

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

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT
MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

Comments - Commentaires

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Civilian Aircraft Division/Division des Avions Civils
Portage III 8C1 - 50
11 Laurier St./11 rue Laurier
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet HELICOPTER PROJECT (DFO)	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation F7013-120014/H	Amendment No. - N° modif. 001
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client F7013-120014	Date 2015-04-10
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$CAG-003-25057	
File No. - N° de dossier 003cag.F7013-120014	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2015-04-30	
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: MacNeil, Michael	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 003cag
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-0078 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 997-0437
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

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

Amendment 001 to the Draft RFP

CANADIAN COAST GUARD FULL FLIGHT SIMULATOR

The purpose of this amendment is to:

- Insert Annex B, Basis of Payment;
- Insert Annex D; Bid Evaluation Plan
- Insert Appendix A to Annex D, Bid Evaluation Score Sheet; and
- Amend the Table of Contents

1. At Annex B, Basis of Payment

INSERT: Annex B, Basis of Payment (attached)

2. At Annex D, Bid Evaluation Plan

INSERT: Annex D, Bid Evaluation Plan (attached)

3. Following Annex D, Bid Evaluation Plan

INSERT: Appendix A, Bid Evaluation Score Sheet (attached)

4. At the Table of Contents, List of Annexes

DELETE: ANNEX E - Bid Evaluation Score Sheet

All other terms and conditions of the contract remain the same.

Note: The licensing requirements will be provided in a follow-on amendment to this RFP.

Solicitation No. – No de l'invitation
F7013-120014/H

Amd. No. – No de la modif.
001

Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur
003cag

Client Ref. No. – No de réf du client
F7013-120014

File No. – No. du dossier
003cagF7013-120014

CCC No./No CCC-FMS No/No VME

ANNEX B

BASIS OF PAYMENT

Milestone Number	Milestone Description	Percentage of Contract Value	Milestone Amount (CAD)
001	Agreement by Canada that the Contractor has completed Project Initiation Meeting (PIM) & System Requirements Review (SSR) meeting.	5%	TBD
002	Agreement by Canada that the Contractor has completed Preliminary Design Review (PDR).	5%	TBD
003	Agreement by Canada that the Contractor has completed Critical Design Review (CDR).	5%	TBD
004	Agreement by Canada that the Contractor has completed in-plant laboratory demonstration and testing of major systems and sub-systems.	10%	TBD
005	Agreement by Canada that the Contractor has completed In-Plant acceptance.	10%	TBD
006	Agreement by Canada that the Contractor has completed On-Site acceptance.	15%	TBD
007	Regulatory Qualification by Transport Canada .	20%	TBD
008	Simulator Ready-for-Training (RFT).	15%	TBD
009	Final delivery of documentation, spares and completion of training.	5%	TBD
010	Final Deficiencies Resolution.	5%	TBD
011	Agreement by Canada that the Contractor has completed the 90 Day Reliability Period.	5%	TBD
	Total Amount Authorized for Claims:	100%	TBD



Fisheries and Oceans
Canada

Pêches et Océans
Canada

Canadian
Coast Guard

Garde côtière
canadienne



Safety First, Service Always

Helicopter Project
ANNEX D
Full Flight Simulator
Bid Evaluation Plan
Draft RFP

Full Flight Simulator Evaluation Procedures and Selection Criteria

Evaluation and Selection Process

Following the bid solicitation closing for the Full Flight Simulator (FFS), a phased evaluation and selection process will be initiated. Subject to the requirements for clarification and proof and/or confirmation, bids will be required to meet the minimum requirements associated with a phase, or step in the process. There are several phases in the evaluation process, which are described below.

The Evaluation and Selection Process phases are as follows:

Phase 1 – Confirmation of Compliance with all Mandatory Technical Requirements

Phase 2 – Evaluation of Rated Technical Qualifications

Phase 3 – Evaluation of Rated Desirable Requirements

Phase 4 – Evaluation of Financial Proposals

Phase 5 – Contractor Selection

The technical proposals will be evaluated and scored in accordance with the scoring methodology described in the Bid Score Sheet attached as Appendix A to this document.

Phase 1 – Confirmation of Compliance with Mandatory Requirements

In Phase 1, Canada will review the bids for compliance with the Mandatory Technical Requirements as described in the CCG FFS Baseline Statement of Technical Requirements included as Appendix A to the Statement of Work (Annex A to this RFP). Bidders must also meet the technical requirement for having delivered a Level D FFS in the last 3 years.

Bids must meet all mandatory technical requirements as defined in CCG FFS Baseline Statement of Technical Requirements. Bids that do not meet all of the mandatory technical requirements will be deemed non-compliant and will not be subject to further evaluation. Bidders must complete the Compliance Matrix in accordance with DID T-001 to demonstrate how they will meet all technical requirements for the FFS by the time of delivery. Technical Requirements must be addressed in the exact chronology that they appear in the CCG FFS Baseline Statement of Technical Requirements.

It is required that proposals address in writing all of the mandatory technical requirements. It is the bidder's responsibility to ensure that the proposal is complete in technical detail to allow for evaluation. The information provided must be complete, concise and clearly demonstrate that the bidder meets the stated mandatory requirements. Responses consisting of a simple statement of compliance or lacking narrative must be avoided. If the evaluation team finds that a proposal does not provide sufficient detail to substantiate a mandatory requirement, then that proposal may be declared non-compliant and will not be subject to further evaluation.

If a requirement is evaluated as non-compliant, the evaluation team may, at its discretion, proceed with the evaluation of any given bid while it further considers a final decision concerning any potential non-compliance of that bid.

Phase 2 – Evaluation of Rated Technical Qualifications

To ensure that Canada procures a Full Flight Simulator (FFS) that provides the capability to conduct mission training, Bidders are required to complete an Evaluation of Rated Technical Qualifications. The objective of the Technical Evaluation is to provide a Canada a way to assess a paper/virtual version of the Bidder's proposed final FFS to ensure it will meet the needs of Canada.

The Total Technical Score for each Bidder will be equal to the sum of the points scored for each point-rated technical requirement. One hundred points are available for the technical score as shown in the table below.

Category	Available Points
Experience	20
Simulator Systems	35
CCG Mission Training	25
Facility Compliance	5
Project Management	10
Presentation	5

It is required that proposals address in writing all of the requirements. It is the Bidder's responsibility to ensure that the proposal is complete in technical detail to allow for a rated technical evaluation. The information provided must be complete, concise and clearly demonstrate the Bidder's qualifications in each category.

Responses should be guided by the scoring criteria information provided in Appendix A - Bid Evaluation Score Sheet as well as the specific DIDs associated with each requirement.

The Bidder shall provide as part of its Technical Proposal all documents essential to demonstrate compliance with each requirement, including, without limitation, photographs, drawings, calculations, documents, and other such evidence.

The Bidder shall provide references that substantiate their experience claims for responses in the Experience category. Canada reserves the right to contact one or all of the references. It is the responsibility of the Bidder to ensure that the references provided are current and relevant to this solicitation.

Phase 3 – Evaluation of Rated Desirable Requirements

Section to be promulgated.

Phase 4 – Evaluation of Financial Proposals

The financial proposals of those Bidders who are technically compliant will be evaluated by PWGSC with respect to the requirements as described in this Solicitation.

Phase 5 – Contractor Selection

The Bidder who has met all the mandatory requirements and has obtained the highest Best Value Score will be recommended for contract award, subject to the provisions of this solicitation.

The Best Value Score will be determined by using the following formula subject to the following weighting factors:

- i. Technical Weighting Factor = 70
- ii. Price Weighting Factor = 30

$$\text{Best Value Score} = \left(\frac{TP_n \times P_{wf}}{TP} \right) \times \frac{LPP}{P_n} + \left(\frac{TP_n \times T_{wf}}{TP} \right)$$

Where:

TP_n = Total Technical Points Acquired by Bidder n

TP = Total Available Weighted Technical Points (100+10)

P_{wf} = Price Weighting Factor (30)

LPP = Lowest Total Assessed Bid Price of all Compliant Proposal

P_n = Total Assessed Bid Price for Bidder n

T_{wf} = Technical Weighting Factor (70)

Bidders will also provide pricing for selected desirable requirements. Criteria for rating desirable requirements to be determined.

APPENDIX A – FFS Bid Evaluation Score Sheet

DRAFT

Phase 1 - Technical Mandatory

Technical Mandatory	Related DID	Description	PASS/FAIL
TM 1	N/A	Mandatory Experience.	P/F
TM 2	T-001	Mandatory Compliance Matrix.	P/F
Requires both criteria to PASS			

Criteria			
The Bidder must demonstrate that they have delivered a Level D or equivalent Full Flight Simulator (FFS) in the past three years.			
Criteria	Related DID	Fail	Pass
TM 1	N/A	Bidder does not comply fully with Mandatory Requirement.	Bidder complies fully with Mandatory Requirement.
TM 2 - Mandatory Compliance Matrix			
The Bidder must provide a Compliance Matrix that is consistent with the numbering and chronology of the Baseline Statement of Technical Requirements (demonstrated below), Appendix A to ANNEX A (Statement of Work).			
Criteria	Related DID	Fail	Pass
TM 2	T-001	Bidder does not comply fully with Mandatory Requirement.	Bidder complies fully with Mandatory Requirement.

EXAMPLE OF COMPLIANCE MATRIX FOR BID

Object Number	Mandatory Requirements	Proof of Compliance Required from Bidder	Bidder's Response (How requirement is met)	Comments
1.0-1	REGULATORY AND QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS The Full Flight Simulator (FFS) must be qualified to Level D for operation in Canada by the Transport Canada National Simulator Program (NSP), in accordance with standards described in the latest revision of the FAA 14 CFR Part 60 criteria.			
1.0-2	The FFS must have one motion platform and visual system with convertible cockpits for the CCG Bell 429 helicopter and the CCG Bell 412EPI helicopter, and must be qualified to Level D in accordance with 1.0-1.			

Phase 2, Item 1 - Experience

Experience	Mandatory Technical Requirement	Score
EX 1	The Bidder must have delivered a Level D or equivalent rotorcraft flight simulator in the past 3 years.	5
EX 2	The Bidder must have delivered a Level D or equivalent rotorcraft flight simulator with convertible cockpit in the past 3 years.	5
EX 3	The Bidder must have delivered 2 Level D or equivalent rotorcraft flight simulators in the past 3 years.	1
EX 4	The Bidder must have delivered 3 Level D or equivalent rotorcraft flight simulators in the past 3 years.	1
EX 5	The Bidder must have delivered 4 Level D or equivalent rotorcraft flight simulators in the past 3 years.	1
EX 6	The Bidder must have delivered 5 Level D or equivalent rotorcraft flight simulators in the past 3 years.	1
EX 7	The Bidder must have delivered 6 Level D or equivalent rotorcraft flight simulators in the past 3 years.	1
EX 8	The Bidder must have delivered a Level 7 FTD or a Level B,C, or D FFS qualified by Transport Canada or FAA in the past 3 years.	5
Maximum Potential Score		20

Phase 2, Item 2 - Simulator Systems

Criteria #	Related DID	Description	Maximum Points Available
SS 1	T-006	Convertible Cockpit: The Bidder must demonstrate their capability to deliver a convertible cockpit FFS by providing a report supported by drawings, pictures, relevant technical data that fully demonstrates their approach to a convertible cockpit FFS. The bidder must address the hardware aspects of the convertible cockpit, software as well as their approach to change out of the cockpits. DID T-006 provides amplifying detail.	5
SS 2	T-007	Simulator Configuration: The Bidder shall define their proposed FFS solution. The bidder shall submit a report in accordance with DID T-007 which describes in detail the technical configuration of their proposed solution.	10
SS 3	T-011	Simulator Data Plan: The Bidder must demonstrate their approach to developing the necessary flight and other engineering data required to meet CCG FFS technical requirements. The bidder shall submit a technical report in accordance with DID T-011 which describes the approach to IOS and lesson plan builder, how their system will meet CCG requirements and showing the functionality of the IOS.	5
SS 4	T-003, T-004	IOS/Lesson Plan Builder: The Bidder must demonstrate their solution for the IOS including their approach to the lesson plan builder. The bidder shall submit a report in accordance with DIDs T-003, T-004 and T-005 which describes and illustrates to the extent possible their approach to IOS and lesson plan builder.	5
SS 5	T-008	Visual Database: The Bidder must provide a response to DID T-008 and include a description of how the Visual Database will address the requirements for qualified airports and the scenes within the OTAs. The response must include the process used to acquire and refine the raw data and model it to render the imaging necessary to create a high quality synthetic training environment. The response must demonstrate that the proposed solution meets all CCG requirements.	10
Maximum Potential Score			35

Category - Simulator Systems												
Criteria #	Related DID	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
SS 1. Convertible Cockpit	T-006	The Bidder does not clearly address the intention of the requirement. The report is poorly written and hard to understand	The bidder provides only a general concept for convertible cockpit. The report indicates only notional development of the convertible cockpit.	Report provides little clarity or detail of the technical configuration of the bidder's proposed solution. Contains only preliminary engineering design work for the configuration of the proposed solution.	Clear and well laid out report that describes and illustrates through drawings, pictures and narrative the configuration of the bidder's proposed solution. Contains advanced production engineering design work for the proposed solution.							
SS 2. Simulator Configuration	T-007	The Bidder does not clearly address the intention of the requirement. The report is poorly written and hard to understand	The bidder provides only a general concept on the technical configuration. The report indicates only notional development of the proposed solution.	Report provides little clarity or detail of the technical configuration of the bidder's proposed solution. Uncertainty remains regarding the configuration of the proposed solution.	Report describes and illustrates through some drawings, pictures and narrative the configuration of the bidder's proposed solution. Report contains some technical detail indicating that the proposed solution is state of the art, and will support mission training needs.							
SS 3. Simulator Data Plan	T-011	The Bidder does not clearly address the intention of the requirement. The report is poorly written and hard to understand	Poorly laid out, confusing or difficult to read report which provides little confidence that the bidder understands the data requirement.	Report adequately describes the bidder's approach for acquisition or development of required data. Report indicates that bidder understands the requirement but leaves significant areas of uncertainty.	Clear and well laid out report that fully describes the bidder's approach for acquisition or development of required data. Report clearly demonstrates that the bidders fully understands the data requirement and has a well-developed plan to address.							
SS 4. IOS/Lesson Plan Builder	T-003, T-004, T-005	The Bidder does not clearly address the intention of the requirement. The report is poorly written and hard to understand	Poorly laid out, confusing or difficult to read report which does not provide the reader a clear understanding of the functionality of the IOS/Lesson plan builder and make it difficult to draw any conclusions regarding its effectiveness.	Report is clear but describes user interface, system layout or functionality that seems awkward and difficult to navigate.	Clear and well laid out report that describes and illustrates the functionality of the IOS and lesson plan builder. IOS/Lesson plan builder is logical, well laid out and provides logical workflow. Report includes drawings, schematics, proposed system pages which clearly indicate that the thought process behind the IOS/Lesson Plan Builder is largely complete, or that a minimal degree of development is required on the bidder's existing IOS to achieve the functionality demonstrated.							
SS 5. Visual Database	T-008	The Bidder does not clearly address the intention of the requirement. The report is poorly written and hard to understand	The bidder provides only a general concept on how data is acquired. It is unclear how the data will be used in the final product.	The bidder only partly elaborates on how to data is acquired, rendered and modeled. Some uncertainty and confusion regarding application to the final product.	The bidder demonstrates a good understanding of the requirement. Bidder has outlined the process for collection, rendering and modeling of the data to achieve CCG mission training requirements							

Phase 2, Item 3 - Mission Training

Criteria #	Related DID	Description	Maximum Points Available
MT 1	T-002	Description and depiction of the synthetic environment.	6
MT 2	T-002	Static and Moving models, complexity and control	6
MT 3	T-002	Modeling of airflow, aerodynamic and environmental effects.	6
MT 4	T-002	Complex weather and sea state modeling.	6
MT 5	T-002	Use of the IOS to achieve the training objectives.	6
Maximum Potential Score			25

Category - Mission Training

The bidder shall provide a response to DID 002, Mission Training Requirements, that fully describes how their proposed solution will design, develop and deliver a synthetic training environment that will satisfy the requirements outlined in the associated mission training scenario. Responses to 1 to 5 should indicate how each element contributes to the goal of high quality training value by way of interaction of the flight crew with the synthetic training environment.

Criteria #	Related DID	0	1	3	5
MT 1. Description and depiction of the synthetic environment.	T-002	The Bidder does not clearly address the intention of the requirement. The report is poorly written and hard to understand	Cursory description of the area of focus. Minimal detail, some uncertainty with respect to what users should expect.	Good description of the operating environment. Reader is left with a reasonable understanding of what to expect. Bidder demonstrates sufficient knowledge and understanding of the requirement. Response is tailored to what the user will see, hear, feel and comprehend.	Full description of the area of focus. Narrative is rich in detail. Reader is left with a complete understanding of the element and how it interacts with the rest of the simulator. Bidder demonstrates comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the requirement. Response is concise with respect to what the user will see, hear, feel and comprehend.
Sub-category	Related DID	0	1	3	5
MT 2. Static and Moving models, complexity and control.	T-002	The Bidder does not clearly address the intention of the requirement. The report is poorly written and hard to understand	Cursory description of the area of focus. Minimal detail, some uncertainty with respect to what users should expect.	Good description of the operating environment. Reader is left with a reasonable understanding of what to expect. Bidder demonstrates sufficient knowledge and understanding of the requirement. Response is tailored to what the user will see, hear, feel and comprehend.	Full description of the area of focus. Narrative is rich in detail. Reader is left with a complete understanding of the element and how it interacts with the rest of the simulator. Bidder demonstrates comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the requirement. Response is concise with respect to what the user will see, hear, feel and comprehend.
Criteria #	Related DID	0	1	3	5
MT 3. Modeling of airflow, aerodynamic and environmental effects.	T-002	The Bidder does not clearly address the intention of the requirement. The report is poorly written and hard to understand	Cursory description of the area of focus. Minimal detail, some uncertainty with respect to what users should expect.	Good description of the operating environment. Reader is left with a reasonable understanding of what to expect. Bidder demonstrates sufficient knowledge and understanding of the requirement. Response is tailored to what the user will see, hear, feel and comprehend.	Full description of the area of focus. Narrative is rich in detail. Reader is left with a complete understanding of the element and how it interacts with the rest of the simulator. Bidder demonstrates comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the requirement. Response is concise with respect to what the user will see, hear, feel and comprehend.
Criteria #	Related DID	0	1	3	5
MT 4. Complex weather and sea state modeling.	T-002	The Bidder does not clearly address the intention of the requirement. The report is poorly written and hard to understand	Cursory description of the area of focus. Minimal detail, some uncertainty with respect to what users should expect.	Good description of the operating environment. Reader is left with a reasonable understanding of what to expect. Bidder demonstrates sufficient knowledge and understanding of the requirement. Response is tailored to what the user will see, hear, feel and comprehend.	Full description of the area of focus. Narrative is rich in detail. Reader is left with a complete understanding of the element and how it interacts with the rest of the simulator. Bidder demonstrates comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the requirement. Response is concise with respect to what the user will see, hear, feel and comprehend.
Criteria #	Related DID	0	1	3	5

Appendix A to Annex B- Full Flight Simulator Bid Evaluation Score Sheet To F7013-120014/G

<p>MT 5. Use of the IOS to achieve the training objectives.</p>	<p>T-002</p>	<p>The Bidder does not clearly address the intention of the requirement. The report is poorly written and hard to understand</p>	<p>Cursorly description of the area of focus. Minimal detail, some uncertainty with respect to what users should expect.</p>	<p>Good description of the operating environment. Reader is left with a reasonable understanding of what to expect. Bidder demonstrates sufficient knowledge and understanding of the requirement. Response is tailored to what the user will see, hear, feel and comprehend.</p>	<p>Full description of the area of focus. Narrative is rich in detail. Reader is left with a complete understanding of the element and how it interacts with the rest of the simulator. Bidder demonstrates comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the requirement. Response is concise with respect to what the user will see, hear, feel and comprehend.</p>
---	--------------	--	--	---	--

Phase 2, Item 4 - Facility Compliance

Criteria #	Related DID	Description	Maximum Points Available
FC 1	FR-001	The Bidder must demonstrate that their proposed solution will fit into the space at TC ASD.	5
Maximum Potential Score			5

Category - Facility Compliance			
The bidder shall demonstrate that the proposed solution will fit into the allotted space at TC ASD. The bidder shall submit a technical report in accordance with DID FR-001 which verifies that the proposed solution will fit into the space at TC ASD.			
Related DID	0	5	
FR-001	Poorly laid out, confusing or difficult to read report which provides little confidence that the bidder understands the requirement. No drawings are provided.	Clear and well laid out report and accompanying drawings that indicate the proposed solution will fit into the allotted space at TC ASD.	

Phase 2, Item 5 - Project Management

Project Management	Related DID	Description	Maximum Points Available
PM 1	M-001	The Bidder must provide a Project Management Plan (PMP).	5
PM 2	M-002	The Bidder must provide a Master Project Schedule (MPS).	2
PM 3	M-005	The Bidder must provide a Quality Plan (QP).	1
PM 4	M-008	The Bidder must provide an Infrastructure Plan (IP).	1
PM 5	M-008	The Bidder must provide a Human Resources Plan (HR Plan).	1
Maximum Potential Score			10

Category - Project Management					
The bidder shall demonstrate their approach to managing the CCG FFS procurement. Where possible, the approach should align with the bidder's standard approach to project management for a project of this magnitude. Available scoring is listed above each sub category. Bidders must comply with the requirements of the associated DIDs in order to receive scoring in the associated category.					
Related DID	Sub-category	0	1	3	5
M-001	PM 1. Project Management Plan	Bidder did not submit a Project Management Plan.	Bidder complies with the requirement of the associated DID with some uncertainty.	Bidder complies with the requirement of the associated DID with very few missing elements or areas of uncertainty.	Bidder complies fully with all requirements of the associated DID.
Related DID	Sub-category	0	1	2	
M-002	PM 2. Master Project Schedule	Bidder did not submit a Master Project Schedule.	Bidder complies with the requirement of the associated DID but the report is unclear regarding collection of flight test data.	Bidder complies fully with all requirements of the associated DID.	
Related DID	Sub-category	0	1		
M-005	PM 3. Quality Management Plan	Bidder did not submit a Quality Management Plan.	Bidder complies with the requirement of the associated DID.		
Related DID	Sub-category	0	1		
M-008	PM 4. Infrastructure Management Plan	Bidder did not submit an Infrastructure Management Plan.	Bidder complies with the requirement of the associated DID.		
Related DID	Sub-category	0	1		
M-009	PM 5. Human Resources Management Plan	Bidder did not submit a Human Resources Management Plan.	Bidder complies with the requirement of the associated DID.		

Phase 2, Item 6 - Presentation

Criteria #	Related DID	Description	Maximum Points Available
PR 1	N/A	The Bidder must provide comprehensive, well written responses which clearly illustrate how the proposed solution will meet the criteria for all items in Phase 2 of the evaluation.	5
Maximum Potential Score			5

Category - Presentation			
The Bidder must provide comprehensive, well written responses which clearly illustrate how the proposed solution will meet the criteria for all items in Phase 2 of the evaluation.			
Related DID	0	1	5
N/A	Poorly laid out, confusing or difficult to read responses lacking in proper spelling, grammar and punctuation that do not address the requirement as defined by the relevant DIDs and the scoring criteria.	Poorly laid out, confusing or difficult to read responses lacking in proper spelling, grammar and punctuation that provide a limited understanding of the proposed solution.	Well laid out, responses with proper spelling, grammar, and punctuation that clearly and concisely illustrate how the proposed solution will meet the requirements.

Weighted Technical Points

Criteria		Maximum Potential Score
Criteria #	Experience	/20
EX 1	The Bidder must have delivered a Level D or equivalent rotorcraft flight simulator in the past 3 years.	5
EX 2	The Bidder must have delivered a Level D or equivalent rotorcraft flight simulator with convertible cockpit in the past 3 years.	5
EX 3	The Bidder must have delivered 2 Level D or equivalent rotorcraft flight simulators in the past 3 years.	1
EX 4	The Bidder must have delivered 3 Level D or equivalent rotorcraft flight simulators in the past 3 years.	1
EX 5	The Bidder must have delivered 4 Level D or equivalent rotorcraft flight simulators in the past 3 years.	1
EX 6	The Bidder must have delivered 5 Level D or equivalent rotorcraft flight simulators in the past 3 years.	1
EX 7	The Bidder must have delivered 6 Level D or equivalent rotorcraft flight simulators in the past 3 years.	1
EX 8	The Bidder must have delivered a Level 7 FTD or a Level B,C, or D FFS qualified by Transport Canada or FAA in the past 3 years.	5
Criteria #	Simulator Systems	/35
SS 1	Convertible Cockpit	5
SS 2	Simulator Data Plan	5
SS 3	Simulator Configuration	10
SS 4	IOS/Lesson Plan Builder	5
SS 5	Visual Database	10
Criteria #	CCG Mission Training	/25
MT 1	Plan to develop the synthetic environment	5
MT 2	Moving models, complexity, and control	5
MT 3	Modeling of airflow, aerodynamic and environmental	5
MT 4	Complex weather and sea state modeling	5
MT 5	Links to the IOS	5
Criteria #	Facility Compliance	/5
FC 1	The Bidder must demonstrate that their proposed FFS solution will fit in to the space at TC ASD.	5
Criteria #	Project Management	/10
PM 1	PMP	5
PM 2	MPS	2
PM 3	QP	1
PM 4	IP	1
PM 5	HR	1