



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
Science Procurement Directorate/Direction de
l'acquisition de travaux scientifiques
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
11C1, Place du Portage
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet GROUND SEGMENT SOLUT. (MEOSAR PROJ)	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W8474-16ME03/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 022
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8474-16ME03	Date 2016-09-16
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$\$ST-005-29512	
File No. - N° de dossier 005st.W8474-16ME03	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2017-03-31	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Byrnes, Ashley	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 005st
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (873) 469-4453 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
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 22 – This amendment serves to answer questions posed by vendors.

Additional information on the Canadian Content Policy can be found in the Standard Acquisition Clauses and Conditions (SACC) Manual, as well as in the Supply Manual: <https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/supply-manual/section/3/130>

QUESTION	DRAFT DOCUMENT REFERENCE	ANSWER
<p>Q1: Missing Financial data: Canada has not provided the acquisition ceiling cost and the In Service Support (ISS) cost for the MEOSAR Ground System program. The Operation And Maintenance (O&M) budget is not specified which makes it difficult to determine if some of the ISS scope will put pressure on Canada's expected budget.</p>	N/A	<p>The MEOSAR Ground System requirement will be sourced through a competitive process and Canada is not planning to provide an acquisition ceiling cost or an ISS cost.</p>
<p>Q2: Evaluation Criteria: The Industrial and Technological Benefits (ITB) scores and bid evaluation criteria have not yet been provided. Without the evaluation criteria, it is difficult to assess and evaluate the technical capabilities of the various MEOLUT suppliers, identify the gaps, understand the risks and develop the risk mitigation plan.</p>	N/A	<p>There are no ITB requirements associated with this requirement. The draft bid evaluation criteria are now posted on Buy and Sell.</p>

<p>Q3: Task based or sustainable activities definition in ISS Statement of Work (SOW): It is unclear from the SOW which ISS activities are task based and which activities would fall under the core/sustainable work that would require support in the ISS phase. Also, the SOW doesn't specify which requirements are the mandatory and rated requirements for the ISS solution. This Vendor recommends that Canada provides an appendix or a section on all tasking activity to clearly identify the CORE effort.</p>	N/A	<p>Vendors will need to review LOG SOW and ALM-184 which will be provided as reference. Bid Evaluation provides details on mandatory criteria vs rated criteria for ISS.</p>
<p>Q4: Missing Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL): It would be beneficial to industry if Canada provides the list of the Data Item Descriptions (DIDs) and the CDRL documents to assess the MEOSAR ISS requirements and the scope of the work.</p>	N/A	<p>All deliverables are identified in the Statements of Work (SOWs), and include ongoing update of all documents and/or manuals provided.</p>
<p>Q5: Remote Desktop Software: According to section 2.2.4 of CMCC CONOPS, RAdmin Server software CONOPS is used as a conduit to remotely access and use the CMCC IT infrastructure. Would Canada please clarify the Remote desktop Software usage in the MEOSAR project? Would RAdmin Server software be accessible to MEOSAR ISS service providers too?</p>	2.2.4 ConOps	<p>The Remote desktop software will be used for MEOSAR IT systems in the same way it is used on all other SARNET assets. It will be the only authorized method for operators and support to remotely access the systems. For contractor remote support, they will log into the SMMS Citrix portal. The contractor would then use RAdmin to access the MEOSAR IT systems. For the purpose of the bid, the assumption is that SARNOCC will install the software.</p>

<p>Q6: Phase I: For MEOLUT Phase I, integration to the CMCC and transition plan is not well defined and has incomplete information or TBDs in it. Additional information is required to assess the requirements.</p>	<p>ConOps</p>	<p>Phase I is independent of Phase II, is not part of the two Phase II Statements of Work requirements, and is out of scope. No additional information will be provided.</p>
<p>Q7: How will the Monitor And Control (M&C) of each MEOLUT be handled? Will Canada require support for M&C of the MEOLUT and accompanying facilities (HVAC, Diesel Generator, UPS, etc.)?</p>	<p>ConOps</p>	<p>The contractor must provide a solution to meet the requirements. The system must raise alarms, as per the Design Build and Commission (DBAC) SOW. When the contractor is notified of an issue through any applicable means as specified in the ISS SOW, they are responsible to respond. The Remote Operator Interface (ROI) is what is used for the above and will need to be maintained. Yes, Canada will require support for the Monitor & Control of each MEOLUT as noted above. The DND bases will perform the required work related to first line support. To clarify, for the MEOLUT, the ROI is used for M&C and monitored by CMCC/LCMM and vendors. Vendors have access to ROI to evaluate MEOLUT function and performance for Preventative Maintenance (PM) and Corrective Maintenance (CM). Facilities M&C, once built, delivered and accepted, will be the responsibility of the bases/LCMM to maintain (i.e. gas/diesel in generator, HVAC on/off switch to heat/cooling for buildings, light bulbs being changed, grass cutting, snow removal, pest control bait/removal, doors/gates locked, inspections etc.).</p>

Q8: 1.7.1 states that CMCC OCC 600 configuration manual is under development and is expected to be available by 30 Nov 2016. This manual will be important information to review and understand from an ISS perspective.	ConOps section 1.7	This manual is solely used for operator reference for the OCC 600 MCC software. The OCC 600 software is out of scope.
Q9: 2.2.4 Specifies SIT messages to transmit and receive data between C/S entities. Interface description document is not available to completely assess the scope of the work.	ConOps section 2.2.4	As the paragraph clearly states, C/S A.002 clearly defines these. It is the vendor's responsibility to understand the C/S documents which are publicly available.
Q10: 2.7.1 Indicates that command and control is proprietary. Can Canada to clarify how vendors will use this proprietary information to interface with the LUTs?	ConOps Section 2.7	Command and control interfacing with currently installed LUTs and the OCC-600 is out of scope.
Q11: 2.11.1 Alert data from MEOLUT transmitted Subject Indicator Type (SIT) message. Exact configuration is TBD. It is unclear how the Crown believes that the Interface Control Documents (ICD) is specified by the CONOPS? 2.11.2 Command and Control – TBD. Same as above 2.11.3 Calibration data – TBD. Same as above.	ConOps Section 2.11	The Ottawa MEOLUT is out of scope. It is the vendor's responsibility to review the SOWs to understand the scope of the requirements.

Q12: Phase II MEOLUTs to Canadian Beacon Registry Verifier (CBRV) – is this work scoped in the current project or is it the ECPs or a new contract?	ConOps Section 4.1.2 (h)	As stated in the DBAC SOW, the provided MEOLUTs are required to send data to the CBRV server in accordance with the required formats.
Q13: Would the MEOLUTs need to be re-commissioned whenever there is any modification to applicable COSPAS-SARSAT standards and National requirements? A large potential cost driver of ISS is the requirement to meet unknown future COSPAT-SARSAT requirements and potentially have to re-commission the entire system.	ISS SOW	In accordance with the referenced C/S A.0xx (Operational) and T.0xx. (Technical) series of documents, often partial recommissioning is needed, while other times full recommissioning is needed. Which option is chosen depends on the type and criticality of modification as decided by the C/S Council. This is the standard process for the C/S systems and the way the C/S addresses future requirements and vendors need to account for this.
Q14: Requirements for re-commissioning, enhancements and line of maintenance are ambiguous.	ISS SOW	These requirements are embedded in the COSPAS/SARSAT documents that the SOW references and requires the bidder to comply with. The onus is on the bidder to understand the C/S documents and procedures.
Q15: The draft ISS SOW is missing the Integrated Logistics Support (ILS) requirements on sparring strategy, technical publications, etc. for the MEOLUTs, remote terminals etc.	ISS SOW	Based on the design and build of the system provided by the bidder, the ILS (i.e. Recommended Spare Parts List (RSPL), technical manuals and docs for all delivered systems) will be provided by the bidder. The ILS is to be performed and supported by an Electronic Information Exchange (EIE) in accordance with the LOG SOW and ALM 184 as per R&O contracts.

Q16: Clarification required on how “improve performance” is part of core ISS work.	ISS SOW	The vendor community is responsible to ensure the systems are kept current with changing standards and ensuring that changes always improve functional and overall system performance. Improving performance is the standard guideline for COSPAS-SARSAT required upgrades.
Q17: EIE implementation is part of Build contract and should not be included in the ISS phase.	ISS SOW	Noted. The detailed functional requirements may be provided in the DBAC. Final changes will be made before final SOW for RFP.
Q18: There is a significant cost to staff a help desk 24/7 with the level of expertise defined within this SOW. An alternate approach would be defined initial limited help desk support and a requirement for response time by a qualified technician.	ISS SOW/ConOps	The system is used and monitored 24/7 for 365 days a year. Search and rescue is a 24/7 task which means that 24/7 availability is an operational requirement. As such, vendors must meet the requirements as stated in the final RFP documents.
Q19: Could Canada clarify the intent of contractor remote terminal support? Or, contractor is supposed to use the RAdmin Server software application provided by Canada? Does this mean that there is a 24/7 monitoring and the contractor has access to the MEOLUTs status remotely? Re: monitoring and control, it is not clear who is responsible for raising the system alarms?	ConOps	This is the IT system that the contractor will use to access the provided MEOSAR GS systems to provide remote support as required by the SOW. Yes, the system is used and monitored 24/7/365. The system must raise alarms as per the Design Build and Commission SOW. When the contractor is notified of an issue through any applicable means as specified in the ISS SOW, they are responsible to respond.

<p>Q20: Would DND also clarify “conversant with the GS System basic operation and components” from para 6.1.1.3.2. What would be sufficient training to deem “conversant” for technical support specialists?</p>	<p>ISS SOW 6.1.1.3</p>	<p>"Conversant with the GS System basic operation and components": means in depth knowledge of the contractor provided components to a level where they are able to answer any questions on how the system functions and how to conduct any required corrective maintenance on a 24/7 basis. "Sufficient Training": as DND staff are not currently specialists on all potential contractors' equipment, it is the contractor's responsibility to ensure their staff are sufficiently trained to support their provided solution.</p>
<p>Q21: It is unclear how this relates to 6.3.4. If a Firm Fixed Price (FFP) contract, why are we then proposing effort/proposal for Mobile Repair Party (MRP)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st line – DND? • 2nd line deployment – only on TA approval? • 3rd line – FFP of ISS contract? 	<p>ISS SOW 6.6.2</p>	<p>Section 6.6.2 of the ISS SOW does not reference and does not relate to section 6.3.4. As for MRPs, details regarding these are provided in the LOG SOW and ALM 184 for R&O.</p>
<p>Q22: An approved DND task authorization will cause delay in taking action to correct the fault. It is unclear how this task authorization process relates to CORE ISS scope.</p>	<p>ISS SOW section 6</p>	<p>Details are provided further in Section 6.6 relating to Task Authorization and in the LOG SOW and ALM 184 for R&O.</p>

Q23: The requirement to have initial troubleshooting within 30 minutes means not only does contractor have to have 24/7 help desk, but also need to provide the 24/7 support. It will drive the cost higher. This seems to conflict with defined response times in Table 4.	ISS SOW 6.8.5	Correct; 24/7 support is what is required. Table 4 will be corrected and streamlined for the final RFP.
Q24: The contents of ISS SOW Table 4 seem to contradict the “initial response requirement of 30 min” quoted.	ISS SOW Table 4	With respect to the response times, Para 6.8.5 governs the initial response and initial troubleshooting. The detailed investigation and resolution are as per Table 4. As mentioned earlier, Table 4 will be corrected for the final RFP.
Q25: Is preventative maintenance included in the Operational Time Required (OTR)?	ISS SOW section 6	OTR is the number of hours in a calendar month. This is a 24/7 system, so for a 30 day month (i.e. April) the OTR is 720 hours. Downtime (DT) is any downtime for all preventative and corrective maintenance and any failures, and Operational Time (OT) is OTR less the DT.
Q26: Clarification required for understanding how DND network will impact the availability measurement for the GS System	ISS SOW section 6	DND network is not to be confused with "MEOLUT Network". DND Network is the Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) provided IT network for communications between the LUTs and CMCC, and CMCC to other international servers. Typically the availability of the DND network can be considered at 99.7% for the purpose of analysis.

Q27: 99% for EIE may needlessly drive the ISS cost with little to no benefit on MEOSAR operations.	ISS SOW section 6	In the market, vendors that provide similar web based systems offer them at 99.9% or higher levels of service for very competitive rates.
Q28: If DND is conducting 1st line of maintenance then it is not clear who is responsible for costing spares.	ISS SOW section 6	As per LOG SOW and ALM-184, the vendor is responsible to provide RSPL recommendations which will be approved by the LCMM.
Q29: Mean Time Between Failure (MTBF) and Mean Time to Repair (MTTR), is a static property of the equipment acquired. It would be more appropriate in the acquisition SOW.	ISS SOW section 6	MTBF and MTTR are to be provided under the build SOW. However, the nature of an "update" as per C/S requirements, and associated changes to the C/S docs, require that these properties are included under the ISS in order for the defined values to be accurate through the life of the system.

<p>Q30: Request that Canada states the requirements on when contractor is responsible for all future commissioning to enable the contractors to evaluate the scope of work in re-commissioning. Any change which is significant and approved by TA that requires re-commissioning should be an Engineering Change Proposal (ECP).</p>	<p>ISS SOW section 6</p>	<p>The requirement to re-commission after any major or critical software or hardware change is mandated by the C/S community, after any decision by the C/S Council to do such re-commissioning, and as such estimates to meet this must be included in the ISS bidder proposal.</p> <p>As mentioned in earlier responses, these requirements and procedures are embedded in the COSPAS/SARSAT documents that the SOW references and requires the bidder to comply with. The onus is on the bidder to understand the C/S documents and procedures.</p>
<p>Q31: With respect to Table 1, please confirm that the In-Service-Support (ISS) Interim Period and Steady State period are within the Acquisition contract, while ISS Option 1 (or y) are covered by another contract.</p>	<p>ISS SOW</p>	<p>Contract Award implies that the awardee will be responsible for both the Design, Build and Commission (DBAC), and ISS SOWs. Once the first MEOLUT has passed its testing and is accepted by DND for operational use, then the initial ISS contractual period will commence. After the initial ISS period, optional periods of equivalent duration may be exercised at Canada's discretion under the same terms and conditions. These optional periods will be a part of the Contractor's bid and are to be evaluated.</p>

<p>Q32: In the past, we have requested GFI on the CMCC OCC 600. We have been told that this information was proprietary and would not be released pre- or post-contract award. Can Canada please clarify how a respondent is to effectively design and cost an interface to this system without any technical interface documents. In addition, the absence of this technical information creates an unfair competitive advantage for the OEM of the OCC 600.</p>	<p>ConOps</p>	<p>Contractors only need to have the Interface Control Document to interface with the OCC 600. These are very clearly spelled out in the CMCC ConOps as "... All alert data will use the appropriate C/S A.002 Cospas-Sarsat Mission Control Centres Standard Interface Description (SID) defined message. LUT status, warning, and alarm messages will be sent using a SIT 915 to help draw the operator's attention to any potential MEOLUT issues." For example, this means that an unlocated alert would be sent via a properly formatted SIT 142 IAW A.002. All specifications are an open standard and it is the vendor's responsibility to know the C/S documents in order to meet the requirements.</p>
<p>Q33: Does this indicate that the Contractor will become the SARNOCC?</p>	<p>ISS SOW</p>	<p>No. The Contractor is not and will not become SARNOCC.</p>

<p>Q34: Please provide further details on staffing level and capabilities at SARNOCC. For example, in order to effectively assess the skillsets and expertise required, it would be helpful if Canada could provide the rank and MOSIDs for the current SARNOCC team.</p>	<p>ConOps Section 2.2.3</p>	<p>As the vendor is required to give full support to all equipment delivered and installed at Trenton and Belleville, aside from SARNOCC providing access to vendor equipment, SARNOCC capabilities have no direct impact on this contract. They will ensure that, in accordance with the SOW, there is sufficient:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. rack space; b. power; c. network connections; and d. environmental controls (ie. air conditioning and heating in secured building).
<p>Q35: To assist in estimating storage requirements, can Canada please indicate what data type and quantity will be required to be stored for seven years. In addition, can the Contractor choose the location of the archived data?</p>	<p>DBAC Section 6.2.16.2</p>	<p>No, all data and location is clearly stated in section 6.2.15. Total storage requirements must be calculated by the vendor.</p>
<p>Q36: How will the data from the weather sensor (especially wind) be integrated? The hardware solution is relatively straightforward, but will require software integration. The format for that will need to be identified.</p>	<p>DBAC</p>	<p>Weather data must be made available to the CMCC through the vendor provided ROI. The format and method in which this is accomplished is at the vendor's discretion.</p>

Q37: Please confirm that travel for MEOLUT installation, as pertaining to the ACQ SOW will be authorized via DND 626 and therefore reimbursable.	DBAC	Travel costs related to MEOLUT installation should be included in the firm fixed price element of their proposal and will not be on a cost reimbursable basis.
Q38: Our understanding is that the commissioning process will be a shared responsibility between Canada and the contractor. In addition, the SOW identifies a 6-month period for commissioning from time of testing. It is recommended that Canada clearly delineate commissioning responsibilities that will be assigned to the contractor per C/S T.020.	DBAC	The vendor is responsible for all commissioning testing as per T.020. Canada reviews the test data and reports provided by the vendor. If accepted by Canada, the reports are then submitted by Canada to the C/S Secretariat for review by the C/S Joint Committee and approval by C/S Council. This is standard Cospas-Sarsat process and it is the vendor's responsibility to know the C/S commissioning procedures and required documentation process.
Q39: Can Canada specify the Microsoft Data Format or can the Contractor decide?	DBAC 6.1.6.6.	Canada will specify versions for RFP and post contract award. Current preferred version is Microsoft Office 2010
Q40: Is a searchable pdf an acceptable form for the IETM?	DBAC 7.1.1	The preference is to have documents in Word and in searchable pdf (but not scanned into a pdf).

Q41: Scope Exclusions do not exclude communication or other lines at system demarcation (Communication, Alarm, Telecommunications). Does this mean that these systems would be included in the scope of the requirement?	ISS SOW 3.10	Everything from the demarcation point to the MEOLUT site is the vendor's responsibility. For CMCC sites, refer to Q19.
Q42: Can equivalent Military training and experience be considered for prerequisites?	ISS SOW	Vendor must comply with the experience requirements clearly stated on the SOW. Related experience can be provided as part of the bidders response.
Q43: SOW indicates that RAdmin software must be used. Please provide specifications, impact on computer load, memory, etc. Please confirm that RAdmin runs on Windows and confirm the version. 2.2.4: Please confirm that the user/administrator manuals for the Remote Desktop Software (RAdmin) will be provided as Government Furnished Information.	DBAC/CON OPS	Confirmed for both. This is a commercial off the shelf software package. Post contract award, versions to be used and access to the software through DND will be coordinated. Details for Radmin and its requirements are available from the manufacturer of the software: http://support.radmin.com/index.php?Knowledgebase/Article/View/103/9/Radmin-3.x-System-Requirements .
Q44: Can refresher training be in the form of CBT?	ISS SOW 6.7.3	Yes, System Refresher Training can be in the form of computer-based training (CBT).
Q45: Is the Technical Authority the Life-Cycle Material Manager or a designated officer at Canadian Mission Control Centre for the resolution of trouble tickets?	ISS SOW 6.8.11	The Technical Authority will be specified in the final RFP.

Q46: Please specify the number of hard copies.	ISS SOW 7.1.3.1	Number of hard copies will be specified in the final RFP.
--	-----------------	---