



Summary of Feedback and Outcomes
Request for Information No.
W7714-16ADSA/B
All Domain Situational Awareness (ADSA) Program



Table of Contents

1. Introduction
 2. Requirement
 3. Stakeholder Engagement Process
 4. General Overview of the Stakeholder Engagement Process Feedback
 5. Significant change to the upcoming ADSA Program CFP
 6. Summary of Feedback and Outcomes
 7. Conclusion
- Annex A – Questions and Answers
- Annex B – List of Participating Organizations

1. Introduction

This document provides the feedback and outcomes from the Stakeholder Engagement Process, including the Stakeholder Day and one-on-one meetings, related to the Request for Information (RFI) for the All Domain Situational Awareness (ADSA) Program.

The Stakeholder Engagement Process solicited feedback on the upcoming Call for Proposals (CFP), which is an open invitation to government, industry and academia to submit proposals for projects that offer innovative solutions to address identified Science and Technology (S&T) Challenges.

2. Requirement

For the ADSA Program, DRDC is seeking proposals to identify, assess and validate technologies in support of situational awareness across air, maritime surface and sub-surface domains, particularly in the North, with a focus on the following areas:

1. Strategic surveillance of airborne traffic and aerospace warning;
2. Awareness of maritime traffic in Canadian approaches and Arctic littoral regions;
3. Awareness of sub-surface activity approaching or in Canada's North; and
4. Analysis of sensor mixes and information integration and sharing for all domain awareness to enable detection of modern threats beyond the threshold of the current systems.

The objective across the three identified domains (air, maritime surface and sub-surface) is to deliver assessments and advice on the performance and viability of existing and future concepts, technologies and methodologies that could contribute to improved awareness in these domains. The concepts and technology solutions to be considered for the Arctic must be suitable to a remote setting subject to limited power sources, limited access and re-supply, harsh weather, limited communications and vulnerability to capture.

3. Stakeholder Engagement Process

Stakeholder Engagement Period	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Posting of RFI: June 22, 2016.• Responses to RFI requested: July 22, 2016.
Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Forty-six (46) organizations participated in the Engagement Process, please refer to Annex B, List of Participating Organizations.• Thirty-six (36) organizations provided written responses to the RFI.• Twenty-four (24) organizations participated in one-on-one meetings.

4. General Overview of the Stakeholder Engagement Process Feedback

The consultative process provided participating stakeholders with an opportunity to contribute to the procurement process by providing comments, questions and recommendations for improvement of the draft CFP as well as seeking clarification on technical issues.

Overall, most stakeholders indicated that the draft CFP was clear and not restrictive and there was consistency in the comments received. There were some clarifications requested and some suggestions for improvement.

This document details the feedback received during the Stakeholder Engagement Process and the outcomes on the draft CFP. In Article 6 (below), Canada has provided thematic responses to the feedback received from stakeholders to the extent possible. Questions received that were not responded to thematically are provided in Annex A, Questions and Answers.

5. Significant change to the upcoming ADSA Program CFP

Since engaging Industry, Canada has listened and considered the feedback received and has determined a change is necessitated. This is due in part to some of the comments received such as:

- Streamlining the process;
- Allowing Industry an opportunity to present ideas to Canada to determine if they fall within the ADSA S&T Challenges prior to submitting a full proposal;
- Consider reducing/revising the mandatory and point-rated evaluation criteria

As a result, Canada will be issuing a joint Call for Proposals (CFPs) consisting of both the ADSA and CSS Programs to streamline the number of CFPs issued for various programs. Canada will harmonize the terms, conditions and evaluation criteria to ensure consistency where possible. This could change some of the outcomes listed herein. Canada will also allow suppliers an opportunity to present their ideas to Canada to determine if their ideas are within the scope of the S&T Challenges prior to submitting a full proposal. This will assist suppliers in reducing proposal preparation costs, time and effort.

Additionally, Canada will also post a Notice on Buy and Sell, sometime late September/October of its upcoming Request for Information regarding the joint CFP.

6. Summary of Feedback and Outcomes on the ADSA Program

The following represents questions posed in the RFI and the resulting responses from stakeholders provided in written format and in one-on-one meetings. Administrative questions are not included.

SECTION 1 – Administrative Requirement Summary	
SECTION 2 – Requirement	
2.1	<i>Please provide a statement regarding your capability to meet the requirements.</i>
Outcome	Generally, stakeholders indicated they were able to meet the requirements. Some stakeholders requested feedback on the elements detailed below.

2.2	<i>Are any aspects of the draft Call for Proposals unclear?</i>
<i>Respondents</i>	<p>Stakeholders requested clarification of various aspects of the draft CFP, as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. S&T Challenges: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stakeholders requested that Canada clarify and potentially prioritize its intent among the various project types. b. The draft CFP identifies five (5) project types with Technology Readiness Levels (TRLs) ranging from 1-9, however, stakeholders felt wording of the S&T Challenges seemed focused on studies and concepts. Stakeholders requested the wording be clarified if DRDC intends to accept other project types, such as Technology Demonstrations/Pilots. 2. Stakeholders requested clarification of the purpose and intent of the ADSA Program. 3. Stakeholders requested clarification on the total funding available and the duration of the ADSA Program. 4. Stakeholders requested clarification on how project types can be linked, for example if the work starts as a proof of concept, can it proceed to a technology demonstration? 5. Stakeholders requested clarification on the number of proposals that could be submitted. 6. Stakeholders requested clarification on the number of S&T Challenges that could be addressed in a proposal, how to address secondary S&T Challenges and what consideration would be given to a proposal that addressed multiple S&T Challenges. 7. Stakeholders requested clarification on the Financial Proposal, including how it will be evaluated, how to show proposals spanning multiple project types and application of overhead costs. 8. Stakeholders requested clarification on whether there are any stacking limits for funding under the ADSA Program CFP.
<i>Outcome</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. S&T Challenges: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The S&T Challenges are intended to be high-level and broad to invite innovative solutions to address knowledge and capability gaps. Bidders must understand the S&T Challenge (i.e. the gap that is not being addressed by current methods/practices) and apply S&T approaches to arrive at a solution that is presented in their proposal. Bidders are invited to propose their ideas, concepts and/or solutions to the identified S&T Challenges. Where an illustrative list is provided within an S&T Challenge, proposals may address one parameter of the list. Additionally, a proposal or solution does not need to address all four areas of S&T research identified in Annex B of the draft CFP. The S&T Challenges are not prioritized. <p>Questions and answers with respect to specific S&T Challenges are provided Annex A, "Questions and Answers".</p>

	<p>b. DRDC is looking for proposals in all five (5) project types identified, with TRLs ranging from 1 - 9. The S&T Challenges were drafted in an open manner and there is no preferred project type or TRL level. DRDC wishes to receive proposals in all project type categories.</p> <p>2. The purpose of the ADSA Program is to inform Canada of innovative solutions and capabilities to solve S&T Challenges in the Arctic. The results of the Work may be shared with the North American Aerospace Defence Command (NORAD), and could assist in informing Canada on future capital projects. There are no capital projects currently planned. The ADSA Program will end March 31, 2020. At the end of the Program DRDC hopes to have identified possible future capabilities for surveillance and to have de-risked the process of any future acquisitions to replace the North Warning System.</p> <p>3. The ADSA Program has a total budget of \$133M. Some of these funds are spent internally or allocated to other procurement initiatives. Up to \$82 million (CAD, Applicable Taxes included) has been allocated for the ADSA Program S&T Challenges in the upcoming joint CFP. The total joint CFP will be up to \$99M and will be the combined totals of the ADSA Program and the Canadian Safety and Security Program (CSSP) S&T Challenges. This is not a guarantee that the full amount will be spent.</p> <p>Canada would like to start issuing contracts against the proposed joint CFP for the ADSA Program around April 2017, to allow Contractors approximately 36 months to perform the Work.</p> <p>4. Bidders may submit a proposal that spans multiple project types. In these circumstances a go/no-go provision will be included in the contract, at Canada's discretion, to proceed to the next phase of the project.</p> <p>It is understood that resulting contracts and projects might be at varying states of maturity by the end of the 36 months period of work. If DRDC is interested in pursuing a project beyond this CFP process, another procurement process will be initiated. Canada's standard procurement policies and procedures will apply.</p> <p>5. There is no maximum on the number of proposals a bidder can submit or participate in (as a sub-contractor). If a bidder has multiple independent concepts/solutions/technologies, whether complementary or not, they can receive one (1) contract per concept/solution/technology.</p> <p>All proposals will be evaluated independently against the primary S&T Challenge identified. However, if multiple proposals are accepted into the Pool of Pre-qualified Proposals and Canada views that there is overlap between them, Canada may ask the Bidder of each overlapping proposal to combine them OR Canada may only choose to fund only one of the proposals.</p> <p>6. A proposal must align with one (1) S&T Challenge. It is the Bidder's responsibility to identify and describe the alignment with that Challenge. Additional S&T Challenges can be addressed in the proposal; however, the mandatory and point rated technical evaluation will be based on the primary S&T Challenge identified. The Proposal Selection Committee (PSC) considers the distribution of investments across the S&T Challenges including value for money, thus a proposal that addresses multiple S&T Challenges may be a greater priority for DRDC than a proposal that addresses one S&T Challenge.</p>
--	--

	<p>7. Canada's intention is to maintain the format of the Financial Proposal Presentation Sheet and limit the details at proposal submission to the information currently requested therein.</p> <p>Bidders should be aware that they will be required to provide a fully justified price breakdown for each element during contract negotiation.</p> <p>If a bidder's proposal spans more than one project type, bidders are required to provide additional information for each project type and must fill out separate submission questions for each project type covered by the proposal. The Contract will contain a go/no-go provision between project types so it is important to separate the costs by providing a separate Financial Proposal Presentation Sheet for each project type.</p> <p>8. The ADSA Program CFP is not a transfer payment program, therefore stacking limits do not apply. The ADSA Program CFP is subject to the requirements of the Treasury Board <i>Contracting Policy</i>.</p>
<p>2.3</p>	<p><i>Is the current draft CFP unduly restrictive?</i></p>
<p><i>Respondents</i></p>	<p>There were two re-occurring themes in stakeholders comments regarding the restrictiveness of the CFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Funding: Stakeholders commented on the maximum funding available for a contract and expressed concern that the maximum limit of \$3M was restrictive, particularly for projects including Technology Pilots and Demonstrations. 2. Co-Investment Criteria: Stakeholders questioned the purpose of the co-investment criteria and identified it as being unduly restrictive, especially for small and medium enterprises and universities. Some stakeholders found this criteria unfair as some of the research proposed may only be applicable to Canadian defence uses and there would be no opportunity for the Contractor to recoup their investment.
<p><i>Outcome</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Funding: The \$3M proposal limit was included in the draft CFP because of internal government policies, where contracts valued over \$3M could take significantly longer to approve, reducing the 36 months for Contractors to perform their Work. Canada is looking at options to have the \$3M limit increased. 2. Co-investment is seen as an indication of a bidder's willingness to share risks in the development of solutions as well as an indicator for future sustainability of resulting successful solutions. Co-investment criteria have been broken down to in-kind and cash contributions to allow bidders to leverage their existing resources and capabilities. The co-investment score was designed such that even if bidders have no co-investment they could still have a compliant proposal. That being said, Canada is reviewing the requirement for a co-investment contribution and how it will be considered in the evaluation.

2.4	<i>Please state your preference of a two stage proposal submission process where under Stage 1, suppliers submit a Synopsis Proposal, then under Stage 2, compliant suppliers submit a full proposal; or a 1-stage proposal submission process where suppliers only submit one full proposal.</i>
<i>Respondents</i>	<p>The majority of stakeholders stated a preference for a two stage proposal submission process. The main reason is that stakeholders put much more time and effort into a Full Proposal than a Synopsis Proposal. Stakeholders also want feedback from DRDC about whether their proposal ideas are feasible and of interest to DRDC before expending the time and effort involved with a Full Proposal. Some stakeholders stated they had several ideas applicable to the ADSA Program, but did not have the time, funds or manpower to submit full proposals for all ideas. Receiving feedback and suggestions for improvement from DRDC would produce higher quality proposals from stakeholders.</p> <p>The time required to submit a Synopsis Proposal was identified from some stakeholders as approximately 2 – 3 weeks, and the time required to submit a Full Proposal was identified as 4 – 6 weeks.</p>
<i>Outcome</i>	<p>Canada is considering offering one-on-one meetings during the RFI process for the joint CFP where Bidders' ideas can be submitted and discussed. Canada would only provide feedback to advise if the idea presented aligns to the ADSA S&T Challenges. This is intended to replace the proposed two-stage proposal submission process and would be followed by a more streamlined one-stage full proposal submission and evaluation process.</p>

SECTION 3: Evaluation and Basis of Selection	
3.1	<i>Is it clear how Canada proposes to evaluate the proposals?</i>
<i>Respondents</i>	<p>Generally stakeholders felt it was clear how Canada would evaluate proposals. Some stakeholders requested feedback on the elements detailed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarification was requested on the weighting and point-scores for the evaluation criteria. 2. Information about evaluators was requested. 3. Clarification was requested about how proposals from industry and academia would be evaluated against each other. 4. Comments were received about a conflict between the scoring of innovation, which would have a higher risk, and risk management.
<i>Outcome</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The weighting and point scores of each evaluation criterion will be clarified for the final joint CFP document. 2. Evaluators are Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) in the area relevant to the S&T Challenge. The evaluators will most likely be from DRDC and other federal,

	<p>provincial, territorial and municipal public sector entities. They will be selected based on their expertise. If required, SMEs may be sought from third parties, including S&T experts from allied nations, academia or private sector. All evaluators are required to sign a non-disclosure agreement and conflict of interest certification wherein any real or perceived conflicts of interest must be disclosed.</p> <p>3. In accordance with the <i>Agreement on Internal Trade</i> and the <i>Treasury Board Contracting Policy</i>, all suppliers are to be treated fairly and equally in federal government procurements. Therefore, there will be no distinction between Industry and Academia for evaluating proposals.</p> <p>Canada intends to simplify and reduce the evaluation criteria in the joint CFP with the intent of making the criteria more relevant to each project type, and applicable to all types of suppliers.</p> <p>4. Point allocation will be reviewed.</p>
<p>3.2</p>	<p><i>Does the Basis of Selection seem fair and reasonable?</i></p>
<p>Respondents</p>	<p>Generally, stakeholders felt that the basis of selection was fair and reasonable; however, clarification was requested on elements as detailed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Distribution of Investments Across all S&T Challenges: Stakeholders requested clarification on the number of contracts that would be awarded under each S&T Challenge. 2. Proposal Selection Committee (PSC) and Steering Committee (SC): Stakeholders requested clarification regarding the considerations of the PSC and SC when selecting proposals in the Pool of Pre-Qualified proposals for funding.
<p>Outcome</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Distribution of investments across all S&T Challenges: There is no pre-defined limit to the number of contracts that may be awarded under each S&T Challenge. <p>Canada aims to ensure there is a prioritized distribution of investments across all S&T Challenges; however, the number of proposals selected across the S&T Challenges will depend upon the responsive proposals received, the types of projects proposed, the funding requested, and the other factors considered by the PSC. For example, 1) if no responsive proposals are received in one S&T Challenge, no proposals will be selected for that S&T Challenge; and 2) if only one responsive proposal is received in a specific S&T Challenge, it does not by default receive a high prioritization or any prioritization for funding.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Proposal Selection Committee (PSC) and Steering Committee (SC): <p>The proposed solution to the S&T Challenge is the most important factor and the main driver in the selection of proposals for funding; however, other criteria will be considered and will be identified in the joint CFP.</p> <p>Though the point-rated evaluation score could be a consideration, proposals will not be selected in a top down manner based on their scores. As the S&T Challenges are high-level and broad, proposals will be both qualitatively and quantitatively different. The intent is to distribute the funding for the joint CFP according to the criteria detailed therein. A high score does not guarantee selection from pool.</p>

	<p>In the rare instance where Canada receives identical proposals, the PSC may differentiate between them based on the other criteria that will be identified in the joint CFP. Also, Canada may at its discretion approach the Bidders of similar proposals and recommend that they combine resources and efforts.</p>
3.3	<i>Provide any suggestions that, in your opinion, could improve the evaluation and proposal selection methodology and criteria.</i>
Respondents	<p>Stakeholders provided the following suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some stakeholders requested removal of the word limit for evaluation criteria responses. 2. Several stakeholders suggested it may be beneficial to have discussions between Canada and the Bidders selected for contract negotiations. Canada can better assess the work being proposed and Bidders can ensure Canada receives the best possible solution. Written proposals may have holes or gaps that can be filled in through discussion. 3. A suggestion was made to add a point-rated criteria for a Principal Investigator for Studies, as this labour category is just as relevant as the Project Manager. 4. Some stakeholders suggested awarding points for a higher level of Canadian Content. 5. A suggestion was made to consider awarding points for the historical track record of the Bidder of product/service delivery in logistically challenged environments, as this would provide a lesser risk to Canadian operational requirements. 6. Some stakeholders suggested that consideration should be given to evaluation of a bidder's partners.
Outcome	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Canada expects to receive many proposals in response to the joint CFP. In order to complete the evaluation within our proposed schedule, with the intent to issue contracts starting April 2017, Canada needs to limit the length of the proposals. Bidders should focus their proposals to specifically address the evaluation criteria listed in the joint CFP. Canada may consider increasing the word limit for some sections. 2. Discussions will be held between the Bidder and Canada at the time of contract negotiation for selected proposals. 3. The Principal Investigator is to be included as part of the Key Team Members evaluation. Additionally, the Principal Investigator can be identified as the Project Manager if they meet the experience requirements. 4. Canadian Content may be considered as part of the selection from the Pre-Qualified Pool. Canada is reviewing the Canadian Content requirements to be included in the joint CFP. 5. Experience in logistically challenged environments is captured in the evaluation of the team members' prior experience and expertise.

	<p>6. It is not a requirement for a bidder to have project partners in order to address ADSA S&T Challenges. If a bidder does have project partners (either as subcontractors or as a joint venture), and the partners form part of the Project Team, they will be evaluated in accordance with the Project Team evaluation criteria.</p>
3.4	<i>Please provide feedback on the mandatory and point rated evaluation criteria that are described in the draft Call for Proposals. In your opinion, is each of the criteria appropriate given the work described?</i>
Respondents	<p>Generally stakeholders felt that the mandatory and point-rated evaluation criteria were attainable; however, clarification was requested on various elements as detailed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appropriateness of Criteria: Stakeholders suggested that some criteria may not be appropriate for all project types. For example, some stakeholders questioned how TRLs should be gauged for studies. 2. Co-Investment Contribution: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stakeholders were unclear whether it was mandatory to provide a co-investment. b. Some stakeholders suggested providing points for lower levels of co-investment. Currently a minimum of 25% co-investment is required to receive points. Some bidders may only be able to provide 10%.
Outcome	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appropriateness of Criteria: Canada will review and revise the evaluation criteria to ensure that criteria are appropriate for each project type. TRLs are not applicable to studies. 2. Co-Investment Contribution: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Canada is reviewing the requirement for a co-investment contribution and how it will be considered in the evaluation. That said, the point rated criterion was drafted deliberately in a manner to incentivize Bidders to give co-investments. Canada is expecting different ranges of co-investment contribution. b. Canada's intention is to adjust the scoring matrix based on feedback.
3.5	<i>Would you be open for recommendation from DRDC to combine your bid with that of another bidder following the Synopsis Proposal stage for a more comprehensive Full Proposal?</i>
Respondents	<p>Stakeholders were open to the idea of DRDC recommending combining their bid with that of another bidder provided that no confidential or proprietary information was shared, and that it wouldn't be a mandatory requirement at the Full Proposal stage for the bids to be combined.</p>
Outcome	<p>Only the name and contact information of the other bidder would be provided.</p>

	<p>It is the Bidder's discretion whether they partner with another bidder.</p> <p>If two or more proposals are submitted with similar projects proposed, DRDC may not extend the offer to each bidder to partner and may instead select only one proposal for contract negotiations.</p>
--	--

SECTION 4: Other	
4.1	<i>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).</i>
	Generally, stakeholders indicated they were able to recruit resources. Canada can provide information on available networking processes. Please see science.gc.ca for information on Communities of Practice or contact the Contracting Authority for further information.
4.2	<i>Is the 50% Canadian Content requirement reasonable (as opposed to the standard 80%)?</i>
Respondents	Responses were very mixed. Of the Stakeholders that answered this question, approximately 62% preferred 50% Canadian Content; and 28% preferred 80% Canadian Content. Others provided different responses such as no Canadian Content limit.
Outcome	See 4.3 below.
4.3	<i>Should Canada Solely Limit Canadian content to 50% for all proposals? Or should Canadian Content be Conditionally Limited (also at 50%) within each individual S&T Challenge?</i>
Respondents	Again, responses were mixed. Of the Stakeholders that answered this question approximately 50% preferred conditionally limited Canadian Content within each S&T Challenge; 50% preferred solely limited Canadian Content overall for all S&T Challenges.
Outcome	Canada is reviewing the Canadian Content requirements to be included in the joint CFP.
4.4	<i>Please identify any other issues, concerns, recommendations not addressed above.</i>
Respondents	Stakeholders identified the following additional feedback for consideration:

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regarding the draft CFP, Part 4.9.3, Contract Negotiations, a stakeholder questioned the four month period to issue a contract, starting from date of acceptance into the Pool of Pre-Qualified Proposals. It was unclear how much time would be allocated from the four month period to the process between acceptance into the Pool of Pre-Qualified Proposals and start of contract negotiations. 2. A stakeholder requested additional details for the contract negotiation phase, including, what types of basis of payments and which intellectual property provisions would apply to resulting contracts. 3. A stakeholder suggested a bid validity period of less than 12 months. 4. A stakeholder asked if there was flexibility to negotiate the contract terms and conditions.
<p>Outcome</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Canada intends to clarify the wording in the joint CFP to make it clear the four (4) month period starts from date of first contact with the PWGSC Contracting Authority to start contract negotiations. 2. Canada prefers firm price contracts, but ceiling price contracts are also possible. If the proposal is selected the Bidder will enter contract negotiations with Canada wherein Canada will request price support including a detailed price breakdown of the financial proposal. Canada's default position is for the Contractor to own the Intellectual Property (IP), and Canada would retain a licence to the IP. Only in exceptional circumstances would Canada own the IP. These circumstances would be in accordance Canada's <i>Policy on Title to Intellectual Property Arising under Crown Procurement Contracts</i>. This policy can be viewed at the following site: http://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/068.nsf/eng/00005.html It is Canada's intention to incorporate the General Conditions for Research and Development (SACC ID 2040) into all resultant Contracts; these terms and conditions include ownership and licenses for Intellectual Property. 3. Depending on the number of proposals received, it may take several months for proposal evaluation, development of the Pool of Pre-Qualified Proposals, and PSC & SC selection. Defining the Statement of Work and contract negotiations may also take a few months. As a result, proposals need to remain valid. Bidders can request to withdraw their proposals at any point prior to contract award. 4. As the exact nature of the Work is unknown until a proposal is selected, Canada cannot predict in advance (at the joint CFP stage) exactly which clauses and conditions would apply to a contract. Therefore, bidders are not requested to accept all contract clauses and conditions at the proposal submission stage. Instead, bidders are requested to acknowledge they have read and understand all clauses and conditions. Therefore, there is some room for negotiation of the contract clauses. However, if an agreement cannot be reached between Canada and the Bidder, the proposal may be set aside and another proposal may be selected from the Pool of Pre-qualified proposals as per outcome 4.4.1 above.

7. Conclusion

The Stakeholder Engagement Process was a valuable contribution to Canada in informing of potential areas of concern, and clarifying and improving information provided for a future joint CFP. The procurement process will be improved by implementing some changes in the final joint CFP that will address the key concerns.

PSPC and DRDC would like to thank all stakeholders who participated either by attending Stakeholder Day, engaging in one-on-one meetings, or providing written responses to the RFI. The dialogue and information that resulted is invaluable in assisting Canada to develop a future joint CFP.

**ANNEX A
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

PART 1 - GENERAL

Q. Can a bidder be a prime contractor on one proposal and also a sub-contractor on another?

A. Yes.

Q. If the Bidder's subsidiary company was to do some of the work, how would that be shown in the contract?

A. The subsidiary would be a sub-contractor.

Q. What is the proposed procurement schedule for the ADSA CFP?

A. We anticipate the joint CFP to be issued fall 2016, with contracts starting spring 2017.

Q. How will continuity of the project be realized following the ADSA contract?

A. If DRDC is interested in continuing the Work performed under an ADSA contract another procurement process will be initiated. Where proposals and resulting contracts span multiple project types, continuity could be realized through the use of go/no go provisions in between project types.

Q. What are the roadmap and timelines beyond March 2020? How can we ensure to keep R&D valid?

A. There is no guarantee of funding from Canada beyond March 2020. Beyond 2020, funds for successful and promising projects that are deemed to merit further investment by DRDC may come from another program or from existing DRDC funding envelopes subject to the Treasury Board Contracting Policy.

Q. Is DRDC planning a future CFP for ADSA?

A. Depending on the outcome of the first joint CFP, there may be a second CFP for ADSA.

Q. By participating in the ADSA CFP, will bidders be excluded from future procurements?

A. Generally no, the below clause regarding conflict of interest applies to this procurement:

Conflict of Interest

The Work described herein and the deliverable items under any resulting Contract specifically exclude the development of any statement of work, evaluation criteria or any document related to a bid solicitation. The Contractor, its subcontractor(s) or any of their agent(s) directly or indirectly involved in the performance of the Work and/or in the production of the deliverables under any resulting Contract will not be precluded from bidding on any potential future bid solicitation related to the production or exploitation of any concept or prototype developed or delivered under any resulting Contract.

Q. Can bidders submit a proposal for work in an early stage TRL, and submit a proposal to further the work in a future CFP?

A. If there is a future CFP then this is a possibility. However, Bidders may submit proposals that span multiple project types covering the development from an early to a higher TRL.

Q. Could you clarify how collaboration will be formed between DRDC and the Bidder?

A. The arrangement between Canada and the Bidder is a contractual arrangement. The Contractor will perform the work as specified in the Contract and Canada will inspect and accept the Work.

Q. Is a Lead Federal Government Department required as a Partner for the ADSA Program.

A. No.

Q. Would DRDC organize collaboration with other federal government departments if they could be an end user?

A. DRDC is in contact with other federal government departments regarding the ADSA Program. If DRDC believes another federal government department could be an end user for a technology, DRDC may share the completed contract work with another government department.

Q. Can the process for federal government departments submitting bids be clarified?

A. Federal government departments may submit a bid in accordance with the draft CFP. Instead of receiving a contract a Memorandum of Understanding will be put in place.

Q. Does the US government have a role in ADSA?

A. DRDC may share information stemming from ADSA contracts with US government departments and agencies

Q. Is there a process in place to communicate with DRDC to know which ideas would form the best proposal?

A. Bidders should submit this information during the extended RFI period, and DRDC will discuss the information during one-on-one sessions. Please note that this does not guarantee a successful bid, and such decisions can only be made after the evaluation of the proposals.

Q. Will the Bidder get a chance to support the new technology?

A. This is beyond the scope of the ADSA Program. If required, a new procurement process will be initiated for follow-on work.

Q. If an individual is based in the United States, would that be considered foreign content?

A. Information on how to determine Canadian Content can be found at the following sites:
<https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual/5/A/A3050T/3>
<https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/supply-manual/annex/3/6>

Q. What information is required with respect to off-ramps of go/no-go points?

A. A proposal should demonstrate what considerations are in place for a project to end or adjust its path throughout its lifecycle. Key milestones and deliverables should be identified and linked to decision points on whether to proceed or end a project.

Q. If the proposed Work requires access to government data will this be provided?

A. Yes, DRDC will consider providing access to government data if possible.

Q. Where can we find information on previously funded projects?

A. DRDC will consider providing access to information on existing unclassified ADSA relevant projects.

PART 2 - REQUIREMENT / S&T CHALLENGES

Q. Are bidders expected to get through all TRL stages by the end of the 36 month ADSA Program timeline?

A. No. Bidders may choose to work within one project type or span multiple project types. Bidders do not need to complete the contract as a Technology Demonstration.

Q. For certain project types (e.g. Technology Demonstrator & Technology Pilot) where a physical project installation is required in the Arctic region, will DRDC define the available work sites, available infrastructure for use, Arctic work months and expected operational period for any installation?

A. Yes, DRDC will identify available work sites and help provide access to site infrastructure. For operational proposes, demonstrations and pilots should be performed on these work sites and in the summer months, and must be no later than summer of 2019.

Q. Does DRDC have additional interests other than those specified in the deck presented at the Stakeholder Day?

A. Yes, the table on page 4 of the deck were only examples of high level deliverables. The joint CFP is being presented with very broad S&T Challenges to allow bidders to propose their own ideas and solutions, and is deliberately not being prescriptive on specific solution requirements.

Q. Is there a link to Polar Epsilon?

A. The ADSA governance includes representation from Director Generals directly involved with Polar Epsilon and as such complementarity of effort is ensured.

Q. Would S&T Challenge 2.1 include the possibility for unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) or drones as a solution?

A. Yes it could if information on how such UAVs or drones address the challenge and what would be the concept of operations is clearly explained in the submission.

Q. Is there an Industrial and Technological Benefits (ITB) requirement?

A. No. Instead of an ITB requirement there will be a Canadian Content requirement. Any future capital project may have an ITB requirement.

Q. Multiple questions were received on what would be in or out of the scope of the ADSA Program. Please refer to slide 4 of the presentation for information on what is in scope for ADSA. The following comments are offered as clarifications:

A. DRDC is interested in the following:

- both new and innovative ideas/technologies as well as new applications of existing technologies;
- Radar and Lidar;
- multi-static radar concepts effective against threat scenarios;
- all kinds of sensors, including optical, and the architecture of sensors;
- detection, identification, and tracking;
- using different parts of the spectrum;
- high energy lasers;
- sensor fusion architecture, such as location of sensors, how they are integrated, sensor processing, how they cross cue, etc. DRDC is not interested in visualization;
- system of systems architecture;
- modelling and simulation, however, DRDC already has models for sensors and known threats;
- solutions for power supply to remote settings subject to limited power sources, limited access, harsh weather, and limited communications.

DRDC is not interested in the following:

- data fusion;
- command and control;
- human factors/operators;
- communications sensing;
- detection of RADARs;
- work covered under other programs such as:
 - Cyber
 - CBRN (Chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear defense)
- DND is not interested in ballistic missile defence; however, cruise missile defence is a key interest of ADSA.

PART 3 - EVALUATION

Q. The third mandatory criteria, 'Feasibility of Proposed Innovation' may be difficult to prove for any technology above TRL 5. What does Canada expect in the way of proof beyond a statement that it will be possible to complete the Work. This is R&D so one of the implied risks is that whatever is being developed may not work.

A. Canada understands that there are implied risks with R&D, however a simple statement that it will be possible to complete the work is not sufficient. The bidder should demonstrate that the proposed approach is technically feasible and that there is an understanding of what deliverables need to be sequentially completed to achieve the proposed solution.

Q. How are bidders to gauge the TRL for innovative ideas? How will innovative ideas be evaluated for technical feasibility?

A. The Bidder is responsible for determining how the outcome/solution best fits on the scale for TRL. For example, the project plan would help to drive this decision. Bidders should describe the methodology of the approach and not the technology.

Q. Synopsis Proposal Evaluation Criteria, Mandatory Criteria 1.1 – What constitutes having “demonstrated” to the satisfaction of DRDC? Is DRDC going to require relevant previous project/program references or will it simply be confirming statements made by the Bidder? Some project types may not have any previous references but a Technology Pilot or Technology Demonstration may.

A. Bidders need to provide evidence or justification for the TRL being claimed.

Q. Draft CFP, Point Rated Criteria 3, pg. 30, sub-para b) – Who does DRDC define as ‘key members of the proposed project team’? Does DRDC have any expectations in this area or is it up to the Bidder to decide who is a key member of their proposed project team?

A. The Bidder should identify the appropriate persons who are key team members for its proposed project. The Bidder needs to demonstrate how the team members being proposed have the experience and expertise to deliver on the solutions being proposed.

Q. How will the Bidder’s Work Plan be evaluated if the proposal spans multiple project types? For example, the first phase might be R&D, and the second phase Technology Demonstration. The Work Plan for phase 2 can’t be fully defined as it depends on phase 1. Will the Bidders be penalized for this in point-rated criteria 2?

A. It is fully understood that work on future phases can only be speculative at the time of submission. In consideration of the feedback received, Canada is reviewing the evaluation criteria as it would apply to proposals spanning multiple project types.

Q. Regarding the certification “Status and Availability of Resources” in the Draft CFP, pg. 13, – Given the length of time from project proposal submission to contract award, it may be difficult for the Bidder to certify that every individual proposed in its bid will be available to perform the Work.

A. If an individual named in a proposal is not available to perform the Work when the contract starts, the Bidder may substitute an individual with similar qualifications subject to the contracting authority’s agreement. The purpose of this clause is to ensure the work is performed by individuals with the qualifications that were evaluated in the proposal.

Q. Will feedback be provided for all proposals submitted?

A. Yes, evaluation results will be provided to all bidders. Bidders may request a debriefing to obtain feedback on the evaluation of the proposal.

Q. Could access to a network of subject matter experts be considered as an in-kind contribution?

A. If it is direct and quantifiable contribution to the proposal, then yes it could be in-kind.

PART 4 – FINANCIAL

Q. Is it possible to make the \$3M not a hard limit?

A. Canada is looking at options to have the \$3M limit increased.

Q. Should insurance costs be applied as a direct cost or is this covered under overhead?

A. If the insurance is required only for the work under the ADSA contract, it can be considered a direct cost. Otherwise, it is a general business expense and should be included in the overhead cost.

Q. If the Bidder provides a larger co-investment, will the Bidder own a larger percentage of Intellectual Property (IP)?

A. Canada's default position is for the Bidder to own all of the IP, and Canada would retain a license for rights to the IP. The co-investment contribution has no bearing on the ownership of IP.

PART 5 - SECURITY

Q. Will an SRCL be required?

A. DRDC will determine whether an SRCL is required before contract award.

Q. Will PWGSC/DRDC sponsor companies for security clearance?

A. Yes, a request can be sent to the Contracting Authority.

Q. Are there going to be classified S&T Challenges? Will DRDC release classified information to bidders with the appropriate security clearances?

A. Canada may have some classified S&T Challenges for the joint CFP. Where classified information is required for a proposed project Canada will provide this information to bidders and resulting contractors with appropriate security clearances.

Annex B

List of Participating Organizations

- A.U.G. Signals Ltd.
- Accipiter Radar Technologies Inc.
- AGI Canada
- Arctic Security Consultants
- ASL Environmental Sciences Inc.
- Carleton University
- C-CORE
- CFN Consultants
- CMC Research Institutes Inc.
- Cognitive Systems Corp.
- CS Communication & Systems Canada
- DRDC
- eCAST Inc.
- ELTA Systems Ltd.
- Esri Canada
- Esterline Avionics Systems
- Exact Earth Ltd.
- General Dynamics Mission Systems Canada
- Hexagon Safety and Infrastructure
- Norstrat Consulting Inc.
- International Submarine Engineering Ltd.
- KinetX Aérospatiale International
- Kongsberg Geospatial
- Larus Technologies
- Lockheed Martin Canada Inc.
- Maerospace
- MDA Systems Ltd.
- Nova Syst
- Omnispace Canada
- PAL Aerospace Ltd.
- Phaleron Inc.
- Qinetiq Canada Operations Ltd.
- Real-Time Engineering and Simulation Inc
- Rheinmetall Canada Inc.
- SSCL
- Thales Canada Inc.
- Université de Sherbrooke
- University of New Brunswick
- University of Toronto
- University of Waterloo
- UrtheCast Corporation