



**RETURN RESPONSES TO:
RETOURNER LES RÉPONSES À:**

PWGSC Bids Receiving Unit
Place Bonaventure, 7th Floor
South-East Portal
800 De la Gauchetière St. West
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
H5A 1L6

Module de réception des
soumissions de TPSGC
Place Bonaventure, 7^e étage
Portail Sud-Est
800 rue De la Gauchetière Ouest
Montréal, Québec, Canada
H5A 1L6

**SOLICITATION ADMENDMENT
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

Space Programs Directorate (MTD Division)
6767 route de l'Aéroport
Longueuil, Quebec, Canada
J3Y 8Y9



Titre – Sujet Multi-mission Antenna Reservation System (ARS) for the Canadian Space Agency (CSA)	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 9F044-14-0394	Amendment No. - N° modif. 006
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 9F044-14-0934	Date September 11, 2015
GETS Ref. No. - N° de réf. de SEAG PW-15-00690227	
File No. - N° de dossier 9F044-14-0934	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/N° VME N/A
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin : at - à 2:00 pm On - le Thursday, October 8, 2015	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Time (EDT)
F.O.B - F.A.B. Plant-Usine : <input type="checkbox"/> Destination : <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre : <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Pierre Letendre	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 205mtd
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone 450-926-5173	E-mail address - Adresse Courriel pierre.letendre@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: Canadian Space Agency 6767 route de l'Aéroport Longueuil, Quebec, Canada J3Y 8Y9	

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

PROJECT TITLE

Multi-mission Antenna Reservation System (ARS) for the Canadian Space Agency (CSA)

This Amendment 006 provides answers to additional questions raised by potential Bidders as of September 10, 2015 (Section 1).

This Amendment 006 also provides a correction to the Statement of Work of the RFP as a result of questions raised by potential Bidders (Section 2).

This Amendment 006 also extends the RFP closing date from Thursday September 24, 2015 to Thursday October 8, 2015. If you have already submitted your proposal but wish to reconsider it, please send your revised proposal before the new deadline.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED.

AMENDMENT 006 – SECTION 1: ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS RECEIVED

32. Are licensed software costs related to the support period to be included in Price 8? Doing so would cause overlap with Price 7b. Is this intended?

Answer:

Price 7b is intended to list any licensed software that is required to operate the ARS solution proposed by the Bidder, meaning that without such licensed software, Canada could not operate the proposed ARS solution.

If need be, Price 8 is to be used to include the annual software license renewal cost of any "additional" licensed software that would only be required to allow the Bidder to perform optional Maintenance and Support Services for Canada. In such instance, Bidders are to provide a list of such software using an attachment to the Annex "G".

33. Should the baseline price (Price "A") include Licensed Software support only up to the end of warranty? Price 7b would then cover the nine year period starting at the end of warranty. Please confirm.

Answer: That is correct. The baseline price (Price "A") must include Licensed Software support but only up to the end of the 12 months warranty period. Price 7b covers the nine year period starting the nine year period starting at the end of the warranty.

34. Price 7b requests license costs for one “device”. Does this mean one “baseline system” (i.e. including prime and back-up) or is it referring to only the prime machine and Price 7a refers to the second baseline system? Does Price 7a refer to a potential third machine to be procured?

Answer: The Baseline ARS system consists of two stations: a primary one and a backup one, thus it may need at least two (2) device licenses for any licensed software which is required to operate the proposed ARS solution if the proposed solution consists, for example, in two stand-alone computers upon which the ARS software “suite” would run. In such case, Bidders must include the cost of two (2) device licenses under “7b”. Please note that the cost of such licenses (for two “device” licenses) is to be covered by the Bidder until the end of the warranty period.

Price “7a” does indeed refer to a potential third machine that may be procured by Canada at some point in time. This will depend on Canada’s needs and on the Bidder’s proposed solution type to meet our ARS requirement.

35. Does Price “7a” relate to the ten year period starting at the start of warranty?

Answer: Yes. “7a” does relate to ten year period starting at the start of warranty. The idea is for Canada to be able evaluate the total Life Cycle Cost of the proposed solution.

36. Where options include software licenses, should the cost of those licenses be included in the option or in Prices 7a and 7b? If the latter, should Bidders distinguish between baseline license costs and option license costs?

Answer: If options include the need for “additional” software licenses not already listed under prices 7a and 7b, then such additional software licenses costs must be included in the option cost where applicable. In such instance, Bidders are to (using an attachment to the Annex “G”) list such “additional softwares”, provide their respective annual license renewal costs for one year and include such annual license renewal costs for a ten year period in the price of the applicable option block (or individual option when applicable).

37. The PMP evaluation criteria includes “detailed cost breakdown” among its elements implying that this should be included in the PMP. However, elsewhere in the RFP it is stated that detailed cost and price information should not be included in the Technical and Programmatic Proposal. Can Canada please clarify where the detailed cost breakdown should be located?

Answer: Prices are to be included only in the Financial Bid as per the instructions provided under the Part 3 of the RFP. This PMP requirement, as described under the DID-101, paragraph 2 of the Statement of Work is deleted in its entirety under this Amendment 006.

- 38. [AD-2 2.2 Definition of Time Window] Is it envisioned that the ARS be simultaneously scheduling multiple time windows? e.g. Suppose the scheduling period is 48 hours. Might the system be simultaneously working on several schedules? The current time window we're in (for making fast tasking changes)? The one after that as well?**
- a. If multiple schedules are being developed at once, how does this impact performance requirements (such as ARS360)? That is, what happens if the ARS is generating a schedule for one time window and a contact request comes in for a different time window? The ARS may take longer in that case to provide a schedule for the second time window?**
 - b. Or is it envisioned that there is a single Scheduling Time Window (as per ARS020) that the ARS is working on at a given time and the window is manually moved ahead by an operator in the configuration on a regular basis? (This would presumably immediately trigger new propagations/scheduling).**

Answer: There is only one Time Window as per definition that constrains the Schedule period. Although the performance criteria relates to a Time Window set at 48h, the Time Window may actually be set longer in the System Configuration. The Schedule shall cover the configured Time Window, not necessarily bound to a 48h period. ARS360 will be validated with the Time Window configured at 48h, and the processing time is expected to increase proportionally for longer Time Windows. It is assumed that the performance requirement is for processing a single request but does not prevent the ARS to simultaneously receive other requests and process them in a first come first serve basis.

39. [AD-2] mostly does not mention the RCM ICD. (It's only referenced in ARS055.) Should it be assumed that it is not mentioned otherwise because it is anticipated that RCM interface is handled as a "specific" message formats (ARS407, ARS411, ARS413, ARS414, ARS421, ARS431)?

Answer: The RCM ICD shall be considered a Specific Mission Interface defined by AD-5 since ARS407, ARS411, ARS413, ARS414, ARS421, ARS431 pertain the generic Mission interface described in AD-3.

- a. If so, is it the ARS supplier's responsibility to define the RCM configurations or merely to provide the mechanism for defining user configurable formats and associating them with missions?**

Answer: It is expected that RCM configurations be entered during the development as sample files ingestion and products are expected during the development phase of the ARS. This is also to be tested during the OSAT. It is also expected that the Generic interface and the DLR interface will be implemented and tested as well.

- b. Also, the RCM ICD has message types unsupported by the generic interface and not discussed in the requirements. e.g. The Cancel Reservation Request (RCM ICD 3.3.3.3) does not correspond to any message in the requirements and thus cannot be readily handled by the specific formats message.**

Answer: Although not discussed specifically in the requirements, the RCM ICD shall be considered a specific Mission Interface and shall be implemented as per AD-5. The ARS supplier could propose a way to address the Cancel Reservation Request by commonality with a standard Reservation Request (e.g. similar to a Satellite Contact Request (AD-3) by forcing the Action field to WITHDRAW)

- c. The ARS ICD (AD-3) defines some additional facility formats (besides the generic ones). Some of these indicate "TBD" for the entire interface (DRDC, SSC). Some specify sample messages (tab delimited), etc. Is it envisioned that these are defined using the "user configurable format" mechanism? ARS550 indicates that all transactions shall be based on XML. Answer: Please, consider TBD format to be generic Facility Interface format unless specified. ARS550 applies to the generic Facility interface. It is up to the ARS supplier to propose a solution for the specific format of DLR and SSC. (e.g. may be having a configurable conversion layer to generate tab-delimited files from XML or directly generating the right format for the Facility).**

- d. It would be difficult to handle such differing formats (XML like RCM, tab delimited)? Are there some simplifying assumptions that may be made for these user configurable formats? e.g. They are XML following the same structure as the generic interface, but fields may have different names in the specific (user-configured formats) or be omitted with default values defined. Answer: Those assumptions are acceptable as long as the AD-3 and AD-5 are met. With the exception of RCM, structure is expected to be similar, mnemonics may differ and defined in user-configured formats, and optional fields may be omitted. It is not foreseen that more fields are required than those defined in the generic format.**

- 40. The DLR interface (AD-3 9.3.2) indicates that the transport mechanism is email directed to the station coordinator. This does not align with any requirements (which indicate that drop-box type interfaces are used). Should this section of the ICD be ignored and considered not applicable?**

Answer: This section is part of the applicable document AD-3. Since the DRL interface is not generic, it is expected that the ARS supports this specific interface by generating the Antenna Access Request tab-delimited text message and sending it autonomously through email. As discussed above, the ARS provider should propose a convenient solution.

- 41. As per AD-3, the DRDC, SSC, DLR are largely TBD. What assumptions can we make about these interfaces? Should we assume they will be implemented using the "specific file specification" mechanism?**

Answer: As discussed above, DRDC interface is to be considered generic until a specific format be defined. DLR and SSC interfaces to be implemented as above where the specific user-configurable format mechanism could be used.

AMENDMENT 006 – SECTION 2:

CORRECTION TO THE STATEMENT OF WORK (SOW):

11. Paragraph 2 of DID-101 (Project Management Plan) is deleted in its entirety.

*****END OF AMENDMENT 006*****