their bid in separately bound sections as follows:

Section I: Technical Bid (5 hard copies) (and 1 soft copy on CD)

Section II: Financial Bid (1 hard copy) (and 1 soft copy on CD)

Section III: Certifications (1 hard copy)

If there is a discrepancy between the wording of the soft copy and the hard copy, the wording of the hard copy will have priority over the wording of the soft copy.

Prices must appear in the financial bid only. No prices must be indicated in any other section of the bid.

Canada requests that bidders follow the format instructions described below in the preparation of their bid:

- (a) use 8.5 x 11 inch (216 mm x 279 mm) paper;
- (b) use a numbering system that corresponds to the bid solicitation.

In April 2006, Canada issued a policy directing federal departments and agencies to take the necessary steps to incorporate environmental considerations into the procurement process [Policy on Green Procurement](http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/ecologisation-greening/achats-procurement/politique-policy-eng.html) (<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/ecologisation-greening/achats-procurement/politique-policy-eng.html>). To assist Canada in reaching its objectives, bidders should:

- 1) use 8.5 x 11 inch (216 mm x 279 mm) paper containing fibre certified as originating from a sustainably-managed forest and containing minimum 30% recycled content; and
- 2) use an environmentally-preferable format including black and white printing instead of colour printing, printing double sided/duplex, using staples or clips instead of cerlox, duotangs or binders.

#### **Section I: Technical Bid**

In their technical bid, bidders should demonstrate their understanding of the requirements contained in the bid solicitation and explain how they will meet these requirements. Bidders



should demonstrate their capability and describe their approach in a thorough, concise and clear manner for carrying out the work.

The technical bid should address clearly and in sufficient depth the points that are subject to the evaluation criteria against which the bid will be evaluated. Simply repeating the statement contained in the bid solicitation is not sufficient. In order to facilitate the evaluation of the bid, Canada requests that bidders address and present topics in the order of the evaluation criteria under the same headings. To avoid duplication, bidders may refer to different sections of their bids by identifying the specific paragraph and page number where the subject topic has already been addressed.

**Bidders must propose 2 resources** (Primary and Backup) for each **resource category required with bid submission (Core Resources)** and both proposed resources **must meet the minimal criteria score** for the resource category overall.

A resource must only be named once in the bid, either as Primary or back-up.

## **Section II: Financial Bid**

- 1.1 A firm all-inclusive per diem rate (7.5h per day) for each category of resources listed Attachment 1 (**Core and Secondary Resources Categories**) Financial Bid Presentation Sheet (Excel Spreadsheet) for each year of the contract period and for each option period.

The total amount of Applicable Tax is to be shown separately.

No travel and living expenses will be paid for services provided within the National Capital Region (NCR). Further, Canada will not accept any travel and living expenses for travel between the contractor's place of business and the NCR. All of these costs are to be included in the firm all inclusive labour rates requested above.

The information should be provided in accordance with the *Evaluation of Price* in Attachment 1.

- 1.2 For Canadian-based bidders, prices must be in Canadian funds, Canadian customs duties and excise taxes included, and Applicable Tax excluded.

For the purpose of the bid solicitation, bidders with an address in Canada are considered Canadian-based bidders and bidders with an address outside of Canada are considered foreign-based bidders.

- 1.3 The same firm all-inclusive per diem rate (7.5h per day) will be used for primary resources as well as back-up and any other additional future resources requested on each task authorization.

## **Section III: Certifications**

Bidders must submit the certifications required under Part 5.



## **PART 4 - EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION**

### **1. Evaluation Procedures**

- (a) Bids will be assessed in accordance with the entire requirement of the bid solicitation including the technical and financial evaluation criteria.
- (b) An evaluation team composed of representatives of Canada will evaluate the bids.

#### **1.1 Technical Evaluation**

##### **1.1.1 Bidder Experience**

Except where expressly provided otherwise, the experience described in the bid must be the experience of one or more of the following:

- 1. The Bidder itself (which includes the experience of any companies that formed the Bidder by way of a merger but does not include any experience acquired through a purchase of assets or an assignment of contract); or
- 2. The Bidder's affiliates (i.e. parent, subsidiary or sister corporations, provided the Bidder identifies and demonstrates the transfer of know-how, the use of toolsets and the use of key personnel from the affiliate for the applicable criterion); or
- 3. The Bidder's subcontractors (provided the Bidder includes a copy of the teaming agreements and identifies the roles and responsibilities of all parties under the agreement and how their work will be integrated).

The experience of the Bidder's suppliers will not be considered.

##### **1.1.2 Supporting Information**

In the event that the Bidder fails to submit any supporting information pursuant to technical or financial, the Contracting Authority may request it thereafter in writing, including after the closing date of the bid solicitation. It is mandatory that the Bidder provide the supporting information within three (3) business days of the written request or within such period as specified or agreed to by the Contracting Authority in the written notice to the Bidder.

#### **1.2 Technical Evaluation**

Mandatory and point rated technical evaluation criteria are included in Attachment 2.



## 1.3 Financial Evaluation

### 1.3.1 Mandatory Financial Criteria

Refer to Attachment 1 Evaluation of Price Sheet

### 1.3.2 Evaluation of Price

The price of the bid will be evaluated in Canadian dollars, Applicable Taxes excluded, Canadian customs duties and excise taxes included.

For evaluation purposes only, the price of the bid will be determined as detailed in Attachment 1, Evaluation of Price.

## 2. Basis of Selection

### 2.1 Basis of Selection - Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit and Price

1. To be declared responsive, a bid must:
  - (a) comply with all the requirements of the bid solicitation;
  - (b) meet all mandatory criteria; and
  - (c) obtain the required minimum for the technical evaluation criteria which are subject to point rating.
2. Bids not meeting (a) or (b) or (c) will be declared non-responsive.
3. The selection will be based on the highest responsive combined rating of technical merit and price. The ratio will be 70% for the technical merit and 30% for the price.
4. To establish the technical merit score, the overall technical score for each responsive bid will be determined as follows: total number of points obtained / maximum number of points available multiplied by the ratio of 70%
5. To establish the pricing score, each responsive bid will be prorated against the lowest evaluated price and the ratio of 30%
6. For each responsive bid, the technical merit score and the pricing score will be added to determine its combined rating.
7. Neither the responsive bid obtaining the highest technical score nor the one with the lowest evaluated price will necessarily be accepted. The responsive bid with the highest combined rating of technical merit and price will be recommended for award of a contract.
8. Scores will be rounded to two decimal places.

The table below illustrates an example where all three bids are responsive and the selection of the contractor is determined by a 70/30 ratio of technical merit and price, respectively. The total available point's equal 135 and the lowest evaluated price is \$45,000 (45).

### Basis of Selection - Highest Combined Rating Technical Merit (70%) and Price (30%)



	Bidder		
	Bidder 1	Bidder 2	Bidder 3
Overall Technical Score	115/135	89/135	92/135
Bid Evaluated Price	\$55,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$45,000.00
Calculations			
Technical Merit Score	$115/135 \times 70 = 59.63$	$89/135 \times 70 = 46.15$	$92/135 \times 70 = 47.70$
Pricing Score	$45/55 \times 30 = 24.55$	$45/50 \times 30 = 27$	$45/45 \times 30 = 30$
Combined Rating	84.18	73.15	77.70
Overall Rating	1 <sup>st</sup>	3rd	2nd



**ATTACHMENT 1  
EVALUATION OF PRICE  
(see Excel Spreadsheet)**

The same rate will be used for primary resources as well as back-up and any other additional future resources requested on each task authorisation.



## Attachment 2 Mandatory and Point Rated Technical Criteria

### 1. To be considered compliant a proposal must:

- a. Meet all of the Mandatory requirements; and
  - b. Achieve the required minimum score of 60% overall and for each proposed resource; and,
  - c. **Bidders must propose two resources (Primary & Back-up) for each CORE Resource Category** (see below) that meets the minimum overall criteria score of 60%. Both proposed resources will be evaluated and their scores utilized in the Bid Evaluation in the following manner. **A resource may only be named once in the bid, as either a Primary or a Back-up.**
2. In evaluating resource past performance experience, compliance must be demonstrated through a well written, coherent, brief (if possible), past project description containing the following:
- 1) Name of the project.
  - 2) Resource position.
  - 3) Contract start date.
  - 4) Work completion date.
  - 5) Duration of the experience in months..
  - 6) Description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired by the Bidder.
  - 7) An explanation why this experience meets the specific criteria of this solicitation.
  - 8) Client Contact Info, reference, if available. If no reference is available please indicate why.
3. All non-Canadian education must be recognized by the Canadian Center for International Credentials <http://cicic.ca/2/home.canada>
4. The following sections describe the general corporate and resource requirements whereas the full and complete evaluation details are found in subsequent sections / tables. Note the following:
- a. **Corporate Capability – Requirements** In the response to this RFP, the bidder should provide evidence of robust corporate capability and past corporate experience in the areas related to some of the previous concepts.
  - b. **Resource Categories – Requirements** In order to demonstrate sufficient resource skills capability, and in order to support a variety of activities, the bidder should name and describe the capability of resources (Primary and Back-up) against a series of resource point rated categories.



- c. **Process to add a “Resource”** The Primary & Back-up Resources identified and described in each bid will be scored for bid evaluation purposes. These resources will become the named resources in the contract of the successful bidder. In future Task Authorizations, as a result of a larger than anticipated volume of transactions, it is possible that additional resources will be required in any of the stated categories. The bidder must be able to propose additional resources for the stated categories as required to meet this increased demand. **Additional Resources**, beyond the present Primary & (original) Back-up Resources must meet the minimum score for the Resource Category of 60%.
  - d. **Categories of Resources** Two different resumes (Primary & Back-up) must be provided for each of the following **CORE Resource** categories (shown below) for bid evaluation purposes. Proposed candidates must only be found in a single category and must meet the minimum criteria of 60%.
  - e. **Evaluation Methodology A and B** - bidders must receive points in evaluation methodology A in order to be eligible to receive points in evaluation methodology B. Once points are received in A, it is possible to receive a higher score in B.
  - f. **Resources Security Clearance** – Secret is the level of personnel security screening desired at the time of contract award but not mandatory. Upon contract award, the contractor will begin to have resources cleared to the required clearance level. Resources required security clearance levels will be determined by the operational requirements of the resulting Task Authorizations and will range from unclassified to NATO secret. Resources will not be able to working until the appropriate security clearances are received (between reliability to NATO secret) as determined by the resulting Task Authorizations.
  - g. **Evaluation Criteria Technical Responses** – Whenever possible, please keep all technical responses to 1- 2 paragraphs. This is only a suggestion from Canada and it is the responsibility of the bidder to demine the appropriate length of each answer provided. Bidders will not be deemed non-complaint for providing responses longer than 2 paragraphs.
  - h. **Co-investment / In-kind contribution** – This is defined as a project that the bidder partially funded (10% or more) with its own internal funding or resources (labor, equipment, laboratories), for its own benefit / advancement.
5. **Core Resources** to be evaluated with Bid
- 1. Account Manager
  - 2. Chief S&T Advisor
  - 3. Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME
  - 4. Senior Cyber SME in ICS and SCADA
  - 5. Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats
  - 6. Senior Strategist
  - 7. Senior Modelling & Simulation SME.



- 8. Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME
- 9. Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME

**6. List of Acronyms**

AHRA: All Hazards Risks Assessment;  
 CB: Chemical Biological Agents;  
 CBRNE: Chemical, Biological, Radionuclear and Explosives;  
 CIP: Critical Infrastructure Protection;  
 CONOPS: Concept of Operations;  
 CRTI: CBRN Research Technology Initiative;  
 CSSP: Canadian Safety and Security Program;  
 DHS: Department of Homeland Security;  
 DoDAF: Department of Defense Architecture Framework;  
 EM : Emergency Management;  
 EMS: Emergency Medical Services;  
 ICS: Industrial Control System;  
 MoDAF: British Ministry of Defence Architecture Framework;  
 M&S: Modeling and Simulation;  
 PS: Public Safety Canada  
 S&T: Science & Technology;  
 SCADA: Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition;  
 T&E: Test and evaluation;  
 TOGAF: The Open Group Architecture Framework;

**Mandatory Criteria**

<b><u>MANDATORY Criteria – CORPORATE Capability</u></b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
<b>1 – Concept Development &amp; Analysis</b>	The Bidder must demonstrate that it has a minimum of twelve (12) months experience in the last five (5) years from the date of solicitation issue, across two (2) projects that is has co-invested / provided a in-kind contribution to OR a government funded project (Federal, Provincial, and or, municipal), highlighting their specific roles in Concept Development and Analysis.	<p>Meets Mandatory Criteria <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Does NOT Meet Mandatory Criteria <input type="checkbox"/></p>



<b>MANDATORY Criteria – CORPORATE Capability</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
	<p>Bidders must provide details regarding experience in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the development of alternative concepts to meet the Operational needs,</li> <li>b) the direct application of analysis methodologies, designing experiments, and the development of application metrics (Measures of Performance, Measures of Effectiveness, and Capability-level evaluation of alternative Capability design etc..).</li> </ul> <p>All internal corporate experience must be relevant / similar in nature to one (1) of the CSSP five (5) broad domain areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CBRNE hazards and Natural hazards</li> <li>2. Critical physical and digital infrastructure</li> <li>3. Border security, Biometrics for national security and Surveillance Intelligence and Interdiction</li> <li>4. Emergency Management, Communications Interoperability, Operational decision support</li> <li>5. Tri- Services (Law Enforcement, Fire, EMS)</li> </ul>	
<b>2 – Architecture Framework Analysis (Capability Level)</b>	<p>The Bidder must demonstrate that it has a minimum of twelve (12) months experience, in the last five (5) years from the date of solicitation issue, working on projects that employed an architecture framework.</p> <p>Bidders must provide details regarding experience in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The design, development and execution of analysis with DoDAF-like architecture frameworks, (such as TOGAF, Zachman, MoDAF, DoDAF etc) that are relevant / similar in nature to any of the CSSP five (5) broad domain areas (shown above).</li> <li>b) that the architecture frameworks includes, but is not limited to, the development of the following types of views: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Organization Views (OVs);</li> <li>b. System Views (SVs); and,</li> <li>c. Technical Views (TVs).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Meets Mandatory Criteria <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Does NOT Meet Mandatory Criteria <input type="checkbox"/></p>



<b>MANDATORY Criteria – CORPORATE Capability</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
<b>3 – M&amp;S-based Experimentation (at System Level and at Capability level)</b>	<p>The Bidder must demonstrate that it has a minimum of 24 months experience, in the last five (5) years from the date of solicitation issue, defining, configuring, or operating a Modeling and Simulation (M&amp;S) environment(s) in the support of analysis and experimentation at the System level or Capability level.</p> <p>Bidders must provide details regarding :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) whether its experience was live, constructive or virtual simulation experience</li> <li>b) how this experience fits into their corporate M&amp;S capability (methodologies and tools).</li> </ul>	<p>Meets Mandatory Criteria <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Does NOT Meet Mandatory Criteria <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<b>4 – Experience in 5 broad Areas of interest (<a href="http://www.drdc-rddc.gc.ca">www.drdc-rddc.gc.ca</a> is a useful site for more details)</b>	<p>The Bidder must demonstrate that it has documented experience of at least one (1) project, in the last five (5) years from the date of solicitation issue, which has matured an innovative technology or methodology.</p> <p>Bidders must provide details regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Its part in maturing an innovative technology or methodology from a minimal of 3 different TRL levels (ranging from TRL levels 3 to 9).</li> <li>b) That the technology of methodology projects be relevant / similar in nature to at least one(1) of the five (5) CSSP broad domain areas below:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CBRNE hazards and Natural hazards</li> <li>2. Critical physical and digital infrastructure</li> <li>3. Border security, Biometrics for national security and Surveillance Intelligence and Interdiction</li> <li>4. Emergency Management, Communications Interoperability, Operational decision support</li> <li>5. Tri- Services (Law Enforcement, Fire, EMS)</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p>Meets Mandatory Criteria <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Does NOT Meet Mandatory Criteria <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<b>5. Application of Capability based Approach with Federal, Provincial/ Territorial /Municipal</b>	<p>The Bidder must demonstrate that it has completed at least one (1) project, in the last five (5) years from the date of solicitation issue, that employed a Capability-based approach across at least two levels of government (federal, provincial/territorial and, municipal)</p>	<p>Meets Mandatory Criteria <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Does NOT Meet Mandatory Criteria <input type="checkbox"/></p>



<b>MANDATORY Criteria – CORPORATE Capability</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
<b>Depts</b>		
<b>6. Contract management Experience executing multiple concurrent tasks</b>	<p>The Bidder must demonstrated that it has completed at least two (2) projects, in the last five (5) years from the date of solicitation issue, that required management of resource support contracts containing the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) valued at 1 million or more;</li> <li>b) involved the management and execution of multiple concurrent resources (10 or more); and,</li> <li>c) Involving the execution of multiple concurrent contract tasks (5 or more).</li> </ul>	<p>Meets Mandatory Criteria <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Does NOT Meet Mandatory Criteria <input type="checkbox"/></p>
		<p><b>OVERALL:</b></p> <p><b>Meets Mandatory Criteria <input type="checkbox"/></b></p> <p><b>Does NOT Meet Mandatory Criteria <input type="checkbox"/></b></p>



**Point Rated Technical Criteria**

<b>RATED CORPORATE Criteria – CORPORATE Capability</b>					
<b>Category</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A (Quantity Experience)</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B (Quality of Experience)</b>	<b>Points allocation</b>	<b>/ Location in proposal Comments</b>
<b>1 – Corporate Knowledge</b>	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate a corporate understanding of the CSSP's PS S&amp;T activities.</p> <p>Bidders can demonstrate this understanding by providing details on co-investments / in-kind contribution they have provided in research and development projects including studies, analysis, experimentation, and simulation-based assessment through a written summary of industry best practices focusing on each of the following specified areas (6 month minimal experience required for each area). Please provide a 1-2 paragraph explanation for each area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Concept Development;</li> <li>b. Architecture Framework;</li> <li>c. Experimentation &amp; Trial;</li> <li>d. Modeling &amp; Simulation</li> <li>e. Capability Assessment;</li> <li>f. Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance (ISR).</li> </ul>	<p>10 points for each specified area provided (a to f). (60 points Max)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 6+ month Concept Development experience; = 10 points</li> <li>b. 6+ month Architecture Framework experience = 10 points</li> <li>c. 6+ month Experimentation &amp; Trial experience = 10 points</li> <li>d. 6+ month Modeling &amp; Simulation experience = 10 points</li> <li>e. 6+ month Capability Assessment experience; = 10 points</li> <li>f. 6+ month Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance (ISR) experience = 10 points</li> </ul>	<p>Each specified area provided (a to f) will be given a score based on the below scoring chart (Max Score 60)</p> <p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the corporate understanding of CSSP PS S&amp;T activities. Also, the information provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited information provided and missing several elements in terms of corporate understanding of CSSP PS S&amp;T activities. Also, the information provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> information provided in terms relevant details that demonstrate a corporate understanding of CSSP PS S&amp;T activities, and the explanation of why the information meets the specific criteria. Also, the information provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good information provided in terms of relevant details that demonstrate a corporate understanding of CSSP PS S&amp;T activities, and the explanation of why the information meets the specific criteria. Also, the information provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria.</p>	<p>Max Points Methodology <b>A</b> scoring 60 Methodology <b>B</b> scoring 60 <b>(Max Points 120 x 0.833 = 100)</b></p>	<p>weighting factor of 0.833 to bring the total to = 100</p>



<b>RATED CORPORATE Criteria – CORPORATE Capability</b>					
<b>Category</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A (Quantity Experience)</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B (Quality of Experience)</b>	<b>Points allocation</b>	<b>/ Location in proposal Comments</b>
			= 8 Points  Extensive information provided in terms of relevant details that demonstrates a corporate understanding of CSSP PS S&T activities, and the explanation of why the information meets the specific criteria. Also, the information provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria.  = 10 points		
<b>2 – Corporate Methodology</b>	The Bidder should demonstrate that it has a corporate methodology for simulation-based analysis and experimentation, at the system and capability level that is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Documented and trained within the corporate work force;</li> <li>b. Documented and trained within its sub-contractor.</li> </ul>	10 points for each specified area provided. (Max Score 20) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Documented and trained within the corporate work force. = 10 points</li> <li>b. Documented and trained within its sub-contractor. = 10 points</li> </ul>	Each specified area provided (a and b) will be given a score based on the below scoring chart (Max Score 20) <p>Incomplete or insufficient information provided, missing several elements regarding the description of the in house methods and other relevant details that documents the bidder's methodology. Also, the information provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited information provided, missing several elements regarding the description of the in house methods and other relevant details that documents the bidder's methodology and other relevant details that document how this information has been communicated to the recipients. Also, the information provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> information provided in terms of the</p>	A scoring 20 B scoring 20 (Max Points <b>40</b> )	



<b><u>RATED CORPORATE Criteria – CORPORATE Capability</u></b>					
<b>Category</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A (Quantity Experience)</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B (Quality of Experience)</b>	<b>Points allocation</b>	<b>/ Location in proposal Comments</b>
			<p>description of the methodology and other relevant details that document how this information has been communicated to the recipients. Also, the information provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good information provided in terms of the description of the methodology and other relevant details that document how this information has been communicated to the recipients. Also, the information provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive information provided in terms of the description of the methodology and other relevant details that document how this information has been communicated to the recipients. Also, the information provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>3 – Corporate M&amp;S Technology Base</b>	<p>The Bidder Should demonstrate the breadth and depth of the M&amp;S technology software tools available in its organization for constructive and virtual simulation based experimentation.</p> <p>This assessment will be based upon the Bidder's corporate internal experience, using tools found in and / or similar to the <b>Canada's existing tool suite</b>, working on R&amp;D projects</p>	<p>10 points for each specified tool category provided (a to d). (Max Score 40)</p> <p>a. 6+ month M&amp;S tools experience. = 10 points</p> <p>b. 6+ month Capability Analysis tools experience. = 10 points</p> <p>c. 6+ month GIS-based</p>	<p>Each specified Tool Category provided (a to d) will be given a score based on the below scoring chart (Max Points 40)</p> <p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable.</p>	<p>A scoring 40 B scoring 40 (Max Points <b>80 x 0.625 = 50</b>)</p>	<p>weighting factor of 0.625 to bring the total to = 50</p>



<b>RATED CORPORATE Criteria – CORPORATE Capability</b>					
<b>Category</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A (Quantity Experience)</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B (Quality of Experience)</b>	<b>Points allocation</b>	<b>/ Location in proposal Comments</b>
	<p>that it has provided a co-invested / in-kind contribution towards. (6 month minimal experience required for each tool category).</p> <p>(please provide 1-2 paragraph explanation for each tool category):</p> <p>a. M&amp;S tools, such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Matlab™</li> <li>2. Finite Element Modelling (FEM) based tools</li> <li>3. Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) based tools</li> </ol> <p>b. Capability Analysis tools, such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DOORS™</li> <li>2. CORE™</li> <li>3. System Architect™</li> </ol> <p>c. GIS-based Emergency Management (EM) tools and EM tools such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CSS' own MASAS</li> <li>2. ESRI™ tools</li> <li>3. EmerGeo™</li> </ol> <p>d. Visualization tools such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CSS' MASAS</li> <li>2. DHS' Virtual USA</li> <li>3. FEMA's IPAWS</li> </ol>	<p>Emergency Management (EM) tools and EM tools experience. = 10 points</p> <p>d. 6+ month Visualization tools experience. = 10 points</p>	<p>= 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the</p>		



<b>RATED CORPORATE Criteria – CORPORATE Capability</b>					
<b>Category</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A (Quantity Experience)</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B (Quality of Experience)</b>	<b>Points allocation</b>	<b>/ Location in proposal Comments</b>
			experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>4 – Corporate Capability and Architecture Analysis Technology Base</b>	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate the breadth and depth of the Capability Level Analysis and Design Technology Base experience</p> <p>This assessment will be based upon the Bidder's corporate internal experience from working on R&amp;D projects, that it has provided a co-invested / in-kind contribution towards, in the following areas (please provide 1-2 paragraph explanation for each area):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Operational architecture framework analysis at the capability level.</li> <li>Management of identified libraries from resulting analyses and / or recommendations.</li> <li>The design and performance of executable architectures within their facility(ies) as a method of simulation-based analysis.</li> <li>Validation of architecture frameworks with relevant stakeholder audiences.</li> <li>Development of capability roadmaps and implementation plans in</li> </ol>	<p>Each specified area (a to e) will be given a score based on the below scoring chart (Max Points 50)</p> <p>0 month's experience = 0 Points</p> <p>1 to 11 months = 2 Points</p> <p>12 to 23 months = 6 Points</p> <p>24 to 35 months = 8 Points</p> <p>36+ months = 10 points</p>	<p>Each specified area (a to e) will be given a score based on the below scoring chart (Max Points 50)</p> <p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria.</p>	<p>A scoring 50 B scoring 50 (Max Points <b>100x 0.6 = 60 pts)</b></p>	<p>weighting factor of 0.60 to bring the total to = 60</p>



<b>RATED CORPORATE Criteria – CORPORATE Capability</b>					
<b>Category</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A (Quantity Experience)</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B (Quality of Experience)</b>	<b>Points allocation</b>	<b>/ Location in proposal Comments</b>
	accordance with architecture frameworks and Capability-based approach.		<p>= 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 10 points</p>		
<b>5 – Corporate Technology Base in Public Security</b>	The bidder should demonstrate it has corporate experience competing at least one project, in the last 4 years, in the following 3 areas of Public Safety and Security methodologies : a. Risk assessment b. Threat assessment c. Emergency management	<p>10 points for each area provided (a to c). (Max Score 30)</p> <p>a. 1 or more Risk assessment project. = 10 points b. 1 or more Threat assessment project = 10 points c. 1 or more Emergency management project = 10 points</p>	<p>Each specified area provided (a to c) will be given a score based on the below scoring chart (Max Points 30)</p> <p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project or other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing</p>	<p>A scoring 30 B scoring 30 (Max Points <b>60</b>)</p>	



<b><u>RATED CORPORATE Criteria – CORPORATE Capability</u></b>					
<b>Category</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A (Quantity Experience)</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B (Quality of Experience)</b>	<b>Points allocation</b>	<b>/ Location in proposal Comments</b>
			<p>several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project or other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria.</p>		



<b>RATED CORPORATE Criteria – CORPORATE Capability</b>					
<b>Category</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A (Quantity Experience)</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B (Quality of Experience)</b>	<b>Points allocation</b>	<b>/ Location in proposal Comments</b>
			= 10 points		
<b>6 – Corporate Project Management Methodology</b>	<p>The Bidder should describe (please provide 1-2 paragraph explanation for each area):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Its corporate project management methodology</li> <li>b. The impact of the Corporate project management methodology on client projects</li> <li>c. The relationship between the Corporate project management methodology and the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK) best practices.</li> </ul>	<p>10 points for each specified Area provided (a to c). (Max Score 30)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Corporate project management methodology provided. = 10 points</li> <li>b. Explanation on the impact of the Corporate project management methodology on client projects provided= 10 points</li> <li>c. Explanation of the relationship between the Corporate project management methodology and the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK) best practices provided = 10 points</li> </ul>	<p>Each specified area provided (a to c) will be given a score based on the below scoring chart (Max Points 30)</p> <p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the methodology and other relevant details. Also, the methodology provided is not clear, understandable or relatable to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited information provided and missing some elements in terms of the description of the methodology and other relevant details. Also, the methodology provided is somewhat clear, understandable and, less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> information provided in terms of the description of the methodology and other relevant details. Also, the methodology provided is clear, understandable and, at least than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good information provided in terms of the description of the methodology and other relevant details. Also, the methodology provided is clear, understandable and, at least than 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p>	<b>(Max Points 60)</b>	



<b><u>RATED CORPORATE Criteria – CORPORATE Capability</u></b>					
<b>Category</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A (Quantity Experience)</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B (Quality of Experience)</b>	<b>Points allocation</b>	<b>/ Location in proposal Comments</b>
			Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the methodology and other relevant details. Also, the methodology provided is clear, understandable and, at least than 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
				(Max points 370)	Min: 222/370

Point Rated Technical Criteria - Resources Required with Bid submission

<b><u>1.0 Resource Capability – Lead Account Manager</u></b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>1.1</b>	The Lead Account Manager should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University.	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign</p>		(Max points 10)	



<b>1.0 Resource Capability – Lead Account Manager</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		institution = <b>8 Points</b>  Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b>			
<b>1.2</b>	The lead Account Manager should demonstrate that they have Experience managing Program portfolio account(s) with more the 10 projects.	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b>  36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = <b>6</b> points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that	(Max points 20)	



<b>1.0 Resource Capability – Lead Account Manager</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>1.3</b>	The lead Account Manager should demonstrate that they have experience developing complex work plans, schedules and tasks.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this</p>	(Max points 20)	



<b>1.0 Resource Capability – Lead Account Manager</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>1.4</b>	<b>The lead Account Manager should demonstrate that they have a Project Management Professional (PMP) certification</b>	<p>Has not completed recognized training/certification as a Certified professional. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Possesses a Certification as Certified a Professional for less than one year. = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Possesses a Certification as Certified Professional for at least one year. = <b>10 points</b></p>		(Max points 10)	
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 60 x 0.5=30)</b>	weighting factor of 0.5 to bring the



<b>1.0 Resource Capability – Lead Account Manager</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
					total to = 30 pts

<b>2.0 Resource Capability – Back-Up Account Manager</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>2.1</b>	The back-up Account Manager should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University.	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution</p>		(Max points 10)	



**2.0 Resource Capability – Back-Up Account Manager**

	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<b>= 10 Points</b>			
<b>2.2</b>	The back-up Account Manager should demonstrate that they have Experience managing Program portfolio account(s) with more the 10 projects.	0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria.	(Max points 20)	



<b>2.0 Resource Capability – Back-Up Account Manager</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			= 8 Points  Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>2.3</b>	The back-up Account Manager should demonstrate that they have experience developing complex work plans, schedules and tasks.	0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points	(Max points 20)	



<b>2.0 Resource Capability – Back-Up Account Manager</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>2.4</b>	<b>The back-up Account Manager should demonstrate that they have a Project Management Professional (PMP) certification</b>	<p>Has not completed recognized training/certification as a Certified professional. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Possesses a Certification as Certified a Professional for less than one year. = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Possesses a Certification as Certified Professional for at least one year. = <b>10 points</b></p>		(Max points 10)	
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 60 x 0.5=30)</b>	weighting factor of 0.5 to bring the total to = 30 pts



**3.0 Resource Capability – Lead Chief S&T Advisor**

	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>3.1</b>	The Chief S&T Advisor should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		(Max points 10)	
<b>3.2</b>	<p>The Chief S&amp;T Advisor should demonstrate that they have six (6) months experience working within four (4) of the five (5) areas below in the last seven (7) years (please provide 1-2 paragraph explanation for each area):</p> <p>a. Counter-terrorism</p>	<p>Each specified area provide (choose any 4 from a to e) will be given a score based on the below scoring chart (Max points 40)</p> <p>a. 6 month + experience in Counter-terrorism Chemical or Biological or Radiation Nuclear or Explosives,</p>	<p>Each specified area provided (choose any 4 from a to e) will be given a score based on the below scoring chart (Max points 40)</p> <p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This</p>	<b>(Max points 80)</b>	



**3.0 Resource Capability – Lead Chief S&T Advisor**

	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	Chemical or Biological or Radiation Nuclear or Explosives, CBRNE) b. Critical Physical or Digital Infrastructure Protection (CIP) c. Surveillance, Intelligence and Interdiction (SII) Operations d. Emergency Management and Risk Assessment e. Tri Services	CBRNE) = 10 points b. 6 month + experience in Critical Physical or Digital Infrastructure Protection (CIP) = 10 points c. 6 month + experience in Surveillance, Intelligence and Interdiction (SII) Operations = 10 points d. 6 month + experience in Emergency Management and Risk Assessment = 10 points e. 6 month + Tri Services = 10 points	<p>makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = <b>6</b> points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria.</p>		



<b>3.0 Resource Capability – Lead Chief S&amp;T Advisor</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			= 10 points		
<b>3.3</b>	The Chief S&T Advisor should demonstrate that they have experience identifying S&T capabilities to minimize gaps that are relevant to PS&S.	0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>3.0 Resource Capability – Lead Chief S&amp;T Advisor</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>3.4</b>	The Chief S&T Advisor should demonstrate that they have a membership in a related Professional Scientific & Technology Society/Association such as IEEE, HFES, or similar.	<p>Is not a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>Is a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for more than one year = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
			Total	<b>(Max points 120 x 0.5=60)</b>	<b>THE REQUIREMENT IS FOR A WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.5 TO BRING THE TOTAL TO = 60</b>



<b>4.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Chief S&amp;T Advisor</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>4.1</b>	The Chief S&T Advisor should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		(Max points 10)	
<b>4.2</b>	<p>The Chief S&amp;T Advisor should demonstrate that they have six (6) months experience working within four (4) of the five (5) areas below in the last seven (7) years (please provide 1-2 paragraph explanation for each area):</p> <p>a. Chemical or Biological or Radiation Nuclear or Explosives, CBRNE)</p>	<p>Each specified area provide (choose any 4 from a to e) will be given a score based on the below scoring chart (Max points 40)</p> <p>a. 6 month + experience in -Chemical or Biological or Radiation Nuclear or Explosives, CBRNE) = 10 points</p> <p>b. 6 month + experience in Critical Physical or Digital Infrastructure Protection (CIP) = 10 points</p>	<p>Each specified area provided (choose any 4 from a to e) will be given a score based on the below scoring chart (Max points 40)</p> <p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p>	<b>(Max points 80)</b>	



<b>4.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Chief S&amp;T Advisor</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. Critical Physical or Digital Infrastructure Protection (CIP)</li> <li>c. Surveillance, Intelligence and Interdiction (SII) Operations</li> <li>d. Emergency Management and Risk Assessment</li> <li>e. Tri Services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. 6 month + experience in Surveillance, Intelligence and Interdiction (SII) Operations = 10 points</li> <li>d. 6 month + experience in Emergency Management and Risk Assessment = 10 points</li> <li>e. 6 month + Tri Services = 10 points</li> </ul>	<p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>4.3</b>	The Chief S&T Advisor should demonstrate that	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>4.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Chief S&amp;T Advisor</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	they have experience identifying S&T capabilities to minimize gaps that are relevant to PS&S.	<p>1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b></p>	<p>experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the</p>		



<b>4.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Chief S&amp;T Advisor</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score A+B</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>4.4</b>	The Chief S&T Advisor should demonstrate that they have a membership in a related Professional Scientific & Technology Society/Association such as IEEE, HFES, or similar.	<p>Is not a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>Is a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for more than one year = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
			Total	<b>(Max points 120 x 0.5=60)</b>	<b>THE REQUIREMENT IS FOR A WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.5 TO BRING THE TOTAL TO = 60</b>

<b>5.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>



<b>5.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>5.1</b>	The Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
<b>5.2</b>	The Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME should demonstrate that they have experience applying Capability Engineering concepts at the strategic level within a Canadian defence context within the last 5 years.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>5.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	<p>the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>5.3</b>	The Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME should demonstrate that they have experience using architecture framework analysis methodologies (such as DoDAF)	0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>5.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p><b>= 6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience</p> <p><b>= 8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience</p> <p><b>=10 Points</b></p>	<p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 10 points</p>		
<b>5.4</b>	The Senior Capability	0 months Experience	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of	<b>(Max points)</b>	



<b>5.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	Engineering and Architecture SME should demonstrate that they have experience modifying or extending architecture frameworks for specific project requirements	<p><b>= 0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b></p>	<p>the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that</p>	<b>20)</b>	



<b>5.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>5.5</b>	The Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME should demonstrate that they have a Membership in related Professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE, INCOSE or IEAD or similar.	<p>Is not a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year. = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for more than one year. = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 80 x 0.3 = 24)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 24</b>

<b>6.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>6.1</b>	The Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME should demonstrate that they have a University	Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0</b>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>6.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	Degree from a recognized University	<p><b>Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>			
<b>6.2</b>	The Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME should demonstrate that they have experience applying Capability Engineering concepts at the strategic level within a Canadian defence context within the last 5 years.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>6.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>6.3</b>	The Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME should demonstrate that they have experience using architecture framework analysis methodologies (such as DoDAF)	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience</p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>6.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p><b>= 8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b></p>	<p>explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. <b>= 2 Points</b></p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. <b>= 6 points</b></p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. <b>= 8 Points</b></p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. <b>= 10 points</b></p>		
<b>6.4</b>	The Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME should demonstrate that they have experience modifying or extending architecture frameworks for	<p>0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b></p>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable.	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



**6.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME**

	RATED Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Methodology A	Evaluation Methodology B	Score	Location in proposal / Comments
	specific project requirements	12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	= 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points  Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		



<b>6.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>6.5</b>	The Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME should demonstrate that they have a Membership in related Professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE, INCOSE or IEAD or similar.	<p>Is not a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year. = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for more than one year. = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 80 x 0.3 = 24)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 24</b>

<b>7.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Cyber SME in ICS - SCADA</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>



**7.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Cyber SME in ICS - SCADA**

	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>7.1</b>	The Senior Cyber SME in ICS - SCADA should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
<b>7.2</b>	The Senior Cyber SME in ICS – SCADA should demonstrate that they have a project experience focused on ICS /SCADA requirements development, definition and analysis.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria.</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>7.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Cyber SME in ICS - SCADA</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p>36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b></p>	<p>Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>7.3</b>	The Senior Cyber SME in ICS - SCADA should demonstrate that they have experience on projects conducting operational requirements analysis for software or hardware	<p>0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b></p>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable.	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



**7.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Cyber SME in ICS - SCADA**

	RATED Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Methodology A	Evaluation Methodology B	Score	Location in proposal / Comments
	systems.	12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	= 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points  Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria.		



<b>7.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Cyber SME in ICS - SCADA</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			= 10 points		
<b>7.4</b>	The Senior Cyber SME in ICS - SCADA should demonstrate that they have a membership in related Professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or similar.	<p>Is not a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year. = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for more than one year. = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 60 x 0.4 = 16 )</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.40 FOR A TOTAL OF = 24</b>

<b>8.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Cyber SME in ICS - SCADA</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>



<b>8.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Cyber SME in ICS - SCADA</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>8.1</b>	The Senior Cyber SME in ICS - SCADA should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
<b>8.2</b>	The Senior Cyber SME in ICS – SCADA should demonstrate that they have a project experience focused on ICS /SCADA requirements development, definition and analysis.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria.</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>8.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Cyber SME in ICS - SCADA</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p>36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b></p>	<p>Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>8.3</b>	The Senior Cyber SME in ICS - SCADA should demonstrate that they have experience on projects conducting operational requirements analysis for software or hardware	<p>0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable.</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>8.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Cyber SME in ICS - SCADA</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	systems.	12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	= 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points  Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria.		



<b>8.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Cyber SME in ICS - SCADA</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			= 10 points		
<b>8.4</b>	The Senior Cyber SME in ICS - SCADA should demonstrate that they have a membership in related Professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or similar.	<p>Is not a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year. = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for more than one year. = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 60 x 0.4 = 16 )</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.40 FOR A TOTAL OF = 24</b>

<b>9.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID, Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats at National level</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>9.1</b>	The Senior Cyber SME in the capability to ID, Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats at National level should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or</p> <p>College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>9.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID, Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats at National level</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	recognized University.	<p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>			
<b>9.2</b>	The Senior Cyber SME in the capability to ID... should demonstrate that they have experience creating tangible operational procedures for policies relevant to public safety and security at the national level.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



9.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID, Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats at National level					
	RATED Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Methodology A	Evaluation Methodology B	Score	Location in proposal / Comments
			<p>experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
9.3	The Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID... should demonstrate that they have <i>experience</i> defining requirements for ID, mitigation and neutralization of cyber threats at National level.	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria.</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>9.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID, Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats at National level</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p>36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b></p>	<p>Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>9.4</b>	The Senior Cyber SME in Capability should demonstrate that they have a membership in a related Professional S&T Society/Association such as	<p>Is not a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp;</p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>9.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID, Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats at National level</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	IEEE or similar.	Technology Society/Association for less than one year. = <b>6 Points</b>  Is a member of Professional Science & Technology Society/Association for more than one year. = <b>10 Points</b>			
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 60 x 0.4 = 24)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.40 FOR A TOTAL OF = 24</b>

<b>10.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID, Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats at National level</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>10.1</b>	The Senior Cyber SME in the capability to ID, Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats at National level should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University.	Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or  College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b>  Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b>  Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>10.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID, Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats at National level</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution <b>= 10 Points</b>			
<b>10.2</b>	The Senior Cyber SME in the capability to ID... should demonstrate that they have experience creating tangible operational procedures for policies relevant to public safety and security at the national level.	0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. <b>= 0 points</b></p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. <b>= 2 Points</b></p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. <b>= 6 points</b></p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



10.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID, Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats at National level					
	RATED Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Methodology A	Evaluation Methodology B	Score	Location in proposal / Comments
			<p>explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
10.3	The Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID... should demonstrate that they have <i>experience</i> defining requirements for ID, mitigation and neutralization of cyber threats at National level.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>10.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID, Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats at National level</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>10.4</b>	The Senior Cyber SME in Capability should demonstrate that they have a membership in a related Professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or similar.	<p>Is not a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year. = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for more than one year. = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>10.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID, Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats at National level</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 60 x 0.4 = 24)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.40 FOR A TOTAL OF = 24</b>

<b>11.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Strategist</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>11.1</b>	The Senior Advanced Strategist should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University.	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
<b>11.2</b>	The Senior Advanced	0 months Experience	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the	<b>(Max points</b>	



<b>11.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Strategist</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	<p>Strategist should demonstrate that they have Whole of Government (WoG) project experience producing WoG Strategic Advice in Policy.</p>	<p><b>= 0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b></p>	<p>project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience</p>	<b>20)</b>	



<b>11.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Strategist</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>11.3</b>	The Senior Advanced Strategist must demonstrate that they have Whole of Government (WoG) project experience producing WoG Strategic Advice in a Program	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b>  36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>11.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Strategist</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>11.4</b>	The Senior Advanced Strategist should demonstrate that they have a membership in a Professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or similar.	<p>Is not a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year. = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for more than one year. = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 60 x 0.3 = 18)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 18</b>

**12.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Strategist**



	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
12.1	The Senior Advanced Strategist should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University.	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
12.2	The Senior Advanced Strategist should demonstrate that they have Whole of Government (WoG) project experience producing WoG Strategic Advice in Policy.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience</p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>12.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Strategist</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<b>=10 Points</b>	<p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>12.3</b>	The Senior Advanced Strategist must demonstrate that they have Whole of Government (WoG) project experience producing WoG Strategic Advice in a Program	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>12.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Strategist</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p><b>= 8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b></p>	<p>experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. <b>= 2 Points</b></p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. <b>= 6 points</b></p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. <b>= 8 Points</b></p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. <b>= 10 points</b></p>		
<b>12.4</b>	The Senior Advanced Strategist should demonstrate that they have a membership in a Professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or similar.	<p>Is not a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less</p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>12.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Strategist</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		than one year. = <b>6 Points</b>  Is a member of Professional Science & Technology Society/Association for more than one year. = <b>10 Points</b>			
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 60 x 0.3 = 18)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 18</b>

<b>13.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Modeling and Simulation (M&amp;S) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>13.1</b>	The Senior M&S SME should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University.	Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or  College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b>  Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b>  Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>13.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Modeling and Simulation (M&amp;S) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		institution = <b>8 Points</b>  Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b>			
<b>13.2</b>	The Senior M&S SME should demonstrate that they have recognized experience in M&S using any tools such as the Crown's toolkit or similar.	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b>  36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>13.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Modeling and Simulation (M&amp;S) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>13.3</b>	The Senior M&S SME should demonstrate that they have Web-based M&S (HTTP Protocol) and Distributed M&S (DIS protocol or HLA protocol) experience in Defence or Security.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = <b>6 points</b></p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>13.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Modeling and Simulation (M&amp;S) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>13.4</b>	The Senior M&S SME should demonstrate that they have a Certified Modelling and Simulation Professional (CMSP) designation or peer-recognized equivalent	<p>Is not a Certified Modelling and Simulation Professional or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a Certified Modelling and Simulation Professional for less then one year. = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Is a Certified Modelling and Simulation Professional for one year or more. = <b>10 points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
<b>13.5</b>	The Senior M&S SME should demonstrate that they have recognized experience in employing Open Standards and Open Architecture	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable.	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>13.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Modeling and Simulation (M&amp;S) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	= 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points  Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>13.6</b>	The Senior M&S SME should demonstrate that they	Is not a member of a Professional Science & Technology		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>13.0 Resource Capability – Lead Senior Modeling and Simulation (M&amp;S) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	have a membership in an professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or similar	<p>Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year. = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for more than one year. = <b>10 Points</b></p>			
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 90 x 0.3 =27)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 27</b>

<b>14.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Modeling and Simulation (M&amp;S) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>14.1</b>	The Senior M&S SME should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University.	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or</p> <p>College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>14.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Modeling and Simulation (M&amp;S) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b>  Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b>  Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b>			
<b>14.2</b>	The Senior M&S SME should demonstrate that they have recognized experience in M&S using any tools such as the Crown's toolkit or similar.	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b>  36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>14.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Modeling and Simulation (M&amp;S) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>14.3</b>	The Senior M&S SME should demonstrate that they have Web-based M&S (HTTP Protocol) and Distributed M&S (DIS protocol or HLA protocol) experience in Defence or Security.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>14.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Modeling and Simulation (M&amp;S) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = <b>6</b> points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = <b>8</b> Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = <b>10</b> points</p>		
<b>14.4</b>	The Senior M&S SME should demonstrate that they have a Certified Modelling and Simulation Professional (CMSP) designation or peer-recognized equivalent	<p>Is not a Certified Modelling and Simulation Professional or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a Certified Modelling and Simulation Professional for less then one year. = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Is a Certified Modelling and Simulation Professional for one year or more. = <b>10 points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>14.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Modeling and Simulation (M&amp;S) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>14.5</b>	The Senior M&S SME should demonstrate that they have recognized experience in employing Open Standards and Open Architecture	0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable.            = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria.            = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria.            = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria.            = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>14.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Senior Modeling and Simulation (M&amp;S) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>14.6</b>	The Senior M&S SME should demonstrate that they have a membership in an professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or similar	<p>Is not a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year. = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for more than one year. = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 90 x 0.3 =27)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 27</b>

<b>15.0 Resource Capability – Lead Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>15.1</b>	The Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME should demonstrate that they have a	Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>15.0 Resource Capability – Lead Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	University Degree from a recognized University	<p>or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>			
<b>15.2</b>	The Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME should demonstrate that they have recognized experience in CIP within Public Security, performing risk based analyses, linking threats, hazards, vulnerabilities and thus risks to gaps in capability	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>15.0 Resource Capability – Lead Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>15.3</b>	The Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME should demonstrate that they have experience in CIP related to dependencies and interdependencies in the domain of Public Security.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>15.0 Resource Capability – Lead Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	<p>provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 50 x 0.3 = 15)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 15</b>



<b>16.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>16.1</b>	The Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
<b>16.2</b>	The Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME should demonstrate that they have recognized experience in CIP within Public Security, performing risk based analyses, linking threats, hazards, vulnerabilities and thus risks to gaps in capability	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria.</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>16.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	= 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points  Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>16.3</b>	The Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME should demonstrate that they have experience in CIP related to dependencies and interdependencies in the domain of Public Security.	0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>16.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 50 x 0.3 = 15)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 15</b>



<b>17.0 Resource Capability – Lead Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>		<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>17.1</b>	The Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
<b>17.2</b>	The Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME should demonstrate that they have recognized experience in an intellectual leadership role, capable of assessing business opportunities and assessing/developing strategies for innovative technologies.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria.</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>17.0 Resource Capability – Lead Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>		<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	= 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points  Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>17.3</b>	The Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME should demonstrate that they have recognized experience in the research, assessment and development of market opportunity analyses and market size analyses for innovative technologies considered for exploitation by clients and considered for	0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>17.0 Resource Capability – Lead Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>		<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	commercialization.	24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	<p>of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria.            = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria.            = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria.            = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria.            = 10 points</p>		
<b>17.4</b>	The Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME should demonstrate that they have recognized experience actually transitioning to clients and commercialized new innovative technologies	0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable.	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>17.0 Resource Capability – Lead Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>		<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	in Public Safety and Security.	12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	= 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points  Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>17.5</b>	The Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME	Is not a member of a Professional Science & Technology		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>17.0 Resource Capability – Lead Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>		<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	should demonstrate that they have a membership in a professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or similar	<p>Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year. = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for more than one year. = <b>10 Points</b></p>			
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 80 x 0.4 = 32)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.40 FOR A TOTAL OF = 32</b>

<b>18.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>		<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>



<b>18.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>		<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>18.1</b>	The Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
<b>18.2</b>	The Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME should demonstrate that they have recognized experience in an intellectual leadership role, capable of assessing business opportunities and assessing/developing strategies for innovative technologies.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria.</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>18.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>		<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	= 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points  Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>18.3</b>	The Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME should demonstrate that they have recognized experience in the research, assessment and development of market opportunity analyses and market size analyses for innovative technologies considered for exploitation by clients and considered for	0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



**18.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME**

	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>		<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	commercialization.	<p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>18.4</b>	The Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME should demonstrate that they have recognized experience actually transitioning to clients and commercialized new innovative technologies	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable.</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>18.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>		<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	in Public Safety and Security.	12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	= 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points  Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>18.5</b>	The Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME	Is not a member of a Professional Science & Technology		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>18.0 Resource Capability – Back-up Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>		<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	should demonstrate that they have a membership in a professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or similar	<p>Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year. = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for more than one year. = <b>10 Points</b></p>			
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 80 x 0.4 = 32)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.40 FOR A TOTAL OF = 32</b>

**Total Score**

	Corporate Criteria Score	Resource Criteria Score	Total
Maximum score possible	<b>370</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>878</b>
Minimal score required	<b>222</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>527</b>



## **PART 5 - CERTIFICATIONS**

Bidders must provide the required certifications and documentation to be awarded a contract.

The certifications, in Attachment 3, provided by bidders to Canada are subject to verification by Canada at all times. Canada will declare a bid non-responsive, or will declare a contractor in default, if any certification made by the Bidder is found to be untrue whether during the bid evaluation period or during the contract period.

The Contracting Authority will have the right to ask for additional information to verify the Bidder's certifications. Failure to comply with this request will also render the bid non-responsive or will constitute a default under the Contract.

### **1. Mandatory Certifications Required Precedent to Contract Award**

#### **1.1 Integrity Provisions – Associated Information**

By submitting a bid, the Bidder certifies that the Bidder and its affiliates are in compliance with the provisions as stated in Section 01 Integrity Provisions - Bid of Standard Instructions 2003. The related documentation therein required will assist Canada in confirming that the certifications are true.

#### **1.2 Federal Contractors Program for Employment Equity - Bid Certification**

By submitting a bid, the Bidder certifies that the Bidder, and any of the Bidder's members if the Bidder is a Joint Venture, is not named on the Federal Contractors Program (FCP) for employment equity "FCP Limited Eligibility to Bid" list ([http://www.labour.gc.ca/eng/standards\\_equity/eq/emp/fcp/list/inelig.shtml](http://www.labour.gc.ca/eng/standards_equity/eq/emp/fcp/list/inelig.shtml)) available from Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC) - Labour's website.

Canada will have the right to declare a bid non-responsive if the Bidder, or any member of the Bidder if the Bidder is a Joint Venture, appears on the "FCP Limited Eligibility to Bid" list at the time of contract award.

Canada will also have the right to terminate the Contract for default if a Contractor, or any member of the Contractor if the Contractor is a Joint Venture, appears on the "[FCP Limited Eligibility to Bid](#)" list during the period of the Contract.

The Bidder must provide the Contracting Authority with a completed annex [Federal Contractors Program for Employment Equity - Certification](#), before contract award. If the Bidder is a Joint Venture, the Bidder must provide the Contracting Authority with a completed annex Federal Contractors Program for Employment Equity - Certification, for each member of the Joint Venture.

#### **1.3 Canadian Content Certification**

This procurement is solely limited to Canadian services.

Subject to the evaluation procedures contained in the bid solicitation, bidders acknowledge that only bids with a certification that the service offered is a Canadian service, as defined in clause A3050T, will be considered.

Failure to provide this certification completed with the bid will result in the service offered being treated as a non-Canadian service and deemed non-compliant.

The Bidder certifies that:



( ) a minimum of 80 percent of the total bid price consist of Canadian services as defined in paragraph 5 of clause A3050T.

## **2. Additional Certifications Precedent to Contract Award**

The certifications in Attachment 3, Certifications Precedent to Contract Award, should be completed and submitted with the bid but may be submitted afterwards. If any of these required certifications is not completed and submitted as requested, the Contracting Authority will so inform the Bidder and provide the Bidder with a time frame within which to meet the requirement. Failure to comply with the request of the Contracting Authority and meet the requirement within that time period will render the bid non-responsive.



### Attachment 3

## CERTIFICATIONS PRECEDENT TO CONTRACT AWARD AND CERTIFICATIONS REQUIRED WITH THE BID

### 1.0 Certifications Required with the Bid

#### 1.1 Integrity Provisions

1. Bidders should provide, with their bids or promptly thereafter, a complete list of names of all individuals who are currently directors of the Bidder. If such a list has not been received by the time the evaluation of bids is completed, the Contracting Authority will inform the Bidder of a time frame within which to provide the information. Bidders must submit the list of directors before contract award, failure to provide such a list within the required time frame will render the bid non-responsive.

COMPLETE LIST OF BIDDER'S DIRECTORS	
1	4
2	5
3	6

2. The Contracting Authority may, at any time, request that a Bidder provide properly completed and Signed Consent Forms (Consent to a Criminal Record Verification form – PWGSC- TPSGC 229) for any or all individuals named in the aforementioned list within a specified delay. Failure to provide such Consent Forms within the delay will result in the bid being declared non-responsive.

#### 1.2 FEDERAL CONTRACTORS PROGRAM FOR EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

By submitting a bid, the Bidder certifies that the Bidder, and any of the Bidder's members if the Bidder is a Joint Venture, is not named on the Federal Contractors Program (FCP) for employment equity "FCP Limited Eligibility to Bid" list ([http://www.labour.gc.ca/eng/standards\\_equity/eq/emp/fcp/list/inelig.shtml](http://www.labour.gc.ca/eng/standards_equity/eq/emp/fcp/list/inelig.shtml)) available from Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC) - Labour's website.

Canada will have the right to declare a bid non-responsive if the Bidder, or any member of the Bidder if the Bidder is a Joint Venture, appears on the "FCP Limited Eligibility to Bid" list at the time of contract award.

Canada will also have the right to terminate the Contract for default if a Contractor, or any member of the Contractor if the Contractor is a Joint Venture, appears on the "[FCP Limited Eligibility to Bid](#)" list during the period of the Contract.

The Bidder must provide the Contracting Authority with a completed annex [Federal Contractors Program for Employment Equity - Certification](#), before contract award. If the Bidder is a Joint Venture, the Bidder must provide the Contracting Authority with a completed annex Federal Contractors Program for Employment Equity - Certification, for each member of the Joint Venture.

#### 1.3 Canadian Content Certification

This procurement is limited to Canadian services.  
Subject to the evaluation procedures contained in the bid solicitation, bidders acknowledge that only bids with a certification that the service offered is a Canadian service, as defined in clause A3050T, may be considered.



Failure to provide this certification completed with the bid will result in the service offered being treated as a non-Canadian service.

The Bidder certifies that:

- ( ) a minimum of 80 percent of the total bid price consist of Canadian services as defined in paragraph 5 of clause A3050T.

## 2.0 Certifications Precedent to Contract Award

### 2.1 Former Public Servant - Competitive Requirements

Contracts with former public servants (FPS) in receipt of a pension or of a lump sum payment must bear the closest public scrutiny, and reflect fairness in the spending of public funds. In order to comply with Treasury Board policies and directives on contracts with FPS, bidders must provide the information required below.

#### Definitions

For the purposes of this clause, "former public servant" is any former member of a department as defined in the Financial Administration Act, R.S., 1985, c. F-11, a former member of the Canadian Armed Forces or a former member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. A former public servant may be:

- a. an individual;
- b. an individual who has incorporated;
- c. a partnership made of former public servants; or
- d. a sole proprietorship or entity where the affected individual has a controlling or major interest in the entity.

"lump sum payment period" means the period measured in weeks of salary, for which payment has been made to facilitate the transition to retirement or to other employment as a result of the implementation of various programs to reduce the size of the Public Service. The lump sum payment period does not include the period of severance pay, which is measured in a like manner.

"pension" means, a pension or annual allowance paid under the Public Service Superannuation Act (PSSA), R.S., 1985, c.P-36, and any increases paid pursuant to the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act, R.S., 1985, c.S-24 as it affects the PSSA. It does not include pensions payable pursuant to the Canadian Forces Superannuation Act, R.S., 1985, c.C-17, the Defence Services Pension Continuation Act, 1970, c.D-3, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Pension Continuation Act, 1970, c.R-10, and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act, R.S., 1985, c.R-11, the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act, R.S., 1985, c.M-5, and that portion of pension payable to the Canada Pension Plan Act, R.S., 1985, c.C-8.

#### Former Public Servant in Receipt of a Pension

As per the above definitions, is the Bidder a FPS in receipt of a pension? Yes ( ) No ( )

If so, the Bidder must provide the following information, for all FPS in receipt of a pension, as applicable:

- a. name of former public servant;
- b. date of termination of employment or retirement from the Public Service.

By providing this information, Bidders agree that the successful Bidder's status, with respect to being a former public servant in receipt of a pension, will be reported on



departmental websites as part of the published proactive disclosure reports in accordance with Contracting Policy Notice: 2012-2 and the Guidelines on the Proactive Disclosure of Contracts.

### **Work Force Reduction Program**

Is the Bidder a FPS who received a lump sum payment pursuant to the terms of a work force reduction program? Yes ( ) No ( )

If so, the Bidder must provide the following information:

- a. name of former public servant;
- b. conditions of the lump sum payment incentive;
- c. date of termination of employment;
- d. amount of lump sum payment;
- e. rate of pay on which lump sum payment is based;
- f. period of lump sum payment including start date, end date and number of weeks;
- g. number and amount (professional fees) of other contracts subject to the restrictions of a work force reduction program.

For all contracts awarded during the lump sum payment period, the total amount of fees that may be paid to a FPS who received a lump sum payment is \$5,000, including the Goods and Services Tax or Harmonized Sales Tax.

## **2.2 Status and Availability of Resources**

The Bidder certifies that, should it be awarded a contract as a result of the bid solicitation, every individual proposed in its bid will be available to perform the Work as required by Canada's representatives and at the time specified in the bid solicitation or agreed to with Canada's representatives. If for reasons beyond its control, the Bidder is unable to provide the services of an individual named in its bid, the Bidder may propose a substitute with similar qualifications and experience. The Bidder must advise the Contracting Authority of the reason for the substitution and provide the name, qualifications and experience of the proposed replacement. For the purposes of this clause, only the following reasons will be considered as beyond the control of the Bidder: death, sickness, maternity and parental leave, retirement, resignation, dismissal for cause or termination of an agreement for default.

If the Bidder has proposed any individual who is not an employee of the Bidder, the Bidder certifies that it has the permission from that individual to propose his/her services in relation to the Work to be performed and to submit his/her résumé to Canada. The Bidder must, upon request from the Contracting Authority, provide a written confirmation, signed by the individual, of the permission given to the Bidder and of his/her availability. Failure to comply with the request may result in the bid being declared non-responsive.

## **2.3 Education and Experience**

The Bidder certifies that all the information provided in the résumés and supporting material submitted with its bid, particularly the information pertaining to education, achievements, experience and work history, has been verified by the Bidder to be true and accurate. Furthermore, the Bidder warrants that every individual proposed by the Bidder for the requirement is capable of performing the Work described in the resulting contract.



**3. Acknowledgment:**

By submitting a bid, the Bidder certifies that the information submitted by the Bidder in response to the above requirements is accurate and complete.

The bid must contain no condition. Any condition, whatsoever, will render the bid non-responsive.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_



## **PART 6 - SECURITY, FINANCIAL AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS**

### **1. Security Requirement**

1. Before award of a contract, the following conditions must be met:
  - (a) the Bidder must hold a valid Facility Security Clearance as indicated in Part 7 - Resulting Contract Clauses;
  - (b) the Bidder's proposed individuals requiring access to classified or protected information, assets or sensitive work site(s) must meet the security requirement as indicated in Part 7 - Resulting Contract Clauses;
  - (c) the Bidder must provide the name of all individuals who will require access to classified or protected information, assets or sensitive work sites;
  - (d) the Bidder will be required to complete a Questionnaire and submit the documentation to the ISS, PWGSC. Once documentation is received, PWGSC will conduct a FOCl evaluation to determine if the company is "Not Under FOCl" or "Under FOCl". When an organization is determined to be *Under FOCl*, PWGSC will ascertain if mitigation measures exist or must be put in place by the company so it can be deemed "*Not Under FOCl through Mitigation*".
2. Bidders are reminded to obtain the required security clearance promptly. Any delay in the award of a contract to allow the successful bidder to obtain the required clearance will be at the entire discretion of the Contracting Authority.
3. For additional information on security requirements, bidders should consult the "Security Requirements for PWGSC Bid Solicitations - Instructions for Bidders" (<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/app-acq/lc-pl/lc-pl-eng.html#a31>) document on the [Departmental Standard Procurement Documents](#) website.

### **2. Financial Capability**

*Manual SACC clause A9033T (2012-07-16) Financial Capability*

### **3. Controlled Goods Program**

*SACC Manual clause A9130T (2011-05-16), Controlled Goods Program*



## **PART 7 - RESULTING CONTRACT CLAUSES**

The following clauses and conditions apply to and form part of any contract resulting from the bid solicitation.

### **1.0 Statement of Work**

The Contractor must perform the work in accordance with the Statement of Requirement at Annex A.

### **1.1 Task Authorization**

#### **1.1.1 Task Authorization - Department of National Defence**

The administration of the Task Authorization process will be carried out by \_\_\_\_\_  
(to be entered at contract award) This process includes monitoring, controlling and reporting on expenditures of the contract with task authorizations to the Contracting Authority.

#### **1.2.2 Task Authorization Process**

##### **Task Authorization:**

The Work or a portion of the Work to be performed under the Contract will be on an "as and when requested basis" using a Task Authorization (TA). The Work described in the TA must be in accordance with the scope of the Contract.

##### **Task Authorization Process:**

1. The Technical Authority will provide the Contractor with a description of the task using the DND 626, Task Authorization Form specified in Annex D.
2. The Task Authorization (TA) will contain the details of the activities to be performed, a description of the deliverables, and a schedule indicating completion dates for the major activities or submission dates for the deliverables. The TA will also include the applicable basis(bases) and methods of payment as specified in the Contract.
3. The Contractor must provide the Technical Authority, within 5 calendar days of its receipt, the proposed total estimated cost for performing the task and a breakdown of that cost, established in accordance with the Basis of Payment specified in the Contract.
4. The Contractor must not commence work until a TA authorized by the Technical Authority has been received by the Contractor. The Contractor acknowledges that any work performed before a TA has been received will be done at the Contractor's own risk.

#### **1.1.3 Task Authorization Limit**

The Technical Authority may authorize individual task authorizations up to a limit of \$100,000.00 Goods and Services Tax or Harmonized Sales Tax included, inclusive of any revisions.

Any task authorization to be issued in excess of that limit must be authorized by the Contracting Authority before issuance.

#### **1.1.4 Minimum Work Guarantee - All the Work - Task Authorizations**

1. In this clause,



- "Maximum Contract Value" means the amount specified in the "Limitation of Expenditure" clause set out in the Contract; and

- "Minimum Contract Value" means 5%.

2. Canada's obligation under the Contract is to request Work in the amount of the Minimum Contract Value or, at Canada's option, to pay the Contractor at the end of the Contract in accordance with paragraph 3. In consideration of such obligation, the Contractor agrees to stand in readiness throughout the Contract period to perform the Work described in the Contract. Canada's maximum liability for work performed under the Contract must not exceed the Maximum Contract Value, unless an increase is authorized in writing by the Contracting Authority.
3. In the event that Canada does not request work in the amount of the Minimum Contract Value during the period of the Contract, Canada must pay the Contractor the difference between the Minimum Contract Value and the total cost of the Work requested.
4. Canada will have no obligation to the Contractor under this clause if Canada terminates the Contract in whole or in part for default.

### **1.1.5 Periodic Usage Reports - Contracts with Task Authorizations**

The Contractor must compile and maintain records on its provision of services to the federal government under authorized Task Authorizations issued under the Contract.

The Contractor must provide this data in accordance with the reporting requirements detailed below. If some data is not available, the reason must be indicated. If services are not provided during a given period, the Contractor must still provide a "nil" report.

The data must be submitted on a quarterly basis to the Contracting Authority.

The quarterly periods are defined as follows:

- 1st quarter: April 1 to June 30;
- 2nd quarter: July 1 to September 30;
- 3rd quarter: October 1 to December 31; and
- 4th quarter: January 1 to March 31.

The data must be submitted to the Contracting Authority no later than \_\_\_\_ (insert number of days) calendar days after the end of the reporting period.

#### Reporting Requirement- Details

A detailed and current record of all authorized tasks must be kept for each contract with a task authorization process. This record must contain:

For each authorized task:

- a. the authorized task number or task revision number(s);
- b. a title or a brief description of each authorized task;
- c. the total estimated cost specified in the authorized Task Authorization (TA) of each task, exclusive of Applicable Taxes;
- d. the total amount, exclusive of Applicable Taxes, expended to date against each authorized task;
- e. the start and completion date for each authorized task; and
- f. the active status of each authorized task, as applicable.

For all authorized tasks:



- a. the amount (exclusive of Applicable Taxes) specified in the contract (as last amended, as applicable) as Canada's total liability to the contractor for all authorized TAs; and
- b. the total amount, exclusive of Applicable Taxes, expended to date against all authorized TAs.

## 2. Standard Clauses and Conditions

All clauses and conditions identified in the Contract by number, date and title are set out in the [Standard Acquisition Clauses and Conditions Manual](https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual) (https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual) issued by Public Works and Government Services Canada.

### 2.1 General Conditions

2040 (2014-03-01), General Conditions - Research & Development, apply to and form part of the Contract.

### 2.2 SACC Manual Clauses

K3410C (2008-12-12), Canada to Own Intellectual Property Rights in Foreground Information

## 3. Security Requirement

### 3.1 The following security requirement (SRCL and related clauses) applies and form part of the Contract.

1. The Contractor must, at all times during the performance of the Contract, hold a valid Facility Security Clearance at the level of NATO SECRET, with approved Document Safeguarding at the level of NATO SECRET, issued by the Canadian Industrial Security Directorate (CISD), Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC).
2. This Contract includes access to controlled goods. Prior to access, the Contractor must be registered in the Controlled Goods Program of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
3. The Contractor personnel requiring access to PROTECTED/CLASSIFIED information, assets or sensitive work site(s) must EACH hold a valid personnel security screening at the level of NATO SECRET, granted or approved by the CISD, PWGSC. Until the security screening of the Contractor personnel required by this Contract has been completed satisfactorily by the Canadian Industrial Security Directorate, Public Works and Government Services Canada, the Contractor personnel **MAY NOT HAVE ACCESS** to CLASSIFIED/PROTECTED information or assets, and **MAY NOT ENTER** sites where such information or assets are kept, without an escort.
4. The Contractor personnel requiring access to NATO UNCLASSIFIED information or assets do not require to hold a personnel security clearance; however, the Contractor must ensure that the NATO Unclassified information is not releasable to third parties and that the "need to know" principle is applied to personnel accessing this information
5. The Contractor personnel requiring access to **NATO RESTRICTED** information or assets **must be citizens of a NATO member country or a permanent resident of Canada** and EACH hold a valid NATO SECRET clearance, granted or approved by a NATO national security authority.



6. The Contractor personnel requiring access to **NATO CLASSIFIED** information, assets or sensitive work site(s) **must be permanent residents of Canada or citizens of a NATO member country** and EACH hold a valid personnel security screening at the level of NATO SECRET, granted or approved by the appropriate delegated NATO Security Authority.
7. Processing of PROTECTED/CLASSIFIED information electronically at the Contractor's site is NOT permitted under this Contract.
8. Subcontracts which contain security requirements are NOT to be awarded without the prior written permission of CISD/PWGSC.
9. The Contractor must complete and submit a Foreign Ownership, Control and Influence (FOCI) Questionnaire and associated documentation identified in the FOCI Guidelines for Organizations prior to contract award to identify whether a third party individual, firm or government can gain unauthorized access to CLASSIFIED NATO information/assets. Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) will determine if the company is "*Not Under FOCI*" or "*Under FOCI*". When an organization is determined to be *Under FOCI*, PWGSC will ascertain if mitigation measures exist or must be put in place by the company so it can be deemed "*Not Under FOCI through Mitigation*".
10. The Contractor should at all times during the performance of the Contract possess a letter from PWGSC identifying the results of the FOCI assessment with a FOCI designation of *Not Under FOCI* or *Not Under FOCI through Mitigation*.
11. All changes to Questionnaire and associated FOCI evaluation factors must immediately be submitted to the Industrial Security Sector (ISS) to determine if the changes impact the FOCI designation.
12. The Contractor must comply with the provisions of the:
  - (a) Security Requirements Check List and security guide (if applicable), attached at Annex D;
  - (b) *Industrial Security Manual* (Latest Edition).

#### **4. Term of Contract**

##### **4.1 Period of the Contract**

The period of the contract is two years from date of contract award.

##### **4.2 Option to Extend the Contract**

The Contractor grants to Canada the irrevocable option to extend the term of the Contract by up to 2 additional 1 year periods under the same conditions. The Contractor agrees that, during the extended period of the Contract, it will be paid in accordance with the applicable provisions as set out in the Basis of Payment.

Canada may exercise this option at any time by sending a written notice to the Contractor at least 1 calendar day prior to the Contract expiry date. The option may only be exercised by the Contracting Authority, and will be evidenced for administrative purposes only, through a contract amendment.



**5. Authorities**

**5.1 Contracting Authority**

The Contracting Authority for the Contract is:

Joseph Hulse  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Acquisitions Branch  
Science Procurement Directorate  
Place du Portage, Phase III, 11C1  
11 Laurier Street  
Gatineau, Quebec  
K1A 0S5  
11 Laurier Street  
Gatineau, Quebec  
K1A 0S5

Telephone: (819) 956-3356  
Facsimile: (819) 997-2229  
E-mail address: [Joseph.Hulse@pwgsc.gc.ca](mailto:Joseph.Hulse@pwgsc.gc.ca)

The Contracting Authority is responsible for the management of the Contract and any changes to the Contract must be authorized in writing by the Contracting Authority. The Contractor must not perform work in excess of or outside the scope of the Contract based on verbal or written requests or instructions from anybody other than the Contracting Authority.

**5.2 Technical Authority**

The Technical Authority for the Contract is:

(To be entered at contract award)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
Organization: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: \_\_\_\_-\_\_\_\_-\_\_\_\_\_  
Facsimile: \_\_\_\_-\_\_\_\_-\_\_\_\_\_  
E-mail address: \_\_\_\_\_

The Technical Authority is the representative of the department or agency for whom the Work is being carried out under the Contract and is responsible for all matters concerning the technical content of the Work under the Contract. Technical matters may be discussed with the Technical Authority; however, the Technical Authority has no authority to authorize changes to the scope of the Work. Changes to the scope of the Work can only be made through a contract amendment issued by the Contracting Authority.

**5.3 Procurement Authority**

The Procurement Authority for the Contract is:

(To be entered at contract award)



The Procurement Authority is the representative of the department or agency for whom the Work is being carried out under the Contract. The Procurement Authority is responsible for the implementation of tools and processes required for the administration of the Contract. The Contractor may discuss administrative matters identified in the Contract with the Procurement Authority however the Procurement Authority has no authority to authorize changes to the scope of the Work. Changes to the scope of Work can only be made through a contract amendment issued by the Contracting Authority.

#### **5.4 Contractor's Representative**

(To be entered at contract award)

### **6. Proactive Disclosure of Contracts with Former Public Servants**

SACC Manual Clause A3025C (2012-11-19)

### **7. Payment**

#### **7.1 Basis of Payment - Individual Task Authorizations**

One of the following types of basis of payment will form part of the approved Task Authorization (TA). The task price must be determined in accordance with the Basis of Payment at Annex B.

##### 7.1.1 Firm Unit Price(s) or Firm Lot Price TA

In consideration of the Contractor satisfactorily completing all of its obligations under the authorized Task Authorization (TA), the Contractor will be paid the firm lot price OR firm unit price(s) in accordance with the basis of payment, in Annex B, as specified in the authorized TA. Customs duties are included and Applicable Taxes are extra.

Canada will not pay the Contractor for any design changes, modifications or interpretations of the Work, unless they have been authorized, in writing, by the Contracting Authority before their incorporation into the Work.

##### 7.1.2 Ceiling Price TA

The Contractor will be reimbursed its costs reasonably and properly incurred in the performance of the Work, as determined in accordance with the Basis of Payment in Annex B, to the ceiling price specified in the approved TA. Customs duties are included and Applicable Taxes are extra.

The ceiling price is subject to downward adjustment so as not to exceed the actual costs reasonably incurred in the performance of the Work and computed in accordance with the Basis of Payment.

Canada will not pay the Contractor for any design changes, modifications or interpretations of the Work unless they have been approved, in writing, by the Contracting Authority, before their incorporation into the Work.

##### 7.1.3 TA subject to a Limitation of Expenditure

The Contractor will be reimbursed for the costs reasonably and properly incurred in the performance of the Work specified in the authorized Task Authorization (TA), as



determined in accordance with the Basis of Payment in Annex B, to the limitation of expenditure specified in the authorized TA.

Canada's liability to the Contractor under the authorized TA must not exceed the limitation of expenditure specified in the authorized TA. Customs duties are included and Applicable Taxes are extra.

No increase in the liability of Canada or in the price of the Work specified in the authorized TA resulting from any design changes, modifications or interpretations of the Work will be authorized or paid to the Contractor unless these design changes, modifications or interpretations have been authorized, in writing, by the Contracting Authority before their incorporation into the Work.

## **7.2 Limitation of Expenditure - All the Work - Task Authorizations**

1. Canada's total liability to the Contractor under the Contract for all authorized Task Authorizations (TAs), inclusive of any revisions, must not exceed the sum of \$ \_\_\_\_\_. Customs duties are included and the Goods and Services Tax or Harmonized Sales Tax is extra, if applicable.
2. No increase in the total liability of Canada will be authorized or paid to the Contractor unless an increase has been approved, in writing, by the Contracting Authority.
3. The Contractor must notify the Contracting Authority in writing as to the adequacy of this sum:
  - a) when it is 75 percent committed, or
  - b) four (4) months before the contract expiry date, or
  - c) as soon as the Contractor considers that the sum is inadequate for the completion of the Work required in all authorized TAs, inclusive of any revisions, whichever comes first.
4. If the notification is for inadequate contract funds, the Contractor must provide to the Contracting Authority, a written estimate for the additional funds required. Provision of such information by the Contractor does not increase Canada's liability

## **7.3 Method of Payment - Task Authorizations**

1. The Contractor must submit a claim for payment using form [PWGSC-TPSGC 1111](#), Claim for Progress Payment.

Each claim must show:

- a. all information required on form [PWGSC-TPSGC 1111](#);
- b. all applicable information detailed under the section entitled "Invoice Submission" of the general conditions;
- c. a list of all expenses;
- d. the description and value of the milestone claimed as detailed in the Contract.

Each claim must be supported by:

- a. a copy of time sheets to support the time claimed;
- b. a copy of the invoices, receipts, vouchers for all direct expenses, travel and living expenses;
- c. a copy of the monthly progress report as required by T.A.



2. Applicable Taxes must be calculated on the total amount of the claim before the holdback is applied. At the time the holdback is claimed, there will be no Applicable Taxes payable as it was claimed and payable under the previous claims for progress payments.
3. The Contractor must prepare and certify one original and two (2) copies of the claim on form [PWGSC-TPSGC 1111](#), and forward it to the *Technical* Authority identified under the section entitled "Authorities" of the Contract for appropriate certification after inspection and acceptance of the Work takes place.

The *Technical* Authority will then forward the original and two (2) copies of the claim to the Contracting Authority for certification and onward submission to the Payment Office for the remaining certification and payment action.

4. The Contractor must not submit claims until all work identified in the claim is completed.

#### **7.4 SACC Manual Clauses**

A9117C (2007-11-30), T1204 - Direct Request by Customer Department  
C0305C (2008-05-12), Cost Submission  
C0711C (2008-05-12), Time Verification

#### **8. Invoicing Instructions**

1. The Contractor must submit a claim for progress payment using form PWGSC-TPSGC 1111 (<http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/app-acq/forms/documents/1111.pdf>), Claim for Progress Payment.

Each claim must show:

- (a) all information required on form PWGSC-TPSGC 1111;
- (b) all applicable information detailed under the section entitled "Invoice Submission" of the general conditions;
- (c) a list of all expenses;
- (d) the description and value of the milestone claimed as detailed in the Contract.

Each claim must be supported by:

- (a) a copy of time sheets to support the time claimed;
- (b) a copy of the invoices, receipts, vouchers for all direct expenses, and all travel and living expenses;
- (c) a copy of the monthly progress report.

2. Applicable Taxes must be calculated on the total amount of the claim before the holdback is applied. At the time the holdback is claimed, there will be no Applicable Taxes payable as it was claimed and payable under the previous claims for progress payments.
3. The Contractor must prepare and certify one original and two (2) copies of the claim on form PWGSC-TPSGC 1111, and forward it to the Contracting Authority for certification. The Contracting Authority will then forward the original and two (2) copies of the claim to the Technical Authority for appropriate certification after inspection and acceptance of the Work takes place, and onward submission to the Payment Office for the remaining certification and payment.
4. The Contractor must not submit claims until all work identified in the claim is completed.



## **9. Certifications**

### **9.1 Compliance**

Compliance with the certifications and related documentation provided by the Contractor in its bid is a condition of the Contract and subject to verification by Canada during the entire contract period. If the Contractor does not comply with any certification, provide the related documentation or if it is determined that any certification made by the Contractor in its bid is untrue, whether made knowingly or unknowingly, Canada has the right, pursuant to the default provision of the Contract, to terminate the Contract for default.

### **9.2 SACC Manual Clauses**

A3060C (2008-05-12), Canadian Content Certification

## **10. Applicable Laws**

The Contract must be interpreted and governed, and the relations between the parties determined, by the laws in force in (to be inserted at contract award).

## **11. Priority of Documents**

If there is a discrepancy between the wording of any documents that appear on the list, the wording of the document that first appears on the list has priority over the wording of any document that subsequently appears on the list.

- (1) the Articles of Agreement;
- (2) Annex C, Security Requirements Check List;
- (3) the general conditions 2040 (2014-03-01), General Conditions - Research & Development;
- (4) Annex A, Statement of Requirement;
- (5) Annex B, Basis of Payment;
- (6) Annex D, the signed Task Authorizations;
- (7) the Contractor's bid dated \_\_\_\_\_.

## **12. Defence Contract**

SACC Manual clause A9006C (2012-07-16), Defence Contract

## **13. Insurance**

SACC Manual clause G1005C (2008-05-12), Insurance

## **14. Canadian Forces Site Regulations**

The Contractor must comply with all standing orders or other regulations, instructions and directives in force on the site where the Work is performed.



**15. Controlled Goods Program**

SACC Manual clause A9131C (2011-05-16), Controlled Goods Program



## ANNEX A Statement of Requirement (SOR)

### Integrated S&T capabilities accessible to the CSSP

#### **1.0 Goal**

The Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) Centre for Security Science (CSS), requires on an “as and when requested” basis, agile and competent Science and Technology (S&T) capabilities accessible to the broader activities harmonized in the Canadian Safety and Security Program (CSSP), and others as appropriate.

#### **2.0 Background**

The CSS was founded in March of 2006 to serve as a centre for Canadian Public Safety & Security (PSS) S&T. It is managed by DRDC, in partnership with Public Safety (PS) Canada and the program governance structure. CSS delivers the CSSP and carries out other Public Safety and Security S&T related activities in support of about 21 federal departments and agencies. Further, the CSSP also manages activities, which influence Canadian provinces, territories, municipalities, and at the national level, as appropriate.

The DRDC CSS was responsible for the Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear (CBRN) Research Technology Initiative (CRTI). The CRTI was a program that supported the development and implementation of leading edge S&T to address the preparation for, prevention of, response to and recovery from high impact chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear or explosive and the forensics of such agents (CBRNEf). The CRTI program was launched in May 2002 and was renewed by Treasury Board in October, 2006. This program was widely regarded as an example and a template of a successful, federally led, collaborative S&T program with impact and influence. The CRTI program eventually evolved to include sister programs such as the Public Security Technical Program (PSTP) and the Canadian Police Research Centre (CPRC). All three (3) programs have since been integrated into a harmonized CSSP in 2012.

The harmonized CSSP is not “technology-focussed”, but “outcome-driven”. The CSSP has evolved to an “all hazards” approach to risk as well as a Capability-based approach in which people, processes, technology and partnerships are addressed in an integrated fashion to deliver effects or influence on “outcomes” that matter to Canadians. The CSSP program is thus not just about maturing innovative technologies per se. To enhance public safety and security capabilities, the CSSP uses S&T as a lead investment to address Public Safety & Security Capability gaps. This Capability based approach has evolved from previous efforts [such as in the Department of National Defence (DND) and Canadian Forces (CF)] to assume a more holistic view of a Capability.

Further, the CSSP is counting on having access to S&T not only on a National level but on an International scale.

Like many Allied Centres, the CSS is largely dependent on access to S&T in the following five (5) broad domains to get work done and achieve the desired influences on Outcomes:

1. CBRNE and Natural hazards,
2. Critical, physical and digital infrastructure
3. Border security, Biometrics for national security and Surveillance Intelligence and Interdiction



4. Emergency Management, Communications Interoperability, Operational decision support, Psycho Social aspects
5. Tri-Services, which includes Law enforcement (LE), Fire, Emergency Medical System (EMS)

The fundamental premise of the CSSP is that S&T, when employed as a lead investment, enables the partner departments or agencies to continue to progress forward and stay ahead of all hazards and threats and thus, augment their capabilities. The CSSP has a significant role in scoping the application of S&T capabilities but needs input from and access to the industrial community to support the CSSP. The end goal of this present effort is to rapidly and efficiently enhance Canada's capacity to 'scale up' the use of S&T capabilities to meet specific S&T or operational requirements. This is even more important knowing the many partners in the CSSP are not from lab-based departments or agencies. In response to the CSSP's requirement to employ S&T as a lead investment, these services are required to provide optimal access to efficient and effective industrial S&T and to provide the desired enhanced support to the broader CSSP communities. The work carried out will develop a greater capacity to scale up responses and generate a greater impact with agility on addressing gaps relevant to the public safety security outcomes.

### **3.0 Objective**

This requirement is to acquire agile PSS S&T contracted research and development services on an "as and when requested" basis to support the broader PSS S&T activities, which involve research, technology and analysis in studies and projects, as well as in concept development, experimentation and experiments in the five (5) domain areas highlighted above.

### **4.0 Tasks**

The Contractor must provide a range of services to the CSSP team. Work will be defined and authorized by Canada in form of a task authorization that is raised on an "as and when requested" basis. After having accepted a task authorization, the Contractor will then execute the task, mostly at the Contractor's facilities. The Contractor must perform such work in an iterative and incremental fashion, to ensure adherence to requirements and standards, access to first responders and to ensure the influence on Outcomes is reached.

It is expected that these tasks may include any of the following classes of support as shown below. To assist in the planning and the development of the CSSP portfolio areas, work tasks will be required to focus support within the following S&T areas of interest:

- 1) Chemical;
- 2) Biological;
- 3) Radiological/Nuclear;
- 4) Explosives;
- 5) Forensics of CBRNE;
- 6) Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP), Risk, Dependencies and Interdependencies;
- 7) eSecurity, focused on bolstering Critical Digital Infrastructure for Industrial Control Systems (ICS) and Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) systems, as well as combating cyber crime by augmenting the Capability to identify, mitigate, neutralize cyber threats mainly at the national level..
- 8) Border & Transportation Security, including Cargo security, Traveller security and Transit security
- 9) Biometrics for national security,
- 10) Intelligence-led Surveillance & Interdiction,
- 11) Emergency Management including Disaster resilience, Emergency Operations Centres (EOC), Situation Awareness, Operational decision support,
- 12) Communications Interoperability,
- 13) Psycho-Social including Community Resilience, as well as Radicalization & Extremism,



- 14) Risk Assessment, Consolidated Risk Assessment (CRA) and All Hazards Risk Assessment (AHRA),
- 15) Capability Based approach: capabilities to Anticipate, Prevent, Prepare, Respond and Recover from emergencies and disasters.
- 16) Visual Analytics, predictive analytics as well as video analytics,
- 17) Tri-services analyses (LE, Fire, EMS),
- 18) Public Safety and Security Policy,
- 19) Business Development, market analysis and Technology transition,
- 20) Operational Research & Analysis;
- 21) Advanced Strategic analysis; evidence based Policy analysis
- 22) Test and Evaluation (T&E) analysis.

To further assist planning, the anticipated relative proportion of requests for each type of task in relation to all clusters and working groups is expected to be relatively equal.

The contractor will be required to execute broad types of tasks described below on an 'as and when requested basis':

a. **Concept Definition and Analysis Studies**

The Contractor must work with members of the CSSP to explore, define, appropriately test and report on new concepts, new innovative technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts and technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis. Concept definition and analysis remain Outcome-Driven.

b. **Project Management**

The Contractor must develop S&T project plans and manage its project teams assigned to all task authorizations consistent with the methodologies followed by the Project Management Institute (PMI). This project management work may include the need to publish and modify project plans as required, forecast resource and cost requirements, monitor and control the S&T work of project teams towards the completion of those plans, report progress, and lead progress review meetings.

c. **Risk Analysis**

The Contractor must conduct the following:

- a. Threat and proliferation assessment analysis;
- b. Vulnerability assessment analysis;
- c. Foresight and security visioning analysis;
- d. Risk analysis in the context of risk management frameworks, such as the Consolidated Risk Assessment (CRA) or the All Hazards Risk Assessment (AHRA); and
- e. Capability gap analysis as it applies to investment prioritization. Subject Matter Expertise (SME) may be required to support the conduct of work for CSSP and may include and necessitate deep knowledge of the Public Safety and Security Policy, Operations, S&T and Intelligence communities.

d. **Organization and Facilitation of Multi-Disciplinary S&T Team Events and Workshops**

During the definition of operational requirements, the creation of concept or system or capability designs, the planning of experiments, and the review of experimental results for exploitation, the Contractor must plan, lead, and summarize the results of multi-disciplinary team sessions, some of which may be executed in a distributed fashion employing collaborative planning environments or in workshops. Such sessions may involve the assistance of a different group of stakeholders in support of the five (5) broad domain areas through structured collaboration, resulting in recorded, agreed



upon, and prioritized material for the project. Teams may be related to threats or hazards, targets of such threats or finally, on operations against such threats.

e. **Capability Analysis and Capability Assessment**

The Contractor must conduct an analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements. The contractor must also validate and document requirements with associated stakeholder communities, in order to define new concepts for systems or capabilities. Furthermore, the Contractor must provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design. At the system level, design inputs will typically be required in the form of design descriptions, illustrations, and visual prototypes (at times models). At the capability level, design inputs could typically be required in the form of Department of Defence Architecture Framework (DoDAF) artifacts, often at the Operational View (OV) level, but at times System Views and Technical Views (SVs and TVs) will also be required. Additionally, the ability to extend architecture analysis at the strategic and enterprise level will be required, primarily as a means to demonstrate traceability to a strategic or departmental vision. Interactions (information, communications, technology) between organizations will be required to reflect the interdependent relationships that can influence the overall impact of an event and an outcome-based solution or both.

f. **Architecture Environment Configuration and Operation**

The Contractor must configure a range of modeling and simulation (M&S) tools to execute architectures in operationally relevant experimental scenarios. These tasks will require both the extension of architecture modeling tools, and M&S environments to increasingly automate the flow of architecture designs into simulation environments, and to increasingly link simulation environments to architecture modeling tools. These tasks will require the Contractor to configure simulation-based analytical environments able to capture system and capability level metrics when architectures are executed in operationally relevant scenarios. M&S environments used to support executable architectures can include both stand alone and distributed simulation, and both constructive and virtual simulation. In support of Public Security's 'system-of-systems' analysis and architectural studies, the Contractor must integrate simulation environments with Command and Control (C2) systems, whereby human-in-the-loop command team exercises can be used to exercise alternative architectures, and operators exercise with their actual or new C2 systems in the simulation.

g. **Experimentation Planning and Design**

The Contractor must define experimentation or exercise campaigns in support of the five (5) broad domains, which are a high level plan for a series of experiments towards an agreed upon objective, in addition to defining individual experiments. The Contractor must develop experimental plan documents, including scenario definition, measurement definition and methods, and the definition of the experimental conduct plan including physical setup (hardware and software infrastructure or both required). In many instances, these experiments will be executed in a distributed fashion and therefore expertise in defining, developing and executing and reporting on distributed simulation experiments is required.

h. **Experimentation Execution, Conduct, and Reporting**

The Contractor must lead the conduct of credible and authoritative experiments and experimentation. While CSSP will develop or will have access to a suitable suite of M&S-based tools to support its programs, initial program development will leverage common methods and simulation methodologies within DRDC and beyond and, as such, these tasks will require the Contractor to employ Canada's tool kit, and others which may include, but are not limited to:



- a) Modelling and simulation tools, such as:
  - 1. Matlab™;
  - 2. Finite Element Modelling (FEM) based tools;
  - 3. Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) based tools;
  - 4. ALL HAZARDS tools (tools to model and to simulate CBRN agents, Explosive Blast, Earthquake, Flood, Wildfires, Tsunamis); and
  - 5. Disaster-losses tools such as in HAZUS™.
  
- b) Capability Analysis tools, such as:
  - 1. DOORS™;
  - 2. CORE™;
  - 3. System Architect™,
  - 4. Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Incident Management System (NIMS) software tool "NIMCAST";
  - 5. IPME™
  
- c) GIS-based Emergency Management (EM) tools and EM tools such as:
  - 1. CSS' own Multi-Agency Situational Awareness System (MASAS);
  - 2. ESRI™ based tools such as:
    - a. ArcGIS™,
    - b. EmerGeo™; and
    - c. Incident Command System tools.
  
- d) Visualization tools such as:
  - 1. CSS' MASAS;
  - 2. DHS' Virtual USA;
  - 3. FEMA's IPAWS;
  - 4. HAZUS™; and
  - 5. Visual analysis tools, such as Geotime™.

From the above, the Contractor must gather and produce experimental data, reduce experimental data sets and publish the results in formal DRDC Technical Reports, using the DRDC template, provided by the technical authority, for proper formatting.

Other requested formats may also be required via Data Item Descriptions (DIDs - see Annex J), presentations, and conference or scientific journal papers. There may also be the requirement for other specific analyses, which are described below:

- i. **Policy Analysis , Strategic S&T Posture Analysis**  
The Contractor must lead the conduct of analyses in relation to new policy or new strategic perspective, the impact or potential impact on S&T, and the impact of S&T on such policy in the whole of Government.
  
- j. **Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps'**  
The Contractor must map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to contrast innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.
  
- k. **Capability Roadmaps**  
The Contractor must map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.



**I. Market analysis, market size analysis, business development, technology transition analysis and finally, technology transition reporting**

The Contractor must document an analysis of the market for mature innovative technology that would be first to market, document the size of such opportunity, analyze a transition journey to operations and finally document the influence on the targeted outcome.

**4.1 CSSP Categories of Resources as well as description and examples of Task**

**A. Account Manager**

- Facilitates coordination and collaboration amongst the Contractor and DND resources.
- Strategically discuss new emerging opportunities for the Enterprise.
- Manages strategically the account.
- Optimizes Resources to the tasks for optimal efficacy and efficiency of all involved.

**B. Chief S&T Advisor**

- Provides recommendations on strategically complex problems, complex protocols that are essential for a Proper Way Ahead to mature or to operationalize innovative Technology.
- Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: Explore, define, appropriately test and report on new innovative concepts/ technologies and the feasibility / applicability of such concepts / technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps.
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test & Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Produce evidence-based option analysis.
- Ensures that Concept/Technology definition / analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Conduct requirements analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements.
- Validate those requirements with associated stakeholder communities and formalize those requirements in documents, as required, to define new concepts for systems or capabilities.
- Provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design.
- Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps': map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to compare and contrast existing innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, efficacy, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.
- Capability Roadmaps : map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

**C. Senior Project Manager**

- Act as Senior PM for large Transactions.
- Directs the project implementation processes associated with S&T projects to confirm objectives and priorities and oversee guidelines and protocols to ensure alignment with DRDC-CSS priorities and PWGSC policy and reporting requirements.
- Manage the administration of annual project business cycle processes
- Oversees the implementation and reports on the performance of projects and programs for conformance to program strategy, plan and schedule.



#### **D. Intermediate Project Manager**

- Tasks are as above, but to an intermediate level of complexity and sensitivity, requiring a intermediate level of experience.

#### **E. Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME**

- Establish and assist execution of a strategic Architecture framework analysis, in support of a Capability plan
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test& Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Advise on, and facilitate the collaborative development of a Capability Roadmap
- Advises on challenges and opportunities based on the data gathered from the various Architecture framework "Views".
- Explore, define, appropriately test and report on new concepts, new innovative technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts and technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Ensures that Concept/Technology definition / analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Conduct Capability Analysis and Capability Assessment.
- Validate those requirements with associated stakeholder communities and formalize those requirements in documents, as required, to define new concepts for systems or capabilities.
- Provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design.
- Provide design inputs typically in the form of design descriptions, illustrations, and visual prototypes (at times models). At the capability level, design inputs could typically be required in the form of Department of Defence Architecture Framework (DoDAF) artifacts, often at the Operational View (OV) level, but at times System Views and Technical Views (SVs and TVs) will also be required.
- Extend architecture analysis at the strategic and enterprise level will be required, primarily as a means to demonstrate traceability to a strategic or departmental vision. Interactions (information, communications, technology) between organizations will be required to reflect the interdependent relationships that can influence the overall impact of an event and an outcome-based .
- Conduct requirements analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements.
- Configure Architecture Environment to execute architectures in operationally relevant experimental scenarios.
- Capture system and capability level metrics when architectures are executed in operationally relevant scenarios.
- Capability Roadmaps: map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

#### **F. Intermediate Capability Engineering and Architecture SME**

- Tasks are as above, but to a lower level complexity and sensitivity, requiring a lower level of experience.

#### **G. Senior Cyber SME in ICS and SCADA**

- Understand related complex challenges and opportunities ;
- Executes with the National Community, S&T plans to close gaps.



- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test& Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: explore, define, appropriately test and report on new concepts, new innovative technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts and technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Ensures that Concept/Technology definition / analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Conduct requirements analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements.
- Validate those requirements with associated stakeholder communities and formalize those requirements in documents, as required, to define new concepts for systems or capabilities.
- Provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design. At the system level, design inputs will typically be required in the form of design descriptions, illustrations, and visual prototypes (at times models).
- Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps': map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to compare and contrast existing innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, efficacy, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.
- Capability Roadmaps: map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

#### **H. Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats**

- Understands scientific and technological gaps in the capability to ID, Mitigate and neutralize Cyber threat and to combat cyber crime at national Level.
- Carries out experiments to document the value of new innovative concepts / technologies to address gaps.
- Address operationalization of solutions.
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test& Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Ensures that Concept/Technology definition / analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: explore, define, appropriately test and report on new innovative Concepts/ Technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts / technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Conduct requirements analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements.
- Validate those requirements with associated stakeholder communities and formalize those requirements in documents, as required, to define new concepts for systems or capabilities.
- Provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design. At the system level, design inputs will typically be required in the form of design descriptions, illustrations, and visual prototypes (at times models).
- Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps': map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to compare and



contrast existing innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, efficacy, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.

- Capability Roadmaps : map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

#### **I. Senior Security Risk Assessment SME**

- Capture the AHRA (ALL HAZARDS RISK ASSESSMENT) 'Body of Knowledge' to help promote the AHRA-like framework model across jurisdictions and to help support informed decision making.
- Formulates and executes novel approaches to Risk.
- Conduct the following:
  - a. Threat and proliferation assessment analysis;
  - b. Vulnerability assessment analysis;
  - c. Foresight and security visioning analysis;
  - d. Risk analysis in the context of risk management frameworks, such as the Consolidated Risk Assessment (CRA) or the All Hazards Risk Assessment (AHRA); and
  - e. Capability gap analysis as it applies to investment prioritization.
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test & Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Support the conduct of work for CSSP and may include and necessitate deep knowledge of the Public Safety and Security Policy, Operations, S&T and Intelligence communities.
- Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: explore, define, appropriately test and report on new concepts, new innovative technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts and technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Ensures that Concept definition and analysis remain Outcome-Driven.

#### **J. Intermediate Security Risk Assessment SME**

- Tasks are as above, but to a lower level complexity and sensitivity, requiring a lower level of experience.

#### **K. Senior Chemical Biological Agent SME**

- Understands scientific and technological gaps in CB S&T.
- Matures the science or the technology or concepts of Defence against CB agents and executes plans for successful transition and operationalization of such related outputs to clients.
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test & Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: explore, define, appropriately test and report on new concepts, new innovative technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts and technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Ensures that Concept/Technology definition / analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Conduct requirements analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements.
- Validate those requirements with associated stakeholder communities and formalize those requirements in documents, as required, to define new concepts for systems or capabilities.



- Provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design. At the system level, design inputs will typically be required in the form of design descriptions, illustrations, and visual prototypes (at times models).
- Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps': map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to compare and contrast existing innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, efficacy, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.
- Capability Roadmaps : map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

#### **L. Senior Radionuclear Agent SME**

- Understands scientific and technological gaps in RN
- Matures the science or the technology or concepts of Defence against RN agents and executes plans for successful transition and operationalization of such related outputs to clients.
- Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: explore, define, appropriately test and report on new innovative concepts/ technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts / technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test& Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Ensures that Concept/Technology definition / analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Conduct requirements analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements.
- Validate those requirements with associated stakeholder communities and formalize those requirements in documents, as required, to define new concepts for systems or capabilities.
- Provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design. At the system level, design inputs will typically be required in the form of design descriptions, illustrations, and visual prototypes (at times models).
- Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps': map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to compare and contrast existing innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, efficacy, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.
- Capability Roadmaps : map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

#### **M. Senior Explosives SME**

- Understands scientific and technological gaps in Explosives and Home Made Explosives.
- Matures the science or the technology or concepts of Defence against E and HME agents and executes plans for successful transition and operationalization of such related outputs to clients.



- Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: explore, define, appropriately test and report on new concepts, new innovative technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts and technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test& Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Ensures that Concept/Technology definition / analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Conduct requirements analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements.
- Validate those requirements with associated stakeholder communities and formalize those requirements in documents, as required, to define new concepts for systems or capabilities.
- Provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design. At the system level, design inputs will typically be required in the form of design descriptions, illustrations, and visual prototypes (at times models).
- Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps': map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to compare and contrast existing innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, efficacy, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.
- Capability Roadmaps : map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

#### **N. Senior Strategist**

- Develops strategic advice on Governance Model or Legal Model or Investment Model or science & Technology insertion Model in support of Transformation, in support of evolution of the Program , in support of the Communities of Practice or in support of a required Way Ahead.
- Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: explore, define, appropriately test and report on new concepts, new innovative technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts and technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test& Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Ensures that Concept/Technology definition / analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Conduct requirements analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements.
- Validate those requirements with associated stakeholder communities and formalize those requirements in documents, as required, to define new concepts for systems or capabilities.
- Provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design. At the system level, design inputs will typically be required in the form of design descriptions, illustrations, and visual prototypes (at times models).
- Policy Analysis, Strategic S&T Posture Analysis: lead the conduct of analyses in relation to new policy or new strategic perspective, their impact or potential impact on S&T and the impact of S&T on such policy in the whole of Government.



- Capability Roadmaps: map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

#### **O. Senior Modelling & Simulation SME**

- Understands and builds new representative scenarios and new M&S constructs.
- Evaluate hardware, software, and facilities requirements for the simulation capability or its efficacy.
- Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: explore, define, appropriately test and report on new concepts, new innovative technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts and technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test& Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Ensures that Concept/Technology definition / analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Conduct requirements analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements.
- Validate those requirements with associated stakeholder communities and formalize those requirements in documents, as required, to define new concepts for systems or capabilities.
- Provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design. At the system level, design inputs will typically be required in the form of design descriptions, illustrations, and visual prototypes (at times models).
- Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps': map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to compare and contrast existing innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, efficacy, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.
- Capability Roadmaps : map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

#### **P. Intermediate Modeling & Simulation SME**

- Tasks are as above, but to a lower level complexity and sensitivity, requiring a lower level of experience.

#### **Q. Senior Test & Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations**

- Identify appropriate qualitative and quantitative measurements that are relevant to a Trial, Demonstration or Experimentation.
- Select metrics that would document the testing of the hypothesis;
- Document whether the data supports that the TOOL being tested and evaluated was built right, and whether the right tool was actually built for the requirement, through trials, demonstrations and experiments in various relevant or operational environments.
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test & Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Confirm the resultant TRL level of the Technology.
- Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: explore, define, appropriately test and report on new concepts, new innovative technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts and technologies that may enhance existing



- capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Ensures that Concept/Technology definition / analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps': map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to compare and contrast existing innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, efficacy, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.
- Capability Roadmaps : map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

#### **R. Intermediate Test & Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations**

- Tasks are as above, but to a lower level complexity and sensitivity, requiring a lower level of experience.

#### **S. Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME**

- Understands scientific and technological gaps in key CIP sectors;
- Carry out experiments to document the value of new innovative concepts / technologies to address gaps in the one sector or gaps in dependencies or interdependencies.
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test & Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Address operationalization of solutions.
- Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: explore, define, appropriately test and report on new concepts, new innovative technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts and technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Ensures that Concept definition and analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Conduct requirements analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements.
- Validate those requirements with associated stakeholder communities and formalize those requirements in documents, as required, to define new concepts for systems or capabilities.
- Provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design. At the system level, design inputs will typically be required in the form of design descriptions, illustrations, and visual prototypes (at times models).
- Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps': map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to compare and contrast existing innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, efficacy, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.
- Capability Roadmaps: map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.



## **T. Border Security SME**

- Establish a baseline of feasible sensor technologies based on current COTS systems. Project these and other emerging technologies in a reasonable way to the 2020 timeframe.
- Establish metrics for Sensor sophistication, Practicality, durability, maintainability, sensitivity, reproducibility, etc.
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test& Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: explore, define, appropriately test and report on new concepts, new innovative technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts and technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Ensure that Concept definition and analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Conduct requirements analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements.
- Validate those requirements with associated stakeholder communities and formalize those requirements in documents, as required, to define new concepts for systems or capabilities.
- Provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design. At the system level, design inputs will typically be required in the form of design descriptions, illustrations, and visual prototypes (at times models).
- Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps': map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to compare and contrast existing innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, efficacy, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.
- Capability Roadmaps : map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

## **U. Biometrics SME**

- Establish a baseline of feasible technologies based on current COTS systems. Project these and other emerging technologies in a reasonable way to the 2020 timeframe.
- Establish metrics for Technology sophistication, Practicality, durability, maintainability, sensitivity, reproducibility, etc.
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test& Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: explore, define, appropriately test and report on new concepts, new innovative technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts and technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Ensures that Concept definition and analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Conduct requirements analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements.
- Validate those requirements with associated stakeholder communities and formalize those requirements in documents, as required, to define new concepts for systems or capabilities.



- Provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design. At the system level, design inputs will typically be required in the form of design descriptions, illustrations, and visual prototypes (at times models).
- Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps': map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to compare and contrast existing innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, efficacy, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.
- Capability Roadmaps : map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

#### **V. Emergency Management SME**

- Understands scientific and technological gaps in key Emergency Management
- carry out experiments to document the value of new innovative concepts / technologies to address gaps in EM;
- Address operationalization of solutions.
- Performs Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: explore, define, appropriately test and report on new concepts, new innovative technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts and technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test& Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Ensures that Concept definition and analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Conduct requirements analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements.
- Validate those requirements with associated stakeholder communities and formalize those requirements in documents, as required, to define new concepts for systems or capabilities.
- Provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design. At the system level, design inputs will typically be required in the form of design descriptions, illustrations, and visual prototypes (at times models).
- Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps': map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to compare and contrast existing innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, efficacy, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.
- Capability Roadmaps : map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

#### **W. Communications Interoperability SME**

- Understands scientific and technological gaps in Communications Interoperability and 700 MHz part of the Spectrum; Carry out experiments to document the value of new innovative concepts / technologies to address gaps.
- Address operationalization of solutions.
- Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: explore, define, appropriately test and report on new concepts, new innovative technologies and the feasibility or



- applicability of such concepts and technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test& Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Ensures that Concept definition and analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Conduct requirements analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements.
- Validate those requirements with associated stakeholder communities and formalize those requirements in documents, as required, to define new concepts for systems or capabilities.
- Provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design. At the system level, design inputs will typically be required in the form of design descriptions, illustrations, and visual prototypes (at times models).
- Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps': map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to compare and contrast existing innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, efficacy, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.
- Capability Roadmaps : map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

#### **X. Community Resilience SME**

- Understands scientific and technological gaps in Community resilience;
- Carry out experiments to document the value of new innovative concepts / technologies to address gaps.
- Address operationalization of solutions.
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test& Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: explore, define, appropriately test and report on new concepts, new innovative technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts and technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Ensures that Concept definition and analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Conduct requirements analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements.
- Validate those requirements with associated stakeholder communities and formalize those requirements in documents, as required, to define new concepts for systems or capabilities.
- Provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design. At the system level, design inputs will typically be required in the form of design descriptions, illustrations, and visual prototypes (at times models).
- Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps': map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to compare and contrast existing innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, efficacy, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.



- Capability Roadmaps: map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

#### **Y. Radicalization & Extremism SME**

- Understands scientific and technological gaps in Radicalization & Extremism.
- Carry out experiments to document the value of new innovative concepts / technologies to address gaps
- Address operationalization of solutions.
- Conceives, carries out and reports on appropriate and fit-for-the-purpose studies, experiments, trials or Test& Evaluations with the Community of Interest.
- Concept Definition and Analysis Studies: explore, define, appropriately test and report on new concepts, new innovative technologies and the feasibility or applicability of such concepts and technologies that may enhance existing capabilities, the definition of new and emerging capabilities, and opportunities for minimizing capability gaps. This includes evidence-based option analysis.
- Ensures that Concept definition and analysis remain Outcome-Driven to document influence on outcomes.
- Conduct requirements analysis of user requirements, system requirements, and capability requirements.
- Validate those requirements with associated stakeholder communities and formalize those requirements in documents, as required, to define new concepts for systems or capabilities.
- Provide design support to members of CSSP to assist with system, or capability assessment, or concept design. At the system level, design inputs will typically be required in the form of design descriptions, illustrations, and visual prototypes (at times models).
- Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps': map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to compare and contrast existing innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, efficacy, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.
- Capability Roadmaps: map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

#### **Z. Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME**

- performs Market analysis, market size analysis,
- Develops business development plans,
- Articulate strategy for technology transition operationalization and commercialization,
- Develop a strategy for technology transition reporting.
- Technology Roadmaps and Technology 'RoundUps': map out the expected time course of maturation of various innovative technologies, as well compare and contrast competing technologies ('RoundUps' are a means to compare and contrast existing innovative technologies on TRL, sensitivity, cost, user friendliness, efficacy, for example) prior to decision making on selection for additional technology investments.
- Capability Roadmaps : map out and assess the combination of people, process and a particular new innovative technology to a particular capability gap, and ultimately assess the risk of transitioning that innovative technology holistically with people and processes of related organizations in a pilot or in a persistent manner.

#### **AA. Modeling & Simulation and Visualization Technologist**



- Wide ranging Technology support on M&S as well as
- Wide ranging Technology support on Visualization of data, including
- Development of modifications and adaptation of tools.

#### **BB. Facilitation and Workshop Specialist**

- Organize, facilitate and manage a multi day Workshops, with subject matter experts as guest speakers. Upon completion of the workshop a report will be completed to capture the lessons learned during the workshop's conduct.
- During the definition of operational requirements, the creation of concept or system or capability designs, the planning of experiments, and the review of experimental results for exploitation, plan, lead, and summarize the results of multi-disciplinary team sessions, some of which may be executed in a distributed fashion employing collaborative planning environments or in workshops.
- Facilitation of a disparate group of stakeholders in support of the five (5) broad domain areas through structured collaboration, resulting in recorded, agreed upon, and prioritized material for the project. Teams may be related to threats or hazards, targets of such threats or finally, on operations against such threats, augmenting the complexity of the effort.

#### **CC. Technical Writer**

- During the definition of operational requirements, the creation of concept or system or capability designs, the planning of experiments, and the review of experimental results for exploitation, the Contractor may be required to summarize the results of multi-disciplinary team sessions, some of which may be executed in a distributed fashion .

### **5.0 Deliverables**

The deliverables to be created and submitted by the Contractor will be detailed in each task authorization and must be provided to the Technical Authority in accordance with the provisions of the task authorization and in accordance with the schedule therein. The conditions of acceptance for the deliverables, and how they must be submitted, will be detailed in each task, and must all be to the satisfaction of Canada.

Although this is not an exhaustive list, the Contractor may create and submit deliverables of the following types:

- a. Feasibility study reports;
- b. Scoping analysis and plans;
- c. Strategic analysis for optimal S&T posture;
- d. Evidence-based policy analysis;
- e. Progress Reports (on tasks longer than 3 months) (Related DID or Template is found at <http://users.csc.calpoly.edu/~jdalbey/205/Mgmt/progressreport.html>)
- f. Analysis Reports (architecture analysis, requirements analysis, operational analysis, human system integration analysis; threat and risk analysis, capability analysis) ;
- g. Experimental Plans ; (such a template will include the following: Project summary, Objectives, Need for research, Scientific Background, Approach & Procedures, Milestones & Outcomes)
- h. Experimental Design for Trial Development (both live and simulation-based) ;
- i. Configuration and operation of M&S environments for simulation-based scenario driven experiments
- j. Support to field or simulation-based experimentation;
- k. Experimentation Reports;
- l. Architecture Descriptions (with different sets of views);
- m. Test & Evaluation (T&E) Plans and Reports;
- n. Technology roadmaps;



- o. Capability roadmaps;
- p. Concept of Operations (CONOPS) reports, on how a new innovative technology would be used in an operational capability;
- q. Business development plans, market analysis, technology transition reports.

## **6.0 Contractor Support**

As required, Canada may provide a desk should the Contractor be required to perform some of the work “on-site”. Technical and clerical support, supplies and equipment necessary to accomplish tasks must be provided by the Contractor.

As required, Canada may supply a workspace, and telephone for Contractor resources during the normal hours of operation in DND. Access during “silent hours” must be pre-arranged and pre-approved by the Technical Authority (TA). An unclassified web-based portal may be set up by Canada to ensure the sharing of key common documents. Typically, this is accomplished without the need for the Contractor to buy specialized software.

The Technical Authority will act as the liaison between the Contractor and other Government of Canada (GoC) departments, as required.

Canada may provide the Contractor with access to Government Furnished Information (GFI) or Government Furnished Equipment (GFE). As required, all GFE and GFI will be identified within a task authorization. The Contractor must track all provided GFE and GFI using the appropriate DND forms and must return all items upon completion of the task.

## **7.0 Travel and Living**

There may be a requirement to travel. Travel requirements, if applicable, will be specified in each Task Authorization. The Contractors’ personnel will not be compensated for any local travel in the NCR. All travel must have prior written authorization from the Technical Authority and must be undertaken in accordance with the Treasury Board's Travel Directive and Special Travel Authorities.

## **8.0 Glossary**

AHRA: All Hazards Risks Assessment  
CB: Chemical Biological Agents;  
CBRNE: Chemical, Biological, Radionuclear and Explosives;  
CIP: Critical Infrastructure Protection;  
CONOPS: Concept of Operations  
CRTI: CBRN Research Technology Initiative;  
CSSP: Canadian Safety and Security Program  
DHS: Department of Homeland Security;  
EM : Emergency Management;  
EMS: Emergency Medical Services;  
ICS: Industrial Control System;  
PSTP: Public Security Technical Program;  
S&T: Science & Technology;  
SCADA: Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition ;  
T&E: Test and evaluation;

## **9.0 Resource Categories**

- 1) Account Manager
- 2) Chief S&T Advisor
- 3) Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME



- 4) Senior Cyber SME in ICS and SCADA
- 5) Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats
- 6) Senior Strategist
- 7) Senior Modelling & Simulation SME
- 8) Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME
- 9) Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME
- 10) Senior Project Manager
- 11) Intermediate Project Manager
- 12) Intermediate Capability Engineering and Architecture SME
- 13) Senior Security Risk Assessment SME
- 14) Intermediate Security Risk Assessment SME
- 15) Senior Chemical Biological Agent SME
- 16) Senior Radionuclear Agent SME
- 17) Senior Explosives SME
- 18) Intermediate Modeling & Simulation SME
- 19) Senior Test & Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations
- 20) Intermediate Test & Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations
- 21) Border Security SME
- 22) Biometrics SME
- 23) Emergency Management SME
- 24) Communications Interoperability SME
- 25) Community Resilience SME
- 26) Radicalization & Extremism SME
- 27) Modeling & Simulation and Visualization Technologist
- 28) Facilitation and Workshop Specialist
- 29) Technical Writer



**ANNEX B  
BASIS OF PAYMENT**

**1. LABOUR:** at the following firm rates

Category Number	Labour Category	Firm Per Diem Rate Year 1	Firm Per Diem Rate Year 2	Firm Per Diem Rate Option Period 1 Year 3	Firm Per Diem Rate Option Period 2 Year 4
1	Account Manager				
2	Chief S&T Advisor				
3	Senior Capability Engineering and Architecture SME				
4	Senior Cyber SME in ICS and SCADA				
5	Senior Cyber SME in Capability to ID Mitigate Neutralize cyber threats at national level				
6	Senior Strategist				
7	Senior Modelling & Simulation SME				
8	Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) SME				
9	Business Development, Analysis and Transition SME				
10	Senior Project Manager				
11	Intermediate Project Manager				
12	Intermediate Capability Engineering and Architecture SME				
13	Senior Security Risk Assessment SME				
14	Intermediate Security Risk Assessment SME				
15	Senior Chemical Biological Agent SME				
16	Senior Radionuclear Agent SME				
17	Senior Explosives SME				
18	Intermediate Modeling & Simulation SME				
19	Senior Test & Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations				
20	Intermediate Test & Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and				



	Experimentations				
21	Border Security SME				
22	Biometrics SME				
23	Emergency Management SME				
24	Communications Interoperability SME				
25	Community Resilience SME				
26	Radicalization & Extremism SME				
27	Modeling & Simulation and Visualization Technologist				
28	Facilitation and Workshop Specialist				
29	Technical Writer				

Est.: \$

**2. TRAVEL AND LIVING EXPENSES:**

- (a) Canada will not accept any travel and living expenses incurred by the Contractor in the performance of the Work, for:
  - (i) services provided within the National Capital Region (NCR). The National Capital Region (NCR) is defined in the *National Capital Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c.N-4, S.2. The *National Capital Act* is available on the Justice Website: <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/N-4/20100210/> and
  - (ii) any travel between the Contractor's place of business and the NCR.
- (b) For services to be provided outside the NCR, the Contractor will be reimbursed its authorized travel and living expenses reasonably and properly incurred in the performance of the Work, at cost, without any allowance for profit and/or administrative overhead, in accordance with the meal, private vehicle and incidental expenses provided in Appendices B, C and D of the Treasury Board Travel Directive (<http://www.njc-cnm.gc.ca/directive/travel-voyage/s-td-dv-a3-eng.php>), and with the other provisions of the directive referring to “travellers”, rather than those referring to “employees”.
- (c) Canada will not accept any travel and living expenses incurred by the Contractor as a consequence of any relocation of personnel required to satisfy the terms of this Contract.
- (d) All travel must have prior authorization of the Technical Authority. All payments are subject to government audit.

Est.: \$

**Canada’s Total Contract Cost to a Limitation of Expenditure.: \$**  
**(Customs duties are included and Applicable Taxes are extra.)**



ANNEX C

SECURITY REQUIREMENTS CHECK LIST



Government of Canada / Gouvernement du Canada

Contract Number / Numéro du contrat

W7714-135838

Security Classification / Classification de sécurité  
Unclass

SECURITY REQUIREMENTS CHECK LIST (SRCL)  
LISTE DE VÉRIFICATION DES EXIGENCES RELATIVES À LA SÉCURITÉ (LVERS)

PART A - CONTRACT INFORMATION / PARTIE A - INFORMATION CONTRACTUELLE		
1. Originating Government Department or Organization / Ministère ou organisme gouvernemental d'origine DND	2. Branch or Directorate / Direction générale ou Direction DRDC CSS, DSTPS	
3. a) Subcontract Number / Numéro du contrat de sous-traitance RFP	3. b) Name and Address of Subcontractor / Nom et adresse du sous-traitant	
4. Brief Description of Work / Brève description du travail Integrated Scientific and Technological (IST) capabilities accessible to the CSBP		
5. a) Will the supplier require access to Controlled Goods? / Le fournisseur aura-t-il accès à des marchandises contrôlées?	<input type="checkbox"/> No / Non <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / Oui	
5. b) Will the supplier require access to unclassified military technical data subject to the provisions of the Technical Data Control Regulations? / Le fournisseur aura-t-il accès à des données techniques militaires non classifiées qui sont assujetties aux dispositions du Règlement sur le contrôle des données techniques?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No / Non <input type="checkbox"/> Yes / Oui	
6. Indicate the type of access required / Indiquer le type d'accès requis		
6. a) Will the supplier and its employees require access to PROTECTED and/or CLASSIFIED information or assets? / Le fournisseur ainsi que les employés auront-ils accès à des renseignements ou à des biens PROTÉGÉS et/ou CLASSIFIÉS? (Specify the level of access using the chart in Question 7. c) / Préciser le niveau d'accès en utilisant le tableau qui se trouve à la question 7. c)	<input type="checkbox"/> No / Non <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / Oui	
6. b) Will the supplier and its employees (e.g. cleaners, maintenance personnel) require access to restricted zones where access to PROTECTED and/or CLASSIFIED information or assets is permitted? / Le fournisseur et ses employés (p. ex. nettoyeurs, personnel d'entretien) auront-ils accès à des zones d'accès restreintes? L'accès à des renseignements ou à des biens PROTÉGÉS et/ou CLASSIFIÉS n'est pas autorisé.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No / Non <input type="checkbox"/> Yes / Oui	
6. c) Is this a commercial courier or delivery requirement with no overnight storage? / S'agit-il d'un contrat de messagerie ou de livraison commerciale sans entreposage de nuit?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No / Non <input type="checkbox"/> Yes / Oui	
7. a) Indicate the type of information that the supplier will be required to access / Indiquer le type d'information auquel le fournisseur devra avoir accès		
Canada <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NATO / OTAN <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Foreign / Étranger <input type="checkbox"/>
7. b) Release restrictions / Restrictions relatives à la diffusion		
No release restrictions / Aucune restriction relative à la diffusion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All NATO countries / Tous les pays de l'OTAN <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No release restrictions / Aucune restriction relative à la diffusion <input type="checkbox"/>
Not releasable / À ne pas diffuser <input type="checkbox"/>		
Restricted to: / Limité à: <input type="checkbox"/>	Restricted to: / Limité à: <input type="checkbox"/>	Restricted to: / Limité à: <input type="checkbox"/>
Specify country(ies) / Préciser le(s) pays:	Specify country(ies) / Préciser le(s) pays:	Specify country(ies) / Préciser le(s) pays:
7. c) Level of information / Niveau d'information		
PROTECTED A / PROTÉGÉ A <input type="checkbox"/>	NATO UNCLASSIFIED / NATO NON CLASSIFIÉ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PROTECTED A / PROTÉGÉ A <input type="checkbox"/>
PROTECTED B / PROTÉGÉ B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NATO RESTRICTED / NATO DIFFUSION RESTREINTE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PROTECTED B / PROTÉGÉ B <input type="checkbox"/>
PROTECTED C / PROTÉGÉ C <input type="checkbox"/>	NATO CONFIDENTIAL / NATO CONFIDENTIEL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PROTECTED C / PROTÉGÉ C <input type="checkbox"/>
CONFIDENTIAL / CONFIDENTIEL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NATO SECRET / NATO SECRET <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CONFIDENTIAL / CONFIDENTIEL <input type="checkbox"/>
SECRET / SECRET <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	COSMIC TOP SECRET / COSMIC TRÈS SECRET <input type="checkbox"/>	SECRET / SECRET <input type="checkbox"/>
TOP SECRET / TRÈS SECRET <input type="checkbox"/>		TOP SECRET / TRÈS SECRET <input type="checkbox"/>
TOP SECRET (SIGINT) / TRÈS SECRET (SIGINT) <input type="checkbox"/>		TOP SECRET (SIGINT) / TRÈS SECRET (SIGINT) <input type="checkbox"/>

TBS/SCT 350-103(2004/12)

Security Classification / Classification de sécurité  
Unclass





Government of Canada /  
Gouvernement du Canada

Contract Number / Numéro du contrat  
W7714-13688

Security Classification / Classification de sécurité  
unclass

PART A (continued) / PARTIE A (suite)	
8. Will the supplier require access to PROTECTED and/or CLASSIFIED COMSEC information or assets? Le fournisseur aura-t-il accès à des renseignements ou à des biens COMSEC désignés PROTÉGÉS et/ou CLASSIFIÉS? If Yes, indicate the level of sensitivity: Dans l'affirmative, indiquer le niveau de sensibilité:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No / Non <input type="checkbox"/> Yes / Oui
9. Will the supplier require access to extremely sensitive INFOSFC information or assets? Le fournisseur aura-t-il accès à des renseignements ou à des biens INFOSEC de nature extrêmement délicate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No / Non <input type="checkbox"/> Yes / Oui
Short Title(s) of material / Titre(s) abrégé(s) du matériel: Document Number / Numéro du document:	
PART B - PERSONNEL (SUPPLIER) / PARTIE B - PERSONNEL (FOURNISSEUR)	
10. a) Personnel security screening level required / Niveau de contrôle de la sécurité du personnel requis	
<input type="checkbox"/> RELIABILITY STATUS / COTE DE FIABILITE <input type="checkbox"/> TOP SECRET - SIGINT / TRÈS SECRET - SIGINT <input type="checkbox"/> SITE ACCESS / ACCÈS AUX EMPLACEMENTS <input type="checkbox"/> CONFIDENTIAL / CONFIDENTIEL <input type="checkbox"/> NATO CONFIDENTIAL / NATO CONFIDENTIEL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SECRET / SECRET <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NATO SECRET / NATO SECRET <input type="checkbox"/> TOP SECRET / TRÈS SECRET <input type="checkbox"/> COSMIC TOP SECRET / COSMIC TRÈS SECRET	
Special comments: Commentaires spéciaux : Anticipated work to up to NATO SECRET.	
NOTE: If multiple levels of screening are identified, a Security Classification Guide must be provided. REMARQUE: Si plusieurs niveaux de contrôle de sécurité sont requis, un guide de classification de la sécurité doit être fourni.	
10. b) May unscreened personnel be used for portions of the work? Du personnel sans autorisation sécuritaire peut-il se voir confier des parties du travail? If Yes, will unscreened personnel be escorted? Dans l'affirmative, le personnel en question sera-t-il escorté?	<input type="checkbox"/> No / Non <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / Oui
PART C - SAFEGUARDS (SUPPLIER) / PARTIE C - MESURES DE PROTECTION (FOURNISSEUR)	
INFORMATION / ASSETS / RENSEIGNEMENTS / BIENS	
11. a) Will the supplier be required to receive and store PROTECTED and/or CLASSIFIED information or assets on its site or premises? Le fournisseur sera-t-il tenu de recevoir et d'entreposer sur place des renseignements ou des biens PROTÉGÉS et/ou CLASSIFIÉS?	<input type="checkbox"/> No / Non <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / Oui
11. b) Will the supplier be required to safeguard COMSEC information or assets? Le fournisseur sera-t-il tenu de protéger des renseignements ou des biens COMSEC?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No / Non <input type="checkbox"/> Yes / Oui
PRODUCTION	
11. c) Will the production (manufacture, and/or repair and/or modification) of PROTECTED and/or CLASSIFIED material or equipment occur at the supplier's site or premises? Les installations du fournisseur seront-elles à la production (fabrication et/ou réparation et/ou modification) de matériel PROTÉGÉ et/ou CLASSIFIÉ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No / Non <input type="checkbox"/> Yes / Oui
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT) MEDIA / SUPPORT RELATIF À LA TECHNOLOGIE DE L'INFORMATION (TI)	
11. d) Will the supplier be required to use its IT systems to electronically process, produce or store PROTECTED and/or CLASSIFIED information or data? Le fournisseur sera-t-il tenu d'utiliser ses propres systèmes informatiques pour traiter, produire ou stocker électroniquement des renseignements ou des données PROTÉGÉS et/ou CLASSIFIÉS?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No / Non <input type="checkbox"/> Yes / Oui
11. e) Will there be an electronic link between the supplier's IT systems and the government department or agency? Disposera-t-on d'un lien électronique entre le système informatique du fournisseur et celui du ministère ou de l'agence gouvernementale?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No / Non <input type="checkbox"/> Yes / Oui

TBS/SC1 350-103(2004/12)

Security Classification / Classification de sécurité  
unclass

Canada







Instructions for completing DND 626 - Task Authorization	Instructions pour compléter le formulaire DND 626 - Autorisation des tâches
<p><b>Contract no.</b> Enter the PWGSC contract number in full.</p>	<p><b>N° du contrat</b> Inscrivez le numéro du contrat de TPSGC en entier.</p>
<p><b>Task no.</b> Enter the sequential Task number.</p>	<p><b>N° de la tâche</b> Inscrivez le numéro de tâche séquentiel.</p>
<p><b>Amendment no.</b> Enter the amendment number when the original Task is amended to change the scope or the value.</p>	<p><b>N° de la modification</b> Inscrivez le numéro de modification lorsque la tâche originale est modifiée pour en changer la portée.</p>
<p><b>Increase/Decrease</b> Enter the increase or decrease total dollar amount including taxes.</p>	<p><b>Augmentation/Réduction</b> Inscrivez le montant total de l'augmentation ou de la diminution, y compris les taxes.</p>
<p><b>Previous value</b> Enter the previous total dollar amount including taxes.</p>	<p><b>Valeur précédente</b> Inscrivez le montant total précédent, y compris les taxes.</p>
<p><b>To</b> Name of the contractor.</p>	<p><b>À</b> Nom de l'entrepreneur.</p>
<p><b>Delivery location</b> Location where the work will be completed, if other than the contractor's location.</p>	<p><b>Expédié à</b> Endroit où le travail sera effectué, si celui-ci diffère du lieu d'affaires de l'entrepreneur.</p>
<p><b>Delivery/Completion date</b> Completion date for the task.</p>	<p><b>Date de livraison/d'achèvement</b> Date d'achèvement de la tâche.</p>
<p><b>for the Department of National Defence</b> Signature of the DND person who has delegated Authority for signing DND 626 (level of authority based on the dollar value of the task and the equivalent signing authority in the delegation of financial authorities). <b>Note:</b> the person signing in this block ensures that the work is within the scope of the contract, that sufficient funds remain in the contract to cover this task and that the task is affordable within the Project/Unit budget.</p>	<p><b>pour le ministère de la Défense nationale</b> Signature du représentant du MDN auquel on a délégué le pouvoir d'approbation en ce qui a trait à la signature du formulaire DND 626 (niveau d'autorité basé sur la valeur de la tâche et le signataire autorisé équivalent mentionné dans les délégations des pouvoirs financiers). <b>Nota :</b> la personne qui signe cette attache de signature confirme que les travaux respectent la portée du contrat, que suffisamment de fonds sont prévus au contrat pour couvrir cette tâche et que le budget alloué à l'unité ou pour le projet le permet.</p>
<p><b>Matériel/Services</b> Define the requirement briefly (attach the SOW) and identify the cost of the task using the contractor's quote on the level of effort. The Task must use the basis of payment stipulated in the contract. If there are several basis of payment then list here the one(s) that will apply to the task quote (e.g. milestone payments; per diem rates/labour category hourly rates; travel and living rates; firm price/celling price, etc.). All the terms and conditions of the contract apply to this Task Authorization and cannot be ignored or amended for this task. Therefore it is not necessary to restate these general contract terms and conditions on the DND 626 Task form.</p>	<p><b>Matériel/Services</b> Définissez brièvement le besoin (joignez l'ET) et établissez le coût de la tâche à l'aide de la soumission de l'entrepreneur selon le niveau de difficulté de celle-ci. Les modalités de paiement stipulées dans le contrat s'appliquent à la tâche. Si plusieurs d'entre elles sont prévues, énumérez ici celle/celles qui s'appliqueront à la soumission pour la tâche à accomplir (p.ex. acompte fondé sur les étapes franchies; taux quotidien ou taux horaire établi selon la catégorie de main-d'oeuvre; frais de déplacement et de séjour; prix fixe ou prix plafond; etc.). Toutes les modalités du contrat s'appliquent à cette autorisation de tâche et ne peuvent être négligées ou modifiées quant à la tâche en question. Il n'est donc pas nécessaire de répéter ces modalités générales afférentes au contrat sur le formulaire DND 626.</p>
<p><b>Cost</b> The cost of the Task broken out into the individual costed items in Services.</p>	<p><b>Prix</b> Mentionnez le coût de la tâche en le répartissant selon les frais afférents à chaque item mentionné dans la rubrique Services.</p>
<p><b>GST/HST</b> The GST/HST cost as appropriate.</p>	<p><b>TPS/TVH</b> Mentionnez le montant de la TPS/TVH, s'il y a lieu.</p>
<p><b>Total</b> The total cost of the task. The contractor may not exceed this amount without the approval of DND indicated on an amended DND 626. The amendment value may not exceed 50% (or the percentage for amendments established in the contract) of the original value of the task authorization. The total cost of a DND 626, including all amendments, may not exceed the funding limit identified in the contract.</p>	<p><b>Total</b> Mentionnez le coût total de la tâche. L'entrepreneur ne peut dépasser ce montant sans l'approbation du MDN, formulaire DND 626 modifié à l'appui. Le coût de la modification ne peut pas être supérieur à 50 p. 100 du montant initial prévu dans l'autorisation de tâche (ou au pourcentage prévu dans le contrat pour les modifications). Le coût total spécifié dans le formulaire DND 626, y compris toutes les modifications, ne peut dépasser le plafond de financement mentionné dans le contrat.</p>
<p><b>Applicable only to PWGSC contracts</b> This block only applies to those Task Authorization contracts awarded by PWGSC. The contract will include a specified threshold for DND sole approval of the DND 626 and a percentage for DND to approve amendments to the original DND 626. Tasks that will exceed these thresholds must be passed to the PWGSC Contracting Authority for review and signature prior to authorizing the contractor to begin work.</p>	<p><b>Ne s'applique qu'aux contrats de TPSGC</b> Le présent paragraphe s'applique uniquement aux autorisations de tâche accordées par TPSGC. On inscrira dans le formulaire DND 626 un plafond précis qui ne pourra être approuvé que par le MDN et un pourcentage selon lequel le MDN pourra approuver des modifications au formulaire DND 626 original. Les tâches dont le coût dépasse ces plafonds doivent être soumises à l'autorité contractante de TPSGC pour examen et signature avant qu'on autorise l'entrepreneur à débiter les travaux.</p>
<p><b>Note:</b> Work on the task may not commence prior to the date this form is signed by the DA Authority - for tasks within the DND threshold, and by both DND and PWGSC for those tasks over the DND threshold.</p>	<p><b>Nota :</b> Les travaux ne peuvent commencer avant la date de signature de ce formulaire par le responsable du MDN, pour les tâches dont le coût est inférieur au plafond établi par le MDN, et par le MDN et TPSGC pour les tâches dont le coût dépasse le plafond établi par le MDN.</p>



## Annex E Evaluation Criteria for secondary resources categories

1. Below is the list of **Secondary Resource Categories**. These resources categories are not required with bid-submission but may be required by future Task-authorizations. When required by a task authorization, the contractor must provide the following resources categories.
  - 1) Senior Project Manager
  - 2) Intermediate Project Manager
  - 3) Intermediate Capability Engineering and Architecture SME
  - 4) Senior Security Risk Assessment SME
  - 5) Intermediate Security Risk Assessment SME
  - 6) Senior Chemical Biological Agent SME
  - 7) Senior Radionuclear Agent SME
  - 8) Senior Explosives SME
  - 9) Intermediate Modeling & Simulation SME
  - 10) Senior Test & Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations
  - 11) Intermediate Test & Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations
  - 12) Border Security SME
  - 13) Biometrics SME
  - 14) Emergency Management SME
  - 15) Communications Interoperability SME
  - 16) Community Resilience SME
  - 17) Radicalization & Extremism SME
  - 18) Modeling & Simulation and Visualization Technologist
  - 19) Facilitation and Workshop Specialist
  - 20) Technical Writer
  
2. **For Secondary to be considered compliant a proposal must:**
  - a. Achieve the required minimum score of 60% for each resource category;
  - b. **The Contractor must propose a Secondary Resource, when required**, that meets the minimum criteria. All proposed resources will be evaluated and their scores utilized in the evaluation of the task authorization (TA). **A resource may only be named once in the TA.**



3. In evaluating resource past performance experience, compliance must be demonstrated through a well written, coherent, brief (if possible), past project description containing the following:
- 1) Name of the project.
  - 2) Resource position.
  - 3) Contract start date.
  - 4) Work completion date.
  - 5) Duration of the experience in months.
  - 6) Description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired by the Bidder.
  - 7) An explanation why this experience meets the specific criteria of this solicitation.
  - 8) Client Contact Info, reference, if available. If no reference is available please indicate why.
4. **Process to add a “Resource”.** As a result of a larger than anticipated volume of transactions, it is possible that additional resources will be required in any of the stated categories. The bidder must be able to propose additional resources for the stated categories as required to meet this increased demand. Additional Resources must meet the minimum/mandatory bid evaluation scoring for the Resource Category.

<b>1.0 Resource Capability – Senior Project Manager</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>1.1</b>	The Senior Project Manager must demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor’s Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master’s Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>1.0 Resource Capability – Senior Project Manager</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution <b>= 10 Points</b>			
<b>1.2</b>	The Senior Project Manager must demonstrate that they have Project management experience within past 5 years within large DND/CF projects such as this one or large R&D initiatives such as a DRDC Technology Demonstration Project type or a CRTI Project)	0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. <b>= 0 points</b>  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria... <b>= 2 Points</b>  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. <b>= 6 points</b>  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific	(Max points 20)	



<b>1.0 Resource Capability – Senior Project Manager</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>1.3</b>	The Senior Project Manager must demonstrate that they have a Project Management Professional (PMP) certification	<p><b>0 points</b> = Has not completed recognized training/certification as a Certified professional;</p> <p><b>6 points</b> = Possesses a Certification as Certified Professional for less than one year.</p> <p><b>10 points</b> = Possesses a Certification as Certified Professional for at least one year.</p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
			<b>Total</b>	<b>Max points 40 x 0.3 = 12</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 12</b>

**2.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Project Manager**



	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
2.1	The Intermediate Project Manager should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
2.2	The Intermediate Project Manager should demonstrate that they have Project management experience within past 3 years within DND-CF projects or R&D initiatives	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience</p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria...</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>2.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Project Manager</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<b>=10 Points</b>	<p>= 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>2.3</b>	The Intermediate Project Manager should demonstrate that they have Project Management Professional (PMP) certification	<p><b>0 points</b> = Has not completed recognized training/certification as a Certified professional;</p> <p><b>6 points</b> = Possesses a Certification as Certified Professional for less than one year.</p> <p><b>10 points</b> = Possesses a Certification as</p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>2.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Project Manager</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		Certified Professional for at least one year.			
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 40 x 0.1 = 4)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.10 FOR A TOTAL OF = 4</b>

<b>3.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Capability Engineering and Architecture SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>		<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>3.1</b>	The Intermediate Capability Engineering SME must demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University.	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution</p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



3.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Capability Engineering and Architecture SME					
	RATED Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Methodology A	Evaluation Methodology B		Location in proposal / Comments
		= <b>10 Points</b>			
3.2	The Intermediate Capability Engineering SME must demonstrate experience applying Capability Engineering concepts within a Canadian defence context.	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b>  36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable.            = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria...            = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria.            = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria.</p>	(Max points 20)	



3.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Capability Engineering and Architecture SME					
	RATED Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Methodology A	Evaluation Methodology B		Location in proposal / Comments
			= 8 Points  Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria.  = 10 points		
3.3	The Intermediate Capability Engineering SME must demonstrate experience using architecture framework analysis methodologies (such as DoDAF)	0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>3.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Capability Engineering and Architecture SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>		<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>3.4</b>	The Intermediate Capability Engineering SME must demonstrate experience modifying or extending architecture frameworks for specific project requirements.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria... = 2 Points</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>3.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Capability Engineering and Architecture SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>		<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 70 x 0.3 = 21)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 21</b>

**4.0 Resource Capability – Senior Security Risk Assessment SME**



	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
4.1	The Senior Security Risk Assessment SME must demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
4.2	The Senior Security Risk Assessment SME must demonstrate public security project experience focusing on scenario-based approach to risk assessment.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience</p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria...</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>4.0 Resource Capability – Senior Security Risk Assessment SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		=10 Points	= 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points  Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>4.3</b>	The Senior Security Risk Assessment SME must demonstrate experience conducting vulnerability assessments and risk prioritization in public security.	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>4.0 Resource Capability – Senior Security Risk Assessment SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p><b>= 6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience</p> <p><b>= 8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience</p> <p><b>=10 Points</b></p>	<p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria...</p> <p>= 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 10 points</p>		
<b>4.4</b>	The Senior Security Risk Assessment SME must demonstrate Membership in	Is not a member of a Professional Science & Technology		<b>(Max</b>	



<b>4.0 Resource Capability – Senior Security Risk Assessment SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	related Professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or similar.	Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement = <b>0 points</b>  Is a member of Professional Science & Technology Society/Association for less than one year = <b>6 Points</b>  Is a member of Professional Science & Technology Society/Association for more than one year = <b>10 Points</b>		<b>points 10)</b>	
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 60 x 0.3 = 18)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 18</b>

<b>5.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Security Risk Assessment SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>5.1</b>	The Intermediate Security Risk Assessment SME must demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b>  Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>5.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Security Risk Assessment SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b>  Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b>  Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b>			
<b>5.2</b>	The Intermediate Security Risk Assessment SME must demonstrate that they have public security project experience.	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b>  36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b> experience	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria... = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>5.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Security Risk Assessment SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>5.3</b>	The Intermediate Security Risk Assessment SME must demonstrate that they have experience conducting security risk assessments.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience</p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60%</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>5.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Security Risk Assessment SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		=10 Points	<p>relatable to the criteria... = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 50 x 0.2 = 10)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.20 FOR A TOTAL OF = 10</b>



<b>6.0 Resource Capability – Senior Chemical –Biological (CB) Agent SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>6.1</b>	The Senior CB Agent SME must demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
<b>6.2</b>	The Senior CB Agent SME must demonstrate that they have defence or security project experience, applying Chemical nerve agents (Sarin, mustard gas, ect...) or Biological agents (Botulinum Toxin, Anthrax, Ebola virus, Ricin, etc...) S&T in analysis and experimentation capacity.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>6.0 Resource Capability – Senior Chemical –Biological (CB) Agent SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria... = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>6.3</b>	The Senior CB Agent SME must demonstrate that they have received accredited CBRN or CBRNE training or have given CBRNE training or have		<b>0 Points</b> = Proposal provides incomplete or insufficient details on specific experience requirements, which makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable.	<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>6.0 Resource Capability – Senior Chemical –Biological (CB) Agent SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	been Certified as CBRN Professionals		<p><b>6 Points</b> = Valid experience demonstrated in terms of stated experience in the requested areas by receiving training.</p> <p><b>8 Points</b> = Very good experience demonstrated in terms of stated experience in the requested areas by providing training.</p> <p><b>10 Points</b> = Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of stated experience in the requested areas by being Certified</p>		
<b>6.4</b>	The Senior CB Agent SME must demonstrate that they have a membership in a Professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or similar.	<p>Is not a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for more than one year = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
			Total	<b>(Max points 50 x 0.3 = 15)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 15</b>



<b>7.0 Resource Capability – Senior RadioNuclear (RN) Agent SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>7.1</b>	The Senior RN Agent SME must demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
<b>7.2</b>	The Senior RN Agent SME must demonstrate that they have defence or security project experience applying RN S&T in analysis and experimentation	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>7.0 Resource Capability – Senior RadioNuclear (RN) Agent SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p>36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b></p>	<p>criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria... = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>7.3</b>	<p>The Senior RN Agent SME must demonstrate that they have received accredited CBRN or CBRNE training; or, have given CBRNE training; or, have been Certified as CBRN</p>		<p><b>0 Points</b> = Proposal provides incomplete or insufficient details on specific experience requirements, which makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable.</p> <p><b>6 Points</b> = Valid experience demonstrated in terms of stated experience in the requested areas by receiving</p>	<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>7.0 Resource Capability – Senior RadioNuclear (RN) Agent SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	Professional		training.  <b>8 Points</b> = Very good experience demonstrated in terms of stated experience in the requested areas by providing training.  <b>10 Points</b> = Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of stated experience in the requested areas by being Certified		
<b>7.4</b>	The Senior RN Agent SME must demonstrate that they have a Membership in an Professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or similar.	Is not a member of a Professional Science & Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement = <b>0 points</b>  Is a member of Professional Science & Technology Society/Association for less than one year = <b>6 Points</b>  Is a member of Professional Science & Technology Society/Association for more than one year = <b>10 Points</b>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 50 x 0.3 = 15)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 50</b>

**8.0 Resource Capability – Senior Explosives SME**



	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>8.1</b>	The Senior Explosives SME must demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University.	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
<b>8.2</b>	The Senior Explosives SME must demonstrate that they have defence or security project experience applying Explosives <b>S&amp;T</b> in a analysis capacity and experimentation capacity	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience</p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria.</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>8.0 Resource Capability – Senior Explosives SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		=10 Points	= 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points  Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>8.3</b>	The Senior Explosives SME must demonstrate that they have received accredited Explosives training; or, have given explosives training; or, have been Certified as CBRNE Professional.		0 Points = Proposal provides incomplete or insufficient details on specific experience requirements, which makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable.  6 Points = Valid experience demonstrated in terms of stated experience in the requested areas by receiving training.	<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



**8.0 Resource Capability – Senior Explosives SME**

	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			8 Points = Very good experience demonstrated in terms of stated experience in the requested areas by providing training.  10 Points = Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of stated experience in the requested areas by being Certified		
<b>8.4</b>	The Senior Explosives SME must demonstrate that they have a Membership in a Professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or similar.	Is not a member of a Professional Science & Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement = <b>0 points</b>  Is a member of Professional Science & Technology Society/Association for less than one year = <b>6 Points</b>  Is a member of Professional Science & Technology Society/Association for more than one year = <b>10 Points</b>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 50 x 0.3 = 15)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 15</b>

**9.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Modeling and Simulation SME**



	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>9.1</b>	The Intermediate M&S SME must demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
<b>9.2</b>	The Intermediate M&S SME must demonstrate that they have recognized experience in M&S using tools such as the Crown's toolkit or similar.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience</p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria . This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria.</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>9.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Modeling and Simulation SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		=10 Points	= 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points  Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>9.3</b>	The Intermediate M&S SME must demonstrate that they have Web-based M&S (HTTP Protocol) and Distributed M&S (DIS protocol or HLA protocol) experience in Defence or Security.	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>9.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Modeling and Simulation SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	<p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria.            = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria.            = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria.            = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria.            = 10 points</p>		



<b>9.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Modeling and Simulation SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>9.4</b>	The Intermediate M&S SME must demonstrate that they have experience employing Open Standards and Open Architecture	0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable.            = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria.            = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria.            = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria.            = 8 Points</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>9.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Modeling and Simulation SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 70 x 0.3 = 21)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 21</b>

<b>10.0 Resource Capability – Senior Test and Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>10.1</b>	The Senior T&E SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations should demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian</p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>10.0 Resource Capability – Senior Test and Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b>  Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b>			
<b>10.2</b>	The Senior T&E SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations must demonstrate that they have T&E project experience.	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b>  36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = <b>6 points</b>  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>10.0 Resource Capability – Senior Test and Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>10.3</b>	<p>The Senior T&amp;E SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations must demonstrate that they have experience in developing and executing and reporting on defence or security related trials, demonstration, and experimentation at the subsystem, system or capability level.</p>	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>10.0 Resource Capability – Senior Test and Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>10.4</b>	The Senior T&E SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations must demonstrate that they have experience applying Measures of Performance and Measures of Effectiveness	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience</p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>10.0 Resource Capability – Senior Test and Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p><b>= 8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience</p> <p><b>=10 Points</b></p>	<p>explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 10 points</p>		
<b>10.5</b>	The Senior T&E SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations must demonstrate that they have a membership in a professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or	Is not a member of a Professional Science & Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>10.0 Resource Capability – Senior Test and Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	similar	<p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for more than one year = <b>10 Points</b></p>			
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 80 x 0.3 = 24)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 24</b>

<b>11.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Test and Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>11.1</b>	The Intermediate T&E SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations must demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign</p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>11.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Test and Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		institution = <b>8 Points</b>  Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b>			
<b>11.2</b>	The Intermediate T&E SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations must demonstrate that they have T&E project experience.	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b>  36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>11.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Test and Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>11.3</b>	The Intermediate T&E SME in Trials Demonstrations and Experimentations must demonstrate that they have experience in developing and executing and reporting on defence or security related Trials, Demonstration, Experimentation at the subsystem, system or capability level.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>11.0 Resource Capability – Intermediate Test and Evaluation SME in Trials, Demonstrations and Experimentations</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 50 x 0.1 = 5)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.10 FOR A TOTAL OF = 5</b>

**12.0 Resource Capability – Border Security SME**



	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
12.1	The Border Security SME must demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
12.2	The Border Security SME must demonstrate that they have defence or security project experience applying Border Security S&T in analysis and experimentation capacity	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience</p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria.</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>12.0 Resource Capability – Border Security SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		=10 Points	= 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points  Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>12.3</b>	The Border Security SME must demonstrate that they have defence or security project experience applying an Intelligence-Based approach to Border Security & Interdiction analyses or experiments.	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>12.0 Resource Capability – Border Security SME</b>					
	RATED Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Methodology A	Evaluation Methodology B	Score	Location in proposal / Comments
		<p><b>= 6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience</p> <p><b>= 8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience</p> <p><b>=10 Points</b></p>	<p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria.</p> <p>= 10 points</p>		
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 50</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF</b>



<b>12.0 Resource Capability – Border Security SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
				<b>x 0.3 = 15)</b>	<b>0.30 FOR A TOTAL OF = 15</b>

<b>13.0 Resource Capability – Biometrics SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>13.1</b>	The Biometrics SME must demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
<b>13.2</b>	The Biometrics SME must	0 months Experience	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of	<b>(Max</b>	



**13.0 Resource Capability – Biometrics SME**

	RATED Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Methodology A	Evaluation Methodology B	Score	Location in proposal / Comments
	<p>demonstrate that they have experience working with a multiple <b>biometric technologies</b> and the use of these S&amp;T capabilities to augment existing recognition and authentication capabilities that are relevant to public safety and security.</p>	<p>= <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that</p>	<p><b>points 20)</b></p>	



<b>13.0 Resource Capability – Biometrics SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>13.3</b>	The Biometrics SME must demonstrate that they have experience in applying biometrics to support policy related to public safety and security	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b>  36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = <b>6 points</b>  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>13.0 Resource Capability – Biometrics SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 50 x 0.2 = 10)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.20 FOR A TOTAL OF = 10</b>

<b>14.0 Resource Capability – Emergency Management (EM) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>14.1</b>	The Emergency Management (EM) SME must demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>14.0 Resource Capability – Emergency Management (EM) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b>  Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b>  Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b>			
<b>14.2</b>	The Emergency Management (EM) SME must demonstrate that they have recognized experience in <b>EM Technologies</b> or in Canadian Emergency Ops Center (EOC).	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b>  36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>14.0 Resource Capability – Emergency Management (EM) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>14.3</b>	The Emergency Management (EM) SME must demonstrate that they have experience, in the civil EM domain, bridging the gap between policy and strategy for Emergency Response for multi-agency scenarios.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60%</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>14.0 Resource Capability – Emergency Management (EM) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p>36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b></p>	<p>relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		



<b>14.0 Resource Capability – Emergency Management (EM) SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>14.4</b>	The Emergency Management (EM) SME must demonstrate that they have a membership in a professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or similar	<p>Is not a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for more than one year = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 60 x 0.4 = 24)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.40 FOR A TOTAL OF = 24</b>

<b>15.0 Resource Capability – Communications Interoperability SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>15.1</b>	The Communications Interoperability	Less than a College degree or		<b>(Max</b>	



<b>15.0 Resource Capability – Communications Interoperability SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	SME must demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>points 10)</b>	
<b>15.2</b>	The Communications Interoperability SME must demonstrate that they have experience in the policy and operational issues related to facilitating <b>interoperability within the communications</b> domain.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60%</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>15.0 Resource Capability – Communications Interoperability SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p>36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b></p>	<p>relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>15.3</b>	The Communications Interoperability SME must demonstrate that they have experience in the domain which bridged the communications gap between various operational communities through defining the requirements for interoperable	<p>0 months Experience <b>= 0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>15.0 Resource Capability – Communications Interoperability SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
	communications	12 to 23 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  36+ months experience <b>=10 Points</b>	<p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria.            = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria.            = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria.            = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria.            = 10 points</p>		



<b>15.0 Resource Capability – Communications Interoperability SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 50 x 0.2 = 10)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.20 FOR A TOTAL OF = 10</b>

<b>16.0 Resource Capability – Community Resilience SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>16.1</b>	The Community Resilience SME must demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University.	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>16.0 Resource Capability – Community Resilience SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>16.2</b>	The Community Resilience SME must demonstrate that they have project experience applying <b>Community Resilience S&amp;T</b> in analysis and experimentation capacity.	0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>  12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b>  24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b>  36+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>16.0 Resource Capability – Community Resilience SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
<b>16.3</b>	The Community Resilience SME must demonstrate that they have a membership in a professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or similar	<p>Is not a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for more than one year = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 40 x 0.1 = 4)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.10 FOR A TOTAL OF = 4</b>

**17.0 Resource Capability – Radicalization and Extremism SME**



	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
17.1	The Radicalization and Extremism SME – must demonstrate that they have a University Degree from a recognized University	<p>Less than a College degree or proposal provides no information on education or College Degree from a Canadian College or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Master's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>Ph.D. from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
17.2	The – Radicalization and Extremism SME must demonstrate that they have project experience applying <b>Radcalization and Extremism S&amp;T</b> in an analysis capacity and experimentation capacity.	<p>0 months Experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 11 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 23 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>24 to 35 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>36+ months experience</p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria.</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>17.0 Resource Capability – Radicalization and Extremism SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<b>=10 Points</b>	<p>= 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>17.3</b>	The Psychosocial SME – Radicalization and Extremism must demonstrate that they have a membership in a professional S&T Society/Association such as IEEE or similar	<p>Is not a member of a Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association or proposal provides no information on this requirement. = <b>0 points</b></p> <p>Is a member of Professional Science &amp; Technology Society/Association for less than one year? = <b>6 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>17.0 Resource Capability – Radicalization and Extremism SME</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		Is a member of Professional Science & Technology Society/Association for more than one year = <b>10 Points</b>			
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 40 x 0.1 = 4)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF X FOR A TOTAL OF = 0.10</b>

<b>18.0 Resource Capability – Modeling and Simulation and Visualization Technologist</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>18.1</b>	The M&S and Visualization Technologist must demonstrate that they have Education diploma from a recognized institution	Less than high school or proposal provides no information on education = <b>0 points</b>  High School Graduate diploma from a Canadian High School or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>6 points</b>  College Degree from Canadian Collage or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>8 points</b>  Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



18.0 Resource Capability – Modeling and Simulation and Visualization Technologist					
	RATED Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Methodology A	Evaluation Methodology B	Score	Location in proposal / Comments
		University or equivalent from a foreign institution = <b>10 Points</b>			
18.2	The M&S and Visualization Technologist must demonstrate that they have experience with <i>using</i> at least one tool from the Crown's toolkit or similar.	0 Months experience = <b>0 Points</b>  1 to 5 months experience = <b>2 Points</b>  6 to 11 months experience = <b>6 Points</b>  12 to 17 months experience = <b>8 Points</b>  18+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria.</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>18.0 Resource Capability – Modeling and Simulation and Visualization Technologist</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>18.3</b>	The M&S and Visualization Technologist must demonstrate that they have experience <i>developing</i> with one tool from the Crown's toolkit or similar.	<p>0 Months experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 5 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>6 to 11 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 17 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>18+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>18.0 Resource Capability – Modeling and Simulation and Visualization Technologist</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>18.4</b>	The M&S and Visualization Technologist must demonstrate that they have experience in <i>exploiting</i> open source, open standard or open architecture.	<p>0 Months experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 5 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>6 to 11 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 17 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>18+ months experience</p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>18.0 Resource Capability – Modeling and Simulation and Visualization Technologist</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		= 10 Points	<p>the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 70 x 0.1 = 7)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.10 FOR A TOTAL OF = 7</b>



<b>19.0 Resource Capability – Facilitation and Workshop Specialist</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>19.1</b>	The Facilitation and Workshop Specialist must demonstrate that they have a Education diploma from a recognized institution	<p>Less than high school or proposal provides no information on education <b>= 0 points</b></p> <p>High School Graduate diploma from a Canadian High School or equivalent from a foreign institution <b>= 6 points</b></p> <p>College Degree from Canadian Collage or equivalent from a foreign institution <b>= 8 points</b></p> <p>Bachelor’s Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution <b>= 10 Points</b></p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	
<b>19.2</b>	The Facilitation and Workshop Specialist must demonstrate experience in facilitation of meetings and workshops.	<p>0 Months experience <b>= 0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 5 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b></p> <p>6 to 11 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 17 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria.</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>19.0 Resource Capability – Facilitation and Workshop Specialist</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p>18+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>19.3</b>	The Facilitation and Workshop Specialist must demonstrate experience in launching meeting and workshops by organizing all participants, written material, and equipment.	<p>0 Months experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 5 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable.</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>19.0 Resource Capability – Facilitation and Workshop Specialist</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p>6 to 11 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 17 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b></p> <p>18+ months experience <b>= 10 Points</b></p>	<p>= 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria.</p>		



<b>19.0 Resource Capability – Facilitation and Workshop Specialist</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			= 10 points		
<b>19.4</b>	The Facilitation and Workshop Specialist must have demonstrated facilitation experience employing a “Decision Support System” or a “Collaborative Work Environment”.	0 Months experience <b>= 0 Points</b>  1 to 5 months experience <b>= 2 Points</b>  6 to 11 months experience <b>= 6 Points</b>  12 to 17 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b>  18+ months experience <b>= 10 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points  Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points  <b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points  Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>19.0 Resource Capability – Facilitation and Workshop Specialist</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 70 x 0.1 = 7)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.10 FOR A TOTAL OF = 7</b>

<b>20.0 Resource Capability – Technical Writer</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
<b>20.1</b>	The Technical Writer must demonstrate that they have a education diploma from a recognized institution	<p>Less than high school or proposal provides no information on education <b>= 0 points</b></p> <p>High School Graduate diploma from a Canadian High School or equivalent from a foreign institution <b>= 6 points</b></p> <p>College Degree from Canadian Collage or equivalent from a foreign institution</p>		<b>(Max points 10)</b>	



<b>20.0 Resource Capability – Technical Writer</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p>= <b>8 points</b></p> <p>Bachelor's Degree from a Canadian University or equivalent from a foreign institution</p> <p>= <b>10 Points</b></p>			
<b>20.2</b>	The Technical Writer must demonstrate that they have experience in writing technical documents in the Defence or in Public Security Environments	<p>0 Months experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 5 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>6 to 11 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 17 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>18+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = <b>6 points</b></p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>20.0 Resource Capability – Technical Writer</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>20.3</b>	The Technical Writer must demonstrate that they have experience in writing technical documents, and integrating information from multiple subject matter experts from multiple source documents, in a science and technology environment.	<p>0 Months experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 5 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>6 to 11 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 17 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>18+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less then 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



<b>20.0 Resource Capability – Technical Writer</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			<p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = <b>6</b> points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = <b>8</b> Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = <b>10</b> points</p>		
<b>20.4</b>	The Technical Writer must demonstrate that they have experience in writing technical documents directly from a brainstorm session, from scratch, with some or little documentation.	<p>0 Months experience = <b>0 Points</b></p> <p>1 to 5 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>6 to 11 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p>	<p>Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = <b>0</b> points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several</p>	<b>(Max points 20)</b>	



**20.0 Resource Capability – Technical Writer**

	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
		<p>12 to 17 months experience <b>= 8 Points</b></p> <p>18+ months experience <b>= 10 Points</b></p>	<p>elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = 6 points</p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points</p>		
<b>20.5</b>	The Technical Writer must demonstrate that they have experience employing a “Decision Support System” and/or a	0 Months experience <b>= 0 Points</b>	Incomplete or insufficient detail regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why	<b>(Max points</b>	



**20.0 Resource Capability – Technical Writer**

	RATED Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Methodology A	Evaluation Methodology B	Score	Location in proposal / Comments
	<p>“collaborative work environment”.</p>	<p>1 to 5 months experience = <b>2 Points</b></p> <p>6 to 11 months experience = <b>6 Points</b></p> <p>12 to 17 months experience = <b>8 Points</b></p> <p>18+ months experience = <b>10 Points</b></p>	<p>this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided in not relatable at all to the criteria. This makes it difficult to properly assess as acceptable. = 0 points</p> <p>Very limited experience demonstrated and missing several elements in terms of stated experience regarding the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is less than 60% relatable to the criteria. = 2 Points</p> <p><b>Valid</b> experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 60% relatable to the criteria. = <b>6 points</b></p> <p>Very good experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria. Also, the experience provided is at least 80% relatable to the criteria. = 8 Points</p> <p>Extensive experience demonstrated in terms of the description of the project and other relevant details that document how this experience has been acquired, and the explanation of why this experience meets the specific criteria.</p>	<p><b>20)</b></p>	



<b>20.0 Resource Capability – Technical Writer</b>					
	<b>RATED Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology A</b>	<b>Evaluation Methodology B</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Location in proposal / Comments</b>
			Also, the experience provided is at least 95% relatable to the criteria. = 10 points		
			<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max points 90 x 0.1 = 9)</b>	<b>WEIGHTING FACTOR OF 0.10 FOR A TOTAL OF = 9</b>