

Summary of Feedback and Outcomes

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

DEFENCE INNOVATION RESEARCH PROGRAM (DIRP)

ON BEHALF OF

DEFENCE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CANADA

FILE # W7714-16-6154/B

TERMINOLOGY

Further to all other definitions in this document, whenever the “Terms” listed beneath appear, they are to be substituted by the “Replacement Terms” below.

REPLACEMENT TERM	TERM
Bid	Proposal (of Innovation)
Bidder	Innovator
Bidder’s Guidebook	Call for Proposals (CFP) (Call 1)
Call for Innovations	Call for Proposals
CFI	CFP
Project	Innovation
Proposal	Innovation
PSPC	PWGSC
Request for Bids	Call for Proposals (CFP) (Call 1)
Solicitation	Call for Proposals (CFP) (Call 1)
TBD	To be determined

1. INTRODUCTION:

On 27 November 2015, Public Works Government Services Canada (PWGSC) published a Request for Information (RFI) on the Government Electronic Tendering Service (GETS) seeking to engage with Innovators (i.e., industry and academia) on behalf of Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC). As part of this engagement, Innovators were asked to provide a written response to questions related to both the technical aspects of the Work to be undertaken and the procurement strategy, as well as their capacity and ability to carry out Innovations in support of the DRDC Strategic Objectives as outlined in the Guide Book. A draft Guide Book was provided, which included Strategic Objectives, Evaluation Criteria and the Basis of Selection.

The purpose of the Stakeholder Engagement was:

- a) To seek information from Innovators on technical aspects of the Work to be undertaken and the procurement strategy, as well as their capacity and ability to carry out Innovations in support of the DRDC Strategic Objectives as outlined in the Guide Book.
- b) To provide Innovators with the opportunity to give feedback on the procurement strategy. Innovators were encouraged to ask questions and provide comments with the objective to receive feedback that may be incorporated into the Call for Proposals document, creating a procurement that is fair and transparent to suppliers, enhances competition, and results in best value to Canada.

The publication of this document and any resulting Call for Proposals (CFP) effectively concludes the Stakeholder Engagement process. The information gathered through this process was considered when finalizing the CFP and should meet the needs of the Government of Canada and be compatible with Industry and Academia standard practices.

2. REQUIREMENT:

DRDC has a requirement to address the following six (6) Strategic Objectives in the context of developing the RADARSAT Constellation Mission (RCM) follow on missions:

- 1. Developing cueing role and automated tasking;

2. Radar concepts;
3. On-board processing;
4. AIS antenna and receiver concepts;
5. Maritime surveillance tools; and
6. Land surveillance tools.

3. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PROCESS:

Stakeholder Engagement Period	Posting of RFI: 27 November 2015; Responses to RFI requested: 8 December 2015; Stakeholder Day: 13 January 2016, in Gatineau, QC
Participants	Nine Innovators provided responses to the RFI: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Airbus Defence and Space Canada Inc.; b) A.U.G. Signals Ltd.; c) C-CORE; d) Envi Enterprise Inc.; e) Intergraph Canada Ltd., d/b/a Hexagon Safety and Infrastructure f) MDA Systems Ltd.; g) OODA Technologies Inc.; h) Space Strategies Consulting Ltd.; and i) UrtheCast Corporation.

4. GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PROCESS FEEDBACK

The consultative process provided Innovators with an opportunity to participate in the procurement process by providing comments, questions and recommendations for improvement of the draft Guide Book, as well as seeking clarification on technical issues.

Overall, Innovators indicated that the draft Guide Book was fair, open, and transparent, and there was consistency in the comments regarding the Strategic Objectives, evaluation criteria, and basis of selection. As a result of the process, Canada has adjusted the Guide Book and published feedback on the RFI process.

This document details the feedback received during the Stakeholder Engagement Process and the impact on the draft Guide Book (i.e., outcomes).

5. SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK AND OUTCOMES

The following represent questions posed by Innovators in the RFI and the resulting responses from Canada. Redundant questions and corporate profiles have not been included. **Modifications have not been made to the Guide Book unless explicitly indicated.** Canada's responses are indicated in *italics with red text*.

RFI Question 1	Please provide an impact statement on your ability to bid. If the current draft Guide Book is unduly restrictive (i.e., Strategic Objectives, Evaluation Criteria and the Basis of Selection) please explain why and suggest alternatives.
Feedback 1	The terms of the DIRP vehicle make it difficult in some cases for a company to produce a return on its investment. This is particularly the case where the innovation is developed

	specifically for a Government of Canada application in market segments where the majority of the business is in direct government procurement. Radar satellite missions are an example of this as they are normally procured by national governments from their own national mission primes. In these cases, we would recommend that the level of funding be raised to at least 65% of approved PWGSC rates which would cover direct costs of the work.
Outcome 1	<i>The level of funding will not be increased as it is not cost effective to the program.</i>
Feedback 2	In Attachment A, Innovation Template there is the following note under Part 1: Innovation Information: "The DIRP is unable to consider Innovations that have already received funding from the Government of Canada, or from provincially or municipally funded programs." For most Government of Canada R&D funding programs, stacking of other government funding is permissible up to the level of 75% of project costs. This requirement makes it more difficult for a company to close its business case, where the work may be partially funded from other government sources. This statement also does not address the case where future funding may be requested from other government sources. Clarification of this note is requested.
Outcome 2	<i>Stacking is defined as using funding from another Canadian government source to fund project costs. For the purposes of this CFP, stacking is not permitted.</i>
Feedback 3	Recommend that DRDC and the PWGSC Contracting Authority consider the possibility of Innovators providing (or acquiring through DIRP as Government Property) commercial off-the-shelf ("COTS") software products and related maintenance services.
Outcome 3	<i>The intent of this statement is unclear to Canada. It is possible for the Innovator to use DIRP funds to purchase COTS software products and related maintenance services for the purposes of executing their proposed project. However, DIRP is not intended as a vehicle to procure COTS software products and related maintenance services for DND.</i>
Feedback 4	The various Intellectual Property Ownership and licensing provisions referenced throughout the Call for Innovation (CFI) could be perceived as problematic for Innovators that develop and extend technologies primarily for private commercial applications.
Outcome 4	<i>Access to IP is addressed in the following SACC 2040 general conditions clauses, available at https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual: 2040 29 (2008-05-12) Ownership of Intellectual Property Rights in Foreground Information 2040 30 (2008-05-12) Licenses to Intellectual Property Rights in Foreground and Background Information</i>

	<i>Neither of these clauses are negotiable in the context of Contracts awarded through the DIR program.</i>
Feedback 5	We recommend that projects that address multiple objectives be given higher priority.
Outcome 5	<i>The bidder must address only one Strategic Objective per proposal, as stated in the CFP Part 1, para 1.2.2 Although a proposal could touch on several Strategic Objectives, each proposal will be assessed on an individual basis against the single corresponding Strategic Objective identified in the proposal by the bidder.</i>
Feedback 6	The DIR program requires that we co-invest in research with Canada to the amount of 50%. Accordingly, companies will need to invest wisely in projects that allow them to recoup their investment over time. This implies that certain strategic objectives might be more difficult for us to justify from an investment point of view, unless the investment affects our products/services in a shorter time frame. Therefore, it is requested that challenges faced by DIR co-investors be carefully considered in any evaluation. To this end, recouping of investment may take longer than expected and companies may have to find creative ways to commercialize the intellectual property. As such, we request a certain amount of flexibility in determining evaluation for the Technology Exploitation Plan (paragraph 2.1.4 of Annex A).
Outcome 6	<i>The Innovator must recognize a strategic benefit of co-investing in a DIRP project. The timeline for realization of the Technology Exploitation Plan has not been dictated.</i>
Feedback 7	Concerning Strategic Objective 4, the consideration of only AIS antenna and receiver concepts seems overly restrictive. We feel the objective should be expanded to include the maturing of AIS mission concepts and synergies with RCM/RADARSAT-2. Perhaps this is already implied with Strategic Objective 2. However, this isn't explicitly stated.
Outcome 7	<i>This type of project would likely fit better into Strategic Objective 5, which addresses maritime surveillance with RADARSAT-2 and RCM.</i>

RFI Question 2	<p>Please indicate your company or institution's ability and that of any subcontractors, to accommodate personnel and facility security requirements, together with controlled goods restrictions:</p> <p>2.1 Please clearly identify any implications that may affect delivery of the proposed contract in accordance with the requirements of the PSPC Industrial Security Program.</p> <p>2.2 If some or all security measures are in progress, please indicate an estimate of when compliance will be achieved.</p> <p>2.3 If it is not possible to meet some or all security requirements, please substantiate.</p>
-----------------------	--

Feedback 1	With staff turnover and new hires, it may be necessary to add a new resource to a project to mitigate schedule risk. For these circumstances, it is requested that allowances be made for individuals to work on project tasks that do not require access to protected or restricted materials.
Outcome 1	<i>The Innovator can manage this within the constraints of the provisions of the Security Requirements Check List (SRCL), should one be required to execute the project.</i> <i>Information regarding the SRCL has been addressed in the Call for Proposal under Part 6 – Security, Financial and Other Requirements.</i>

RFI Question 3	Please provide a statement of interest, capacity and ability to provide research and development services to DRDC in the DIRP context.
Feedback 1	All respondents indicated that they have the capacity and ability to provide research and development services to DRDC in the DIRP context.

RFI Question 4	Please provide information if and how your company can access expertise and experts through professional and/or scientific networks.
Feedback 1	All respondents indicated that they are able to access expertise and experts through professional, academic or scientific networks.

RFI Question 5	Please provide any questions or comments on the nature and clarity of the Guide Book.
Feedback 1	In addition to listing technologies of interest to DRDC/DND under strategic objectives it would be helpful to provide broader detail on the applications these are expected to support. The strategic objectives include some brief mention of applications (e.g., arctic surveillance, intelligence preparation of the battlefield). DRDC should consider including a separate section describing the application requirements that drive these technological needs.
Outcome 1	<i>Canada is trying not to unduly constrain the nature of the Innovations received or the business area of the Innovator.</i>

Feedback 2	We recommend that the final CFI include detailed instructions on what information should be provided in each of the form fields in Form A – Company Information. In addition, we request clarification on why this level of detail is requested as part of the CFI. Our understanding is that this information is not being used to assess the submission and may therefore not be relevant to the program.
Outcome 2	<i>Forms A, B and C will be available as an attachment to the final Call for Proposals in Excel Spreadsheet format.</i> <i>The information will be used to assess the submission as basic tombstone data provides Canada with insight to the Innovator's ability to co-fund their portion of the work. Further instructions will be included in the Guide Book.</i>
Feedback 3	Form B – Innovation Costs currently requests that detailed salary information be provided as part of the proposal. As a publicly traded company, our corporate confidentiality policies do not allow us to publish the salaries of our employees and, as such, we could not provide this level of detail in a response. We suspect that other potential partners in the industry may hold similar policies that would prevent them from providing detailed salary and benefit information in a CFI or Request for Proposal. As an alternative, it would be proposed that standard rates based on seniority level be provided for each resource included in the CFI response.
Outcome 3	<i>Supplier proposals to DIRP are not public documents and are subject to release restrictions that would be identified by the bidder on the proposal. In addition, Canada protects third-party information in accordance with the Access to Information and Privacy (ATIP) Act of Canada. Standard rates would be negotiated with a PWGSC cost analyst, if applicable, and are also protected under ATIP.</i>
Feedback 4	We would like to propose that Form B – Innovation Costs allow for the inclusion of costs related to commercial off-the-shelf software, such as license and maintenance costs. In addition, we would recommend that the form allow for different software pricing models, such as software subscriptions.
Outcome 4	<i>COTS software and maintenance can be purchased for purposes of conducting the R&D.</i> <i>The inclusion of costs related to commercial off the shelf software such as license and maintenance costs has been incorporated into the Call for Proposals.</i>
Feedback 5	We request that the final CFI include detailed instructions on what information should be provided in each of the form fields in Form C – Summary of Project Costs.
Outcome 5	<i>Instructions will be included in the Guide Book.</i>
Feedback 6	In the final CFI, we would request that section 2.2.1 Innovation Funding and Eligible Costs clarify what categories of costs are included in calculating the overall costs of the proposed research. For example, the CFI should clarify if the cost of prerequisite hardware and third party software provided by DRDC, or the cost of software maintenance provided by the Innovator for the duration of the contract, would be included in the total cost.

Outcome 6	<i>GFE (e.g., hardware, third party software, or government data) would be negotiated on a case by case basis, but its value would not be included in the cost calculations. Software maintenance provided by the Innovator may possibly be a direct cost of the project reimbursable at 50%. Such costs would need to conform to PWGSC Contracting Costs 1031-2.</i>
Feedback 7	In section 2.1.4 Technology Exploitation Plan of Attachment B, 23 would recommend that the CFI clarify the intent of this criteria and specify if the purpose is to show how DRDC could commercialize the innovation, or rather how the Innovator would market the innovation.
Outcome 7	<i>The commercialization plan pertains to the Innovator.</i>
Feedback 8	From p. 13 of 57 Canadian Content Policy. Does this policy apply only to funding from the DIRP, or does this apply to the entire project (assuming 50% matching funding from other sources)? We propose that it be the entire project and not just the DIR funding.
Outcome 8	<i>This applies to 50% of the entire project (i.e., the bid price), not just the DIRP portion of the funding.</i>
Feedback 9	From p. 21 of 57 “The DIRP is unable to consider Innovations that have already received funding from the Government of Canada, or from provincially or municipally funded programs.” This statement is not clear, as it is not bounded. Is this meant to exclude projects that are presently co-funded by public funding, meaning that public funding cannot be used as the 50% match? Does this also exclude any innovation that was given previous government funding to create Background Intellectual Property (BIP) to the project (e.g., precursor projects)?
Outcome 9	<i>Canadian public funding cannot be used as the 50% matching funds because this constitutes stacking. This does not apply to developed BIP that may be used in a particular Innovation.</i>

RFI Question 6	How would you propose Canada evaluate bids based on the basis of selection and evaluation criteria proposed in the draft Guide Book.
Feedback 1	Mandatory evaluation criteria 1.1.1 refers to DND/CF Relevance: is there a need for a DND/CAF sponsor for the work as per previous DIR projects. If so what is the preferred process for identifying such a sponsor?
Outcome 1	<i>There is no need for a DND/CAF sponsor.</i>
Feedback 2	Mandatory evaluation criteria 1.1.3 requires that a minimum of 50% of the work to be performed in Canada. The RADARSAT program, including any RCM follow-on, represents a strategic capability for the government of Canada. In order that the resources employed for foundational R&D preceding the program remain in Canada and that the intellectual property (IP) created remain in Canada, a higher threshold for work performed in Canada would be desirable. We suggest that this threshold could be increased to 90% of the work.

Outcome 2	<i>The minimum 50% of the work in Canada is intended to increase the number of Innovations received to achieve the Strategic Objectives while showing benefits to Canada.</i>
Feedback 3	The current evaluation criteria for the Entity Track Record element is very restrictive regarding what past experience could be considered relevant for this innovation. We feel that the DRDC would benefit from allowing Innovators with experience completing innovations in other related fields to be considered as potential partners. This approach would allow the DRDC to benefit from innovative technology which has been developed and used by other sectors.
Outcome 3	<i>While the point is appreciated, Canada believes that a track record that is related to the Strategic Objectives would provide the best opportunity for successfully delivering a relevant R&D project.</i>
Feedback 4	The current criteria does not differentiate between large innovations initiatives such as multi-million, multi-year programs and smaller research projects. As such, we would recommend that the number of relevant innovations required in order to be deemed responsive be reduced.
Outcome 4	<i>Recommendation noted. The definition of Innovation has been modified in the Guide Book.</i>
Feedback 5	It is proposed that the value of the Research Content be evaluated separately from the Work Plan; for example, a company may propose an excellent research idea, but ultimately have an ill-defined work plan. By having the Research Content evaluated separately from the Work Plan, one can give a more effective evaluation of both the idea and the execution.
Outcome 5	<i>The suggestion is appreciated however the Research Content and the Work Plan evaluation criteria remain unchanged.</i>

RFI Question 7	Please provide any suggestions that, in your opinion, may enhance the bidding process and improve the evaluation procedures including evaluation criteria and the basis of selection of the Bidders.
Feedback 1	We recommend that the bidding process require a certification from the bidders that 90% of the work under this contract will be done in Canada and that the resulting IP will remain in Canada, and be used by Canadian companies, unless otherwise authorized by the Government of Canada. The bid solicitation should request information regarding bidder's capabilities in Canada to support this certification.
Outcome 1	<i>Recommendation noted. The 50% minimum is intended to increase the number of Innovations received to achieve the Strategic Objectives while showing benefits to Canada. The SACC General Conditions 2040 outline Canada's rights to exploit the developed IP. Maintaining IP in Canada may unduly restrict Canada. The Innovator's capabilities will be assessed using the Evaluation Criteria.</i>

Feedback 2	Suggest providing more information about the innovation manager's role in this process and potential alternatives to treating this role as a singular position. Dividing the responsibility or allowing for more than one individual to fill this position may provide respondents with more flexibility and capability to pursue multiple innovations while taking advantage of varied, unique experts on the respondent's team.
Outcome 2	<i>Splitting the Innovation Manager role across several individuals is not acceptable to Canada, a single Point of Contact for the Innovation should be identified.</i>
Feedback 3	In Annex A, Mandatory Criteria, paragraph 1.1.2, we find the definition of what constitutes a Canadian entity is missing.
Outcome 3	<i>Please refer to Part 1 - General Information and in Part 5 - Certifications of the Call for Proposals to clarify the intent behind project leadership and Canadian content.</i>

RFI Question 8	For each of the point rated technical and management criteria, 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 education, and the period of time within which the experience is considered to be valid.)
Feedback 1	2.1.1 Entity Track Record: The definition of an Innovation as a 'discrete activity with recognizable start and end dates, deliverable and staff loading' is more similar to the definition of 'a project', innovative or not. The definition of Innovation used for this evaluation criterion should include elements such as novelty, generation of IP, and advancement of TRL.
Outcome 1	<i>The updated definition of Innovation can be found under terminology section of the Call for Proposals.</i>
Feedback 2	2.1.2 Research Content and Work Plan: The evaluation criteria elements are sensibly defined but the scoring mechanism implies a pass/fail for each of the four elements and the minimum requirement only allows for a 'fail' in one out of the four elements. This is somewhat severe. Care is needed to avoid favoring 'safe' research with well-defined low-impact outcomes over more risky research with less clearly defined but potentially high impact outcomes. This might be achieved by giving a score to each of the elements rather than a simple pass/fail.
Outcome 2	<i>The requirements to achieve the noted scores, as well as the evaluation process and selection for funding, are outlined in Part 4 of the Call for Proposals.</i>
Feedback 3	2.1.3 Innovation Manager and Key Personnel: Limiting previous experience to three years has the potential to rule out particularly relevant experience on long duration space mission projects. We suggest a longer window for relevant experience. Further, we suggest that in most cases relevant work experience is more important than education experience, and this could be reflected in the assessment of this criterion.

Outcome 3	<i>The definition of recent has been updated to five (5) years in Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection in the Call for Proposals.</i>
Feedback 4	2.1.4.2 Technology Exploitation Plan/market analysis: It may be difficult defining a technology exploitation plan for specifically RCM-related technology development, as at the present time, the government of Canada is the only user and data and commercialization policies have yet to be defined. This makes it difficult to properly assess applicability to a broader market.
Outcome 4	<i>The international marketplace could also be assessed.</i>
Feedback 5	In Annex A, Mandatory and Point-rated Elements, para 2.1.1, when looking at the Evaluation Scale Part A and Part B, the RFP states that “Proposers must achieve a score of at least 15 points ... to be deemed responsive”. For Part A, any business that is under 36 months old cannot be deemed responsive because they only get 2 points, and so the maximum number of point they can get is 12. Therefore, there need not be any distinction between 0-24 months and 25-36 months. The same is true for Part B - number of innovations, as any business that describes less than 5 innovations cannot be responsive, thus the distinction between having 0-2 or 3-4 innovations is unnecessary.
Outcome 5	<i>Part 4 – Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection of the Call for Proposals contains revisions to this evaluation scale.</i>

RFI Question 9	Please describe and provide an example if possible of your pricing model for the services you offer. For example, do you prefer hourly rates, per diem rates, firm prices over the life of the Contract, ability to negotiate option years (price adjustments, etc.)
Feedback 1	It is particularly important that we be able to include option years in the resulting agreement to avoid interruptions in the work. Most of the innovations that we will propose under this DIRP will be multi-year agreements where interruptions in funding can be disruptive.
Outcome 1	<i>Option periods are generally intended for additional work under the scope of the resulting Contract. However, all proposals and potential resultant Contracts may be multiyear.</i> <i>Funding for DIRP contracts will have been established, whether multiyear or not, and therefore there should be no impact or interruptions in funding. That said, some contracts might include milestone/phase authorization (e.g. “go/no go”) decision points</i>
Feedback 2	What has been challenging in our present DIR is the way we have to bill our 50% cost share. Presently, this has to be done on a month by month basis, whereby every month we have to contribute 50% of the invoice cost. However, this is not how the investment will happen in practice. There may be several months in a row where we are able to contribute 100% of the cost of the work (thanks to complementary work that we have on-going in house), and other months where we may not be able to contribute anything. There should be a mechanism put in place to allow for ‘banking’ of contribution costs.

Outcome 2	<i>Providing that progress reports are submitted monthly and in accordance with the resulting Contract, there is no stipulation indicating that invoicing cannot be submitted on another basis (i.e. quarterly).</i>
Feedback 3	If contracts take a long time to get put in place, there should be the ability to back date contributions to the time that the proposal was submitted. We are allowed to do this for proposals submitted to the Atlantic Innovation Fund and to the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada; these are two Federal agencies that require co-investment for any proposal submitted. Therefore, we see no reason why it couldn't also be put in place for DIR.
Outcome 3	<i>Backdating contributions as indicated is not intended under the current Call for Proposals.</i>
Feedback 4	On a previous DIR we were unable to count funding that was not cash-flowed through our company. For example, we have partners that contribute ship time to the project and there is no way for us to count this valuable contribution. This is a real contribution, one that we would have to pay for through the DIR if it wasn't available to us. There should be some way to take these contributions into consideration without the contribution having to flow through our company. For example, this could be achieved via a signed letter from the partner company attributing the value of the contribution so that it can be counted against the 50% cost share.
Outcome 4	<i>DIRP can only reimburse direct costs that are incurred by the contractor including those of its subcontractors/consultants as allowed under the resulting contract; not in-kind contributions.</i>

RFI Question 10	Please describe the research and scientific networks that your company or institution can access to recruit resources (i.e. university graduates, centres of excellence, head hunters) and comment on the use of value proposition and the possible ways to apply it. Should this form part of the evaluation criteria?
Feedback 1	Should value propositions be of interest to this contract, there should be a statement in the CFP regarding its possibility, and this should form part of the evaluation criteria.
Outcome 1	<i>Value propositions do not form part of the Call for Proposals.</i>

RFI Question 11	Please describe research codes of conduct applicable to your company or institution.
Feedback 1	Most respondents have indicated that they follow a business or research code of conduct.
Outcome 1	<i>Canada encourages each Innovator to include their business or research codes of conduct in their proposal.</i>

--	--

Other Questions Raised

Innovators raised other questions in their RFI responses that didn't explicitly fit into the 11 specific RFI questions or were received later in the RFI process. These questions and Canada's responses follow below.

Other Question 1	Can the clauses in Annex C –Sample Contract be amended?
Response 1	<i>The Sample Contract clauses are included for information purposes. The individual contracts are negotiated on a case-by-case basis and terms and conditions may be added, deleted and/or amended accordingly.</i>
Other Question 2	The six Strategic Objectives are described very briefly in the RFI/LOI. Additional information about the requirements of the CAF and DND will help to ensure that a proposed R&D project will address clearly understood operational or scientific needs. Additional information on the requirements is requested, even if it is in a draft or an “unofficial” form. If a DG Space Statement of Requirement (SOR) cannot be provided it is suggested that DG Space provide a presentation on the space based surveillance SOR or participate in 1-on-1 meetings with potential Innovators to discuss potential R&D project ideas.
Response 2	<i>A SOR document is currently under development by DND. The final, approved version is not currently available for distribution. This document will not be available during this CFP.</i>
Other Question 3	<p>The requirement that innovators must be Canadian will discourage participation by foreign companies that are leaders in SAR and AIS technologies. Excluding foreign entities may diminish DRDC's ability to meet the DIRP's primary objective which is to "benefit Canada by supporting the strategic research interests of the CAF and introducing new and innovative technologies to DND" (see RFI/LOI page 2 of 57, Section 2, sentence 3).</p> <p>Restricting innovators to just Canadian entities will result in various unintended negative consequences such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Reduced access to world class R&D expertise. This may affect the operational performance capability of future surveillance systems procured by the CAF & DND; b) Diminished competition. Competition is important for generating the best innovations at competitive prices. Restricting R&D competition will not benefit the CAF or DND in the long term; c) An inability to leverage Space based surveillance R&D work that is underway in Allied nations. International

	<p>participation will help DND to avoid investing scarce resources duplicating R&D work or reinventing technology that may be available from Canada's allies;</p> <p>d) It will stymie the development of international relationships that can result in positive outcomes that include technology transfers to Canadian entities, the development of new supplier relationships and supplier relationships that can open export markets for new Canadian technologies.</p> <p>Recommendation: It is recommended that the Canadian requirement be modified to allow foreign entities to be innovators on this DIRP when they make firm commitments to (1) work with a Canadian partner(s), and (2) perform 50% of the DIRP R&D work in Canada.</p> <p>If the Canadian requirement is modified in this way it will attract foreign participation in the DIRP, this will help to improve the quantity and quality of the projects that are submitted. This will ensure that Canada has access to the best possible R&D.</p>
Response 3	<p><i>To enhance competition and in an effort to be fair, transparent and achieve best value for the Crown, there will be an amendment to the Guide Book that will remove the requirement for the Innovator to be Canadian. An Innovator will be considered compliant as long as at least fifty (50) percent of the work will be performed in Canada.</i></p>
Other Question 4	<p>What is the "Innovators' Guidebook"? Is the Guidebook available today?</p>
Response 4	<p><i>The "Innovators' Guide Book" is the Call for Proposals (CFP) document. The draft Guide Book was included as Attachment 003 to the RFI. The draft Guide Book has been amended as a result of this RFI process.</i></p>
Other Question 5	<p>It is recommended that NATO equivalent security clearances be accepted to ensure technical experts from Allied nations are able to participate.</p>
Response 5	<p><i>For the resulting contracts, the Security Clearances will be determined by Canada and communicated through the Security Requirements Check List (SRCL) and other provisions, should security be required to execute the project. There is no security requirement for the DIRP CFP.</i></p>
Other Question 6	<p>It is requested that a seventh source of funding be added to Form-A which could be entitled "Other R&D Programs". The purpose of this change to Form-A is intended to allow for foreign funding sources (e.g. ESA, Horizon 2020, etc.) to be included as a contribution to the DIRP project.</p>
Response 6	<p><i>Point appreciated. Foreign funding can be included and would not be considered as stacking.</i></p>
Other Question 7	<p>The statement "The Work must be carried out in Canada" implies that 100% of the work must be carried out in Canada. This is inconsistent with other statements in the DIRP RFI which indicate</p>

	that 50% of the work must occur in Canada. The first reference to 50% can be found on page 3 of 57, Section 5, Government of Canada Applicable Policies. Please clarify which percentage of the work must be carried out in Canada; is it 100% or 50%?
Response 7	<i>Point appreciated. At least fifty (50) percent of the work must be performed in Canada. This has been harmonized within the Guide Book.</i>

6. CONCLUSION

Stakeholder feedback has informed Canada of areas of potential concern for some Innovators which resulted in improvement of the procurement process through the implementation of changes to the final Guide Book that will address many of the concerns.

DRDC would like to thank all Innovators who provided responses. The two-way dialogue and information that resulted was invaluable in assisting Canada in finalizing the DIRP procurement strategy.