

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 0B2 / Noyau 0B2
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5
Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

LETTER OF INTEREST
LETTRE D'INTÉRÊT

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

Title - Sujet RADAR SYSTEMS AND SIGNAL PROCESSING	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W7714-135828/B	Date 2015-03-04
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W7714-135828	GETS Ref. No. - N° de réf. de SEAG PW-\$\$\$V-054-28565
File No. - N° de dossier 054sv.W7714-135828	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2015-03-18	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Brault, Laurie	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 054sv
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-1378 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 997-2229
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE BLDG 29 RECEIVING 3701 CARLING AVE OTTAWA Ontario K1A0Z4 Canada	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

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

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

W7714-135828/B

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

054sv

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

File No. - N° du dossier

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

W7714-135828

054svW7714-135828

Summary of Feedback for the Letter of Interest (LOI) for Radar Systems and Signal Processing Support
W7714-135828/A is attached.



Public Works and
Government Services
Canada

Travaux publics et
Services gouvernementaux
Canada

Canada



**Summary of Feedback and Outcomes
from the
Industry Engagement Process for Radar Systems
and Signal Processing Support
W7714-135828/A**



www.pwpsc-tpsgc.gc.ca

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Industry Engagement Process**
- 3. General Overview of the Industry Engagement Process Feedback**
- 4. Summary of Feedback and Outcomes**
 - 4.1 Administrative Requirement Summary**
 - 4.2 Clarity of the Technical Requirement**
 - 4.3 Evaluation and Basis of Selection**
 - 4.4 Basis of Payment**
 - 4.5 Value Proposition**
 - 4.6 Other**
- 5. Conclusion**
- 6. Next Steps**

Appendix A – The LOI published to BuyandSell.gc.ca on November 19, 2014

1. Introduction

Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) released a Letter of Interest (LOI) on November 19, 2014 as a first step to inform industry of a potential procurement for Technical Support Services for Radar Systems and Signal Processing Support on behalf of Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) and to seek industry input in developing the procurement.

The LOI released by PWGSC was intended to inform industry of the draft Procurement requirements, contract terms, proposal evaluation and basis of selection methodologies and to obtain industry input for the refinement of the procurement strategy and documentation.

All participants of the engagement activities were encouraged to ask questions and provide comments on the information regarding procurement with the objective of improving the procurement in a fair and transparent manner.

The information gathered through this process will be considered when finalizing the procurement strategy.

2. Industry Engagement Process

Industry Engagement Period	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Posting of Letter of Interest (LOI): November 19, 2014• Responses requested: December 4, 2014• Concludes with the publication of the Summary of Feedback Issuance on buyandsell.gc.ca advising industry that the period has ended and date of publication of the RFP
Information disclosed under the LOI	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Draft RFP with evaluation criteria• Draft Statement of Work
LOI Responses submitted	<p>The LOI requested that written responses be submitted by December 4, 2014. Three firms submitted responses to the posted LOI. Responses were received from the following firms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- MDA Systems- QinetiQ Ltd- Array Systems Computing Inc.

3. General Overview of the Industry Engagement Process Feedback

The Engagement Process provided any interested party an opportunity to participate in the further development of the solicitation by submitting comments, questions, recommendations and suggestions for improvement of the draft RFP.

The majority of participants' questions focused on clarification of specific items. These questions are largely addressed in the Technical Question and Responses section of Appendix A.

As a result Canada has made some changes to the procurement documentation to address these issues and resolve items that were initially not clearly defined.

3.1 Acronym List

DRDC	Defence Research and Development Canada
GMTI	Ground Moving Target Indicator
IP	Intellectual Property
LOI	Letter of Interest
PM	Project Manager
PWGSC	Public Works and Government Services Canada
RFP	Request for Proposal
SAR	Synthetic Aperture Radar
SOW	Statement of Work

Appendix A

4. Summary of Feedback and Outcome

SECTION 4.1: ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENT SUMMARY	
LOI Item 1 of Section 1	Feedback was requested to provide an impact statement on the ability to bid. If the current process is not feasible, provide reasoning and suggest alternatives.
Feedback	<p>Generally the feedback received outlined the following concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The number of reserve resources requested in the RFP is too onerous for the work effort outlined in the RFP. Having 1 reserve resource for each of the labour categories is substantial and could be difficult to fill the positions. It has been requested that there would not be any reserve resources except for the following resource categories: the Project Manager, Engineer, and Software Developer. 2. There are too few firms in Canada that could respond to the RFP with the number of Resources and reserve resources required. 3. The RFP, as written, seems to be overly specified and heavily favors the incumbent who performed the most recent work.
Outcome / Action	<p>1 and 2 :</p> <p>Canada is prepared to reduce the reserve staff requirements from 2 to 1 for the Intermediate Software Developer and from 2 to 1 for the Senior Software Developer. The requirements of reserve resources will ensure a timely response to tasks that may involve the need, for example, to quickly analyze and update flight software prior to and during radar experimental trials. This is to minimize expenses occurred through operational delays and adheres to internal project timelines.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The resources identified are required to ensure DRDC obtains the services of skilled individuals to perform the work requirements identified in the SOW.
LOI Item 2 of Section 1	<p>Feedback was requested to demonstrate the institution's or company's ability and that of any subcontractors, to accommodate personnel and facility security requirements, together with controlled goods restrictions (e.g. International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR)), export licenses and 3rd party release requirements):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. To clearly identify any implications that may affect delivery of the proposed project in accordance with the requirements of the PWGSC Industrial Security Program. ii. If some or all security measures are in progress, please indicate an estimate of when compliance will be achieved. <p>If it is not possible to meet some or all security requirements, please substantiate.</p>
Feedback	Based on the feedback provided by the respondents, they each demonstrated the ability and that of any subcontractors, to accommodate personnel and facility security requirements, together with controlled goods restrictions.
Outcome / Action	Canada does not have any concerns with any of the institutions or company's ability and that of any subcontractors to accommodate personnel and facility security requirements, together with controlled goods restrictions.
4.2: REQUIREMENT	
LOI Item 1 of Section 2	Feedback was requested to provide a statement of interest, capacity and ability to provide technical support services for Radar Systems and Signal Processing Support Services to DRDC on a task-by-task basis, and the ability to handle multiple tasks concurrently.
Feedback	Based on the feedback received the respondents demonstrated interest, capacity and ability, to support DRDC in their radar systems and signal processing work, to handle multiple tasks concurrently.
Outcome / Action	Positive interest was received from the respondents on the provision of technical support services. No concerns were raised on the ability to provide technical support services on a task-by-task basis, and to handle multiple tasks concurrently.

LOI Item 2 of Section 2	Feedback was requested to provide information on if and how the company could access expertise and experts through scientific networks.
Feedback	All respondents demonstrated that each have access to expertise and experts through scientific networks including industry and academia.
Outcome / Action	Positive feedback was received from all of the respondents regarding if and how each of the respondents can access expertise and experts through scientific networks. Canada acknowledges that all respondents have access to expertise and experts through scientific networks including industry and academia.
LOI Item 3 of Section 2	Feedback requested to provide any questions on the clarity of the SOW.
Feedback	The following suggestion has been made with respect to the SOW. 1. It was requested that the progress report due date in Section 8 – deliverables in the SOW to be changed to the 10 th of the following month to complete the reports.
Outcome / Action	1. Canada will incorporate the requested changes made to the monthly progress reports requirements under Article 8 Deliverables of the SOW.
4.3 EVALUATION and BASIS OF SELECTION	
LOI Item 1 of Section 3	Feedback was requested on how the respondents would propose Canada evaluate the offers.
Feedback	Respondents suggested that the evaluation process address the following concerns to allow for equal opportunities for all potential bidders: 1. The number of labour resources asked for (eight primary + eight backup personnel) is not commensurate with the relative size of the RFP. The possible work that can be expected to be called upon and all having the requested capability is very onerous for an SME to meet. Allow participation of SMEs who may have the company and staff experience but not the size of resourcing mandated in the RFP. It has been suggested to reduce the reserve staff requirements. 2. Source the engineering and software resources through separate RFPs. 3. The evaluation procedures and the basis of selection are unnecessarily too stringent in some areas. 4. The evaluation process should concentrate on experience and knowledge of the bidder.
Outcome / Action	1. DRDC is willing to reduce the reserve staff requirements from 2 to 1 for the Intermediate Software Developer and from 2 to 1 for the Senior Software Developer; however they are not in the position to reduce the resource requirements further without compromising its need to support the CAF/DND through this task authorization contract. The proposed requirements have been identified to ensure a timely response to tasking that, for example, may involve the need to quickly analyze and update flight software prior to and during radar experimental trials. Additionally, by adhering to internal project timelines, DRDC proposes to minimize expenses incurred caused by operational delays. 2. It does not represent best value or an effective procurement approach for Canada to issue separate RFPs for this procurement. In addition, this strategy would not support efficient integration and implementation of the work objectives and outputs and would require additional internal resources to support this. 3. Canada will accept the experience of subcontractor resources submitted by a bidder in response to Mandatory Technical Criterion 1- Resource Requirements. Each proposed resource subcontractor must provide a resume that will be evaluated on the Point rated criteria for that resource.

	<p>4. The selection process concentrates on recommending a bidder for award of a contract that demonstrates resources and experience to support DRDC in delivering the work to be tasked through this contract. The work to be tasked is based on DRDC requirements to support the CAF/DND during the period of the contract. The necessary experience to execute the work will be embodied in the resources performing the technical work.</p> <p>PRTC 7 Company Capability now includes PRTC 7.2 which requires that the bidder demonstrate successfully completing research and development projects in the areas of expertise of SAR, GMTI, and Maritime Surveillance called for by the contract.</p>
LOI Item 2 of Section 3	Feedback was requested to provide suggestions that could assist Canada in the development of the evaluation procedures including evaluation criteria and the basis of selection of the Bidders.
Feedback	<p>Respondents identified the following suggestions that could assist Canada in the development of the evaluation procedures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Skills from each resource labour category should reflect the specific type of work or task that DRDC requested. Concerns that the evaluation procedures seem to specifically focus on the personnel rather than the expected tasks that will need to be performed. 2. The description of Mandatory Technical Criteria MTC1 to add a sentence allowing the bidder to use a subcontractor to fill the PRTC 1: SAR Computer Operator resource requirement. 3. The following changes to both PRTC 2.3 Intermediate Software Developer/Analyst and PRTC 3.3 Senior Software Developer/Analyst were presented: <p><i>The Bidder should demonstrate the experience of the proposed Intermediate Software Developer/Analyst resource in the design, implementation and documentation of complex radar signal processors and radar system controllers for SAR and GMTI on multiprocessing systems using C/C++ under one of the following operating systems,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - VxWorks OS, <i>and/or</i> - Mercury OS, <i>and/or</i> - Linux OS <p><i>and Matlab under one of the following operating systems,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Linux <i>or</i> - Windows <p><i>Delete the words "operating systems"</i></p> 4. The experience required of the PRTC 3 Senior Software developer/Analyst mirrors that of the PRTC 2 Intermediate Developer but with a requirement for additional years of experience. 5. Include "<i>the familiarity with advanced forms of processing and exploitation</i>" in the description of PRTC 3 Senior Software Developer/Analysis. 6. The experience identified under PRTC 6 Project Manager, involves a great deal of radar processing experience and does not include any assessment of the Project Manager's formal PM qualifications. 7. Company capability has not been addressed. Additionally succession planning over the course of the project should be addressed through an effective resourcing strategy. In order to be credible, organizations should be required to demonstrate a consistent track record of achievement and team continuity.
Outcome / Action	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is Canada's intent to award a task authorization contract as a result of any future solicitation for this requirement, where tasks will be developed and issued on an "as and

	<p>when required” basis after contract award. As such, Canada cannot structure the evaluation procedures based on expected tasks when specific scope and timelines of those tasks have not yet been fully defined.</p> <p>2. Canada will accept the experience of subcontractor resources submitted by a bidder in response to MTC1: Resource Requirements. The solicitation will be revised to address this.</p> <p>3. Canada acknowledges and has made the following changes to PRTC 2.3 Intermediate Software Developer/Analyst and PRTC 3.3 Senior Software Developer/Analyst:</p> <p>PRTC 2.3.1</p> <p><i>The Bidder should demonstrate the experience of the proposed Intermediate Software Developer/Analyst resource in the design, implementation and documentation of complex radar signal processors and radar system controllers for SAR and GMTI on multiprocessing systems using C/C++ under the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - VxWorks OS, and - Mercury OS, and - Linux OS <p>1 point will be awarded for each demonstrated year of experience up to 5 for each proposed resource.</p> <p>All experience must have been obtained within the last ten (10) years from the date of Solicitation closing</p> <p>PRTC 2.3.2</p> <p><i>The Bidder should demonstrate the experience of the proposed Intermediate Software Developer/Analyst resource in the design, implementation and documentation of complex radar signal processors for SAR and GMTI on multiprocessing systems using Matlab under one of the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Linux or -Windows <p>1 point will be awarded for each demonstrated year of experience up to 5 for each proposed resource.</p> <p>All experience must have been obtained within the last ten (10) years from the date of Solicitation closing.</p> <p>PRTC 3.3.1</p> <p><i>The Bidder should demonstrate the experience of the proposed Senior Software Developer/Analyst resource in the design, implementation and documentation of complex radar signal processors and radar system controllers for SAR and GMTI on multiprocessing systems using C/C++ under the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - VxWorks OS, and - Mercury OS, and - Linux OS <p>1 point will be awarded for each demonstrated year of experience up to 5 for each proposed resource.</p> <p>All experience must have been obtained within the last ten (10) years from the date of Solicitation closing.</p> <p>PRTC 3.3.2</p>
--	---

	<p><i>The Bidder should demonstrate the experience of the proposed Senior Software Developer/Analyst resource in the design, implementation and documentation of complex radar signal processors for SAR and GMTI on multiprocessing systems using Matlab under one of the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Linux or - Windows <p>1 point will be awarded for each demonstrated year of experience up to 5 for each proposed resource.</p> <p>All experience must have been obtained within the last ten (10) years from the date of Solicitation closing.</p> <p>4. There is an additional difference between the PRTC 2 Intermediate Developer and PRTC 3 Senior Software Developer/Analyst beyond the additional years of experience. The Intermediate Software developer analyst calls for experience in “3 of the following 5” technology areas, while the Senior Software developer/analyst calls for all of them. As such Canada will not be amending this criterion. No changes shall be made.</p> <p>5. PRTC 3.2 Senior Software Developer/Analysts qualifications were revised at bullet number 2 to read “Sampling, processing and exploitation of high-resolution radar signals.”</p> <p>6. Canada acknowledges that Project Manager’s (PM) experience had not been addressed and has made changes to include the evaluation of Project Managers experience at PRTC 6.3 by requesting the bidder to demonstrate the project experience in the area of SAR, GMTI and Maritime Surveillance.</p> <p>7. Canada acknowledges that Company capability had not been addressed and has made changes to include the evaluation of corporate experience (PRTC 7.2) by requesting the bidder to demonstrate the bidder’s project experience in the area of SAR, GMTI and Maritime Surveillance.</p>
LOI Item 3 of Section 3	<p>Feedback was requested to provide comments on the following: is the Description of qualifications and experience adequate to cover the skills and work experience needed for the resource required? (Take into consideration demonstrated experience and associated technologies, and the period of time within which the experience is considered to be valid).</p>
Feedback	<p>Respondents identified the following suggestions and concerns with the descriptions of the qualifications and experiences needed for the resources and provided suggestions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It was suggested to evaluate what work is planned and then soliciting bidder capability based on that work. 2. Concerns were expressed that the RFP over specifies requirements for each resource category. For example, the descriptions of the Intermediate Engineer PRTC 4.2 and Intermediate Software Developer PRTC 2.2 are over specified and nearly identical. A software engineer who has implemented code used in an operational setting for items such as SAR algorithms for Radar, phase unwrapping for InSAR, beamformers for Sonar, is perfectly capable of coding an engineer’s design or algorithm even if he has never coded for example “Radar pulse selection and compression techniques”. The same concerns are for the PRTC 5 Senior Engineer and the PRTC 3 Senior Software Developer. 3. Concerns were expressed that the RFP seems very specific to recent work and favors the incumbent. 4. Recommendations were proposed to increase value of “recent” which represents the number of years experience obtained using commercial –off-the-shelf VME for the following resources: PRTC 1 SAR Computer Operator, PRTC 4 – Intermediate

	Engineer and PRTC 5 Senior Engineer and feels that that past experience is still very relevant and could easily build software running on a VME backplane today.
Outcome / Action	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refer to answer number 1 under Item 2 section 3. 2. In the RFP, Canada acknowledges that the requirements for PRTC 2.2, 3.2 (Intermediate and Senior Software Developer/Analyst) are similar to 4.2, 5.2 (Intermediate and Senior Engineer) respectively. It is necessary to evaluate the resource experience in the domains that they will be expected to work in. Please note the response to LOI Item 2 of Section 3, which reduces some experience requirements for the Intermediate and Senior Software Developer/Analysts. The qualifications and experience requested for both the PRTC 5 Senior Engineer and PRTC 3 Senior Developer are based on DRDC requirements in these areas. The Technical Authority has identified the qualifications and experience required to achieve the work objectives. 3. This has been addressed in LOI Item 1 of Section 1. 4. Canada is willing to increase the values of recent years experience to “within the last 10 years” for the following resources: PRTC 2, PRTC 3, PRTC 4, PRTC 5, PRTC 6, and increase the value of recent years experience required for the following resources that require VME experience. PRTC 1 SAR Computer Operator, PRTC 4 – Intermediate Engineer and PRTC 5 Senior Engineer to read that any VME work performed “within the last 14 years” will be considered.

SECTION 4.4 : BASIS of PAYMENT

LOI Item 1 of Section 4	Feedback was requested to provide a general estimate for different labour/resource categories on an hourly rate basis. Please provide a general estimate of the costs associated for account management and project management for the proposed contract.
Feedback	All respondents provided a general estimate for different resource categories on an hourly rate basis and provided a general estimate of the costs associated for account management and project management for the proposed resulting contract.
Outcome / Action	Canada acknowledges the feedback received and does not have any additional comments or concerns.
LOI Item 2 of Section 4	Feedback was requested to describe and provide an example if possible of your pricing model for the services you provide.
Feedback	The respondents provided a pricing model that identified their resource categories which corresponded with the resources required for this procurement.
Outcome / Action	Canada acknowledges the feedback received and does not have any additional comment or concerns.

SECTION 4.5 : VALUE PROPOSITION

LOI Item 1 of Section 5	Feedback was requested to describe the research and scientific networks that their company can recommend and comment on the use of Value proposition and the possible ways to apply it.
Feedback	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Respondents demonstrated established close research relationships which have been built over many years with various universities and trusted industrial partnerships. 2. Feedback was received stating that the application of the Value Proposition construct is not required for this project because the work will be carried out by a Canadian company. It is understood that for projects between \$25,000 and \$20,000,000 there could be an assessment of the economic potential of this work.
Outcome /Action 1	Canada acknowledges the feedback received and does not have any additional comments or concerns with the feedback. Benefits to Canada will be achieved through the Canadian Content requirement.
LOI Item 2 of Section 5	Feedback was requested to describe the research codes of conduct applicable to your company.
Feedback	There were no comments received in respect to research Codes of Conduct.
Outcome / Action	No action will be taken by Canada.
SECTION 4.6: OTHER	

LOI Item 1 of Section 6	Feedback was requested to identify any other issues, concerns, recommendations not addressed above.
Feedback	<p>Canada has addressed the following items not identified previously.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is unclear why is there a complete RFP accompanied this LOI. 2. It was requested that the restriction for Travel for services within the National Capital Region (NCR) under the Basis Of Payment (BOP) - Annex B of the draft RFP, be revised to allow travel and living expenses for services provided to the National Capital Region (NCR).
Outcome / Action	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Engagement Process provided any interested party an opportunity to participate in the further development of the solicitation by submitting comments, questions, recommendations and suggestions for improvement of the draft RFP. 2. Canada will accept Travel and Living expenses for services provided to the National Capital Region (NCR), as a result the BOP will be revised to reflect this.

5. Conclusion

Overall, the feedback from industry was very valuable in contributing to the improvement of the procurement documentation. Important clarification for both technical and evaluation items of the requirement will be incorporated as per the feedback received.

6. Next Steps

Canada intends to issue an RFP on Buyandsell.gc.ca 10 business days following the posting of the Summary of Feedback and Outcomes from the Industry Engagement Process for Radar Systems and Signal Processing support, providing that there are no other questions that arise.

PWGC and DRDC would like to thank all respondents for taking part in the Industry Engagement Process.

Contracting Authority:

Laurie D Brault
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Acquisitions Branch
Science Procurement Directorate
Place du Portage III Floor: 11C1 - Room: 72
11 Laurier Street,
Gatineau, Québec
K1A 0S5

Phone: (819) 956-1378
Fax: (819) 997-2229
Email: laurie.brault@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca