



**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**

Defence Communications Division. (QD)

11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier

Place du Portage, Phase III, 8C2

Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> LEISC	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> W8486-184104/C	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 003
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> W8486-184104	<b>Date</b> 2017-12-15
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$QD-038-26555	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 038qd.W8486-184104	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2018-02-02</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Standard Time EST	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Mujkic, Ajida	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 038qd
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 420-0886 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

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

The amendment 003 is raised to answer questions from potential bidders.

**Questions from Potential Bidders and Answers from Canada:**

**Q1:**

Reference: ATTACHMENT 2 TO PART 4 OF THE RFP- SOW Compliance Matrix

Please provide the updated SOW Compliance Matrix that matches the released SOW.

**A1:**

Attachment 2 to Part 4 has been updated and is attached to amendment 003.

**Q2:**

Reference: ATTACHMENT 3 TO PART 4 OF THE RFP BID EVALUATION, Para 1.4.2.g

Please confirm that it 1.4.2.g should be for 175 points, not 100.

**A2:**

Confirmed. Should be 175 points vice 100. Attachment 3 to Part 4 has been updated and is attached to amendment 003.

Attachments to amendment 003:

ATTACHMENT 2 TO PART 4 OF THE RFP-RFP COMPLIANCE MATRIX AND MANDATORY REQUIREMENT CHECKLIST LAND C4ISR ENGINEERING & INTEGRATION SUPPORT (LEISC) CONTRACT

ATTACHMENT 3 TO PART 4 OF THE RFP - BID EVALUATION LAND C4ISR ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION SUPPORT CONTRACT (LEISC) (11 December 2017)

**All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.**

**ATTACHMENT 2  
TO  
PART 4 OF THE RFP**

**RFP COMPLIANCE MATRIX AND  
MANDATORY REQUIREMENT CHECKLIST**

**LAND C4ISR ENGINEERING & INTEGRATION SUPPORT  
(LEISC) CONTRACT**

The following instructions must be adhered to by the bidders:

- a. Bidders should complete the checklist below and include it with their bid. This checklist attempts to capture the mandatory bid deliverable items contained within this solicitation document in one location. The Bidder remains fully responsible to ensure all mandatory requirements of the bid solicitation are met, even if a mandatory deliverable item is not included in this list.
- b. This list does not address the actual content requirements for each deliverable. The Bidder is fully responsible to ensure it addresses the content requirements as detailed in the applicable sections of the bid solicitation.
- c. This list does address deliverables that are not required with the bid but must be provided prior to award of a contract. It is the responsibility of the Bidder to meet such requirements as contained in the bid solicitation.
- d. This list does not preclude bidders from including additional information to support their bid.
- e. If there is any discrepancy between the content of the checklist and the Evaluation Criteria in Attachment 3 to Part 4 of the RFP, the Evaluation Criteria takes precedence.

## 1 Technical Evaluation Checklist

The following Technical Evaluation Checklist may be used by the bidder to ensure that all documents and supporting documents required by Canada to evaluate their bid are provided as requested.

**Table A2-1 Administrative Checklist**

Section Reference		Submitted?
<b>Section 1 – Technical Bid</b>		
Four (4) hard copies and One (1) soft copy as per section 3.1 of RFP.		
Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria		Submitted?
Annex A – SOW	SOW Compliance Matrix	Yes / No
Attachment 3 to Part 4, article 1.3.1 Core Program Management Criteria	The Bidder must submit a complete Program Management Plan (PMP) as outlined in Appendix 5 as per DID 100.001.	Yes / No
Attachment 3 to Part 4, article 1.3.1 Core Program Management Criteria	The Bidder must clearly demonstrate how, when and where they have successfully implemented the proposed PMP on an alternate contract.	Yes / No
Attachment 3 to Part 4, article 1.3.1 Core Program Management Criteria	The Bidder must provide at least one reference check with accurate contact information.	Yes / No
Attachment 3 to Part 4, Article 1.3.2 Core Engineering Management Requirement Criteria	The Bidder must submit a complete Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP) as outlined in Appendix 5 as per DID 200.001.	Yes / No
Attachment 3 to Part 4, Article 1.3.2 Core Engineering Management Requirement Criteria	The Bidder must clearly demonstrate how, when and where they have successfully implemented the proposed SEMF on an alternate contract.	Yes / No
Attachment 3 to Part 4, Article 1.3.2 Core Engineering Requirement Criteria	The Bidder must provide at least one reference check who can validate their claim.	Yes / No

Attachment 3 to Part 4, Article 1.3.3 Personnel Requirement Criteria	The Bidder must provide resumes for the key personnel identified in Appendix 6 to Annex A. The resumes must contain, at a minimum, the information listed at article 1.3.3 of Attachment 3 to Part 4. The Bidder may use subcontractors to meet the Personnel Requirement Criteria.	Yes / No
Attachment 3 to Part 4, Article 1.3.3 Personnel Requirement Criteria	The Bidder must demonstrate compliance in response to Appendix 6 to Annex A - which provides specific position requirements. The Bidder must provide sufficient information to substantiate that the candidates meet the requirement.	Yes / No
Attachment 3 to Part 4, Article 1.3.3 Personnel Requirement Criteria	The Bidder is required to demonstrate accessibility of personnel through the certification that teaming agreement are in place	Yes / No
Attachment 3 to Part 4, Article 1.3.3 Personnel Requirement Criteria	The Bidder must provide copies of diplomas for the highest level of educational qualification stated in the resumes to meet the educational requirement.	Yes / No
<b>Point Rated Evaluation Criteria</b>		<b>Submitted?</b>
Attachment 3 to Part 4, Article 1.4 Rated Technical Bid Evaluation Criteria	The Bidder is required to provide the scoring table with their proposed score.	Yes / No
Attachment 3 to Part 4, Article 1.4.1 Program Management Experience	The Bidder should submit documentary evidence of two (2) recent examples in performing work of similar scope and scale.	Yes / No
Attachment 3 to Part 4, Article 1.4.2 Performance Based Contracting Experience	The Bidder should provide documentary evidence of two (2) recent examples of work performed under a performance based contracting regime.	Yes / No
Attachment 3 to Part 4, Article 1.4.3 System Engineering Management Experience	The Bidder should provide documentary evidence of two (2) recent examples of implementing the proposed Engineering Management Plan.	Yes / No

Attachment 3 to Part 4, Article 1.4.4 Core Engineering Experience	The Bidder should provide documentary evidence of the four (4) core engineering disciplines identified.	Yes / No
Attachment 3 to Part 4, article 1.4.5 Resource Capability Experience	The Bidder should provide documentary evidence of capability of eight (8) resources available to meet the requirement of task-based work.	Yes / No
Mandatory Financial Evaluation Criteria		Submitted?
Attachment 3 to Part 4, article 2.1	Bidders must complete and submit Tables A3-7 through A3-11 with their Financial Bid.	Yes / No

## 2 SOW Compliance Matrix

The following SOW Compliance Matrix should be used and submitted by the bidder.

**Table A2-2 SOW Compliance Matrix**

Reference in SOW	Heading	Compliance (YES/NO/ NOTED)	Reference in Bid	Comments
1.1	Aim	Noted		
1.2	Scope	Noted		
1.3	Background and Land C4ISR High Level Description	Noted		
1.4	Electronic Document Format	Yes		
1.5	Applicable Documents	Noted		
1.7	Roles, Authorities and Responsibilities	Noted		
2.1	General Requirements (Core Work)	Yes		
2.2	General Requirements (Task Based Work)	Yes		
3.1	General (Core Management and Infrastructure Services)	Yes		
3.2	Program Management Core work	Yes		

Reference in SOW	Heading	Compliance (YES/NO/NOTED)	Reference in Bid	Comments
3.3	Program Management Plans	Yes		
3.4	Monitoring and Control	Yes		
3.5	Task Management	Yes		
3.6	Risk Management	Yes		
3.7	Canada Owned Resources Management	Yes		
3.8	Configuration and Data Management (CM-DM) services	Yes		
3.9	Security	Yes		
3.10	Travel	Yes		
3.11	Contractor Infrastructure	Yes		
3.11.1	Facility Security Clearance	Yes		
3.11.2	COMSEC Sub-Account	Yes		
3.11.3	Engineering and Integration Facilities	Yes		
4	Core Engineering Support Services	Yes		
4.1	System Engineering Management	Yes		
4.2	System of Systems Architecture	Yes		
4.3	TacComms Architecture	Yes		
4.4	System of Systems Integration and Testing	Yes		
4.5	TacComms Integration and Testing	Yes		
4.6	EMSEC and E3	Yes		
4.7	Safety			
4.8	Problem Resolution Support	Yes		
4.9	Incident Management Support	Yes		
4.10	Quality Assurance Program	Yes		
4.11	Integrated Logistics Support	Yes		
4.12	Change Management	Yes		
5	Task-based Services	Yes		
5.1	Systems Engineering	Yes		
5.2	Software and Firmware Engineering	Yes		
5.3	Hardware Engineering	Yes		
5.4	CAF Platforms	Yes		
5.5	Speciality Engineering	Yes		



Reference in SOW	Heading	Compliance (YES/NO/NOTED)	Reference in Bid	Comments
5.6	Field Support	Yes		
5.7	Integrated Logistics Support	Yes		
5.8	Change Management	Yes		
Appendix 1	Glossary and Definitions	Noted		
Appendix 2	Standards and Reference Documents	Noted		
Appendix 3	System Description	Yes		
Appendix 4	Logistics SOW	Yes		
Appendix 5, Section 4	Bidders must provide a draft PMP as part of their bid.	Yes		
Appendix 5, Section 4	Bidders must provide a draft SEMP as part of their bid.	Yes		
Appendix 6	Bidders must provide resumes for the key personnel identified in Appendix A6 to Annex A.	Yes		
Appendix 7 – 1.0	Scope (General)	Noted		
Appendix 7 – 2.0	LEISC National NCR-Based Facility	Yes		
Appendix 7 – 2.1	SOSITE	Yes		
Appendix 7 – 2.2	TSIL Secure Facility	Yes		
Appendix 7 – 2.3	TSIL Unclassified Facility	Yes		
Appendix 7 – 2.4	NCR Facility Unclassified Communications closet	Yes		
Appendix 7 – 2.5	Outdoor Integration Compound	Yes		
Appendix 7 – 3.0	Other LEISC Facilities located in Canada	Yes		
Appendix 7 – 3.1	VIIT Lab	Yes		
Appendix 7 – 3.2	EMSEC, E3, and Vehicle Platform E3 Test Lab and Site	Yes		
Appendix 7 – 3.3	LEISC VITT Lab and E3 Test Lab/Site Vehicle Compounds	Yes		

**ATTACHMENT 3 TO  
PART 4 OF THE RFP  
BID EVALUATION**

**LAND C4ISR ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION SUPPORT  
CONTRACT (LEISC)**

**11 December 2017**

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>TECHNICAL BID EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Mandatory Technical Requirement Criteria.....	3
1.2	Rated Requirement Criteria.....	3
1.3	Mandatory Technical Bid Evaluation Criteria .....	3
1.3.1	Core Management Criteria.....	3
1.3.2	Core Engineering Requirement Criteria .....	4
1.3.3	Personnel Requirement Criteria.....	4
1.4	Rated Technical Bid Evaluation Criteria .....	5
1.4.1	Program Management Experience.....	6
1.4.2	Performance Based Contracting Experience .....	7
1.4.3	System Engineering Management Experience .....	8
1.4.4	Core Engineering Experience .....	9
1.4.5	Resource Capability Experience .....	10
1.4.6	Knowledge and Experience .....	10
1.5	Rated Total Score .....	11
<b>2</b>	<b>FINANCIAL BID EVALUATION.....</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1	Personnel Costs .....	12
2.1.1	Hourly Rates .....	12
2.1.2	Total Evaluated Personnel Cost Calculation.....	15
2.2	Core Work.....	15
2.3	The Facility .....	16
2.4	Mark-ups .....	17
2.4.1	Acquisition of hardware, system equipment and software (HW/SE/SW) Mark-Up 17	
2.4.2	Acquisition of the services of individuals with Specialized Knowledge (SK) and Sub-Contracted Services.....	17
2.5	Travel and Living Expenses.....	18
2.6	Financial Bid Worksheet.....	18
<b>3</b>	<b>INDUSTRIAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL BENEFITS AND VALUE PROPOSITIONS</b>	<b>19</b>

## **1 TECHNICAL BID EVALUATION**

### **1.1 Mandatory Technical Requirement Criteria**

- a) Core Management Requirement Criteria; and
- b) Core Engineering Requirement Criteria.

Any bid that fails to meet even one mandatory requirement will be disqualified and given no further consideration.

### **1.2 Rated Requirement Criteria**

- a) Program Management Plan Requirements;
- b) Performance Based Contracting Experience Requirements;
- c) Systems Engineering Management Plan Requirements;
- d) Process Experience Requirements; and
- e) Personnel Experience Requirements.

See section 2.4 of this annex for further details regarding rated criteria.

### **1.3 Mandatory Technical Bid Evaluation Criteria**

#### **1.3.1 Core Management Criteria**

The Bidder must submit with their bid, a Program Management Plan (PMP) in accordance with Appendix 5, CDRL 100.001 and DID 100.001. The Bidder must demonstrate how, when and where they have successfully implemented the proposed PMP, or a previous version of their proposed PMP, on an alternate contract or project of similar scope, scale and complexity. If past experience uses a prior version of the PMP, the bidder must provide documentary evidence of the evolution and rationale of the implemented changes of the new PMP being proposed. The bidder must provide at least one customer reference, in accordance with the Bid Preparation Instructions in Part 3 of the RFP. The customer reference may be contacted to confirm validity of the information provided. The winning Bidder must implement and execute their proposed PMP.

Definitions for this criterion:

- a. Similar Scope, Scale and Complexity means a minimum annual expenditure rate of 3 million per year or having as a minimum, the equivalent of 12 FTE positions throughout the duration of the contract or project and being of a minimum duration of 5 years, within the C4ISR industry.
- b. Successfully Implemented means the services were delivered on cost, schedule, service levels and performance agreement.

### 1.3.2 Core Engineering Requirement Criteria

The Bidder must submit with their bid, a Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP) in accordance with Appendix 5, CDRL 200.001 and DID 200.001. The Bidder must demonstrate how, when and where they have successfully implemented the proposed SEM, or a previous version of their proposed SEM, on an alternate contract or project of similar scope, scale and complexity. If past experience uses a prior version of the proposed SEM, the bidder must provide documentary evidence of the evolution and rationale of the implemented changes of the new SEM being proposed. The bidder must provide at least one customer reference, validated as accurate by the customer, with accurate customer contact information. The customer reference may be contacted to confirm validity of the information provided. The winning Bidder must implement and execute their proposed SEM.

Definitions for this criterion:

- a. Similar Scope, Scale and Complexity means a minimum annual expenditure rate of 3 million per year or having as a minimum, the equivalent of 12 FTE positions throughout the duration of the contract or project and being of a minimum duration of 5 years, within the C4ISR industry.
- b. Successfully Implemented means the services were delivered on cost, schedule, service levels and performance agreement.

### 1.3.3 Personnel Requirement Criteria

Mandatory Personnel qualifications will be assessed by evaluating resumes of key personnel. Bidders shall provide resumes for the key personnel identified in Appendix 6 to Annex A. As a minimum, the following information should be included in each resume and presented in a tabular form:

- a. General: name, company name, location of employee and the employee's government security clearance level status.
- b. Education and training: dates, locations, and names of the institutions where the qualification was acquired. Copies of diplomas shall be provided. This section may also include formal company in house or external courses and attendance at pertinent conferences or symposia. For educational requirements for a particular degree, designation or certificate, Canada will only consider educational programs that were completed by the resource by the time of bid closing. If the degree, designation or certification was issued by an educational institution outside of Canada, the Bidder must provide a copy of the results of the academic credential assessment and qualification recognition service issued by an agency or organization recognized by the Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials (CICIC).
- c. Employment history: presented in tabular form and include the duration (years and months), employer name and position held, in reverse chronological order. Self-

employed consultants shall list major projects and assignments.

- d. Experience: presented in tabular form with three columns including experience area, months of experience in that area and dates (month and year) the experience was obtained; and key details of that experience (e.g. project outline, company, specific tasks performed by the person, number of persons supervised).

The Bidder may use identified team members to meet the Personnel requirements. The Bidder shall confirm that all key personnel will be available to perform the work at Contract award. The Bidders shall demonstrate compliance in response to Appendix 6 to Annex A - which provides specific position requirements. Bidders shall provide sufficient information to substantiate that the candidates meet the requirement. Bidders shall provide copies of diplomas for the highest level of educational qualification stated in the resumes to meet the educational requirement. The same individual must not be proposed for more than one Resource Category.

#### **1.4 Rated Technical Bid Evaluation Criteria**

For purposes of evaluating the rated criteria the following definitions will be used.

**Recent:** Is defined as having been completed within the last five (5) years from date of RFP release.

**Similar Scope and Scale:** Is defined as being within the C4ISR industry, having a minimum annual expenditure rate of 3 million per year or having as a minimum, the equivalent of 12 FTE positions throughout the duration of the contract/project and being of a minimum duration of 5 years.

**Significant:** is defined as depth and breadth of experience associated with the delivery or support of C4ISR capabilities for a period of a minimum of five (5) years in the last 10 years, calculated from date of RFP release.

**Complex:** meaning of a multi-million dollar value, multi-stakeholders, and multi-year contract.

- a. For each Reference Project submitted for 1.4.1 to 1.4.4 below, the Bidder must provide a customer reference, in accordance with the Bid Preparation Instructions in Part 3 of the RFP. The customer may be contacted to confirm validity of the information provided.
- b. For each Reference Project submitted for 1.4.1 to 1.4.2 below, the Bidder should provide a detailed description, including but not limited to the following:
  - 1. Executive Summary;
  - 2. Problem statement;
  - 3. Project Management Strategy that includes at a minimum:
    - i. Industry standard, best practice or corporate methodology used;
    - ii. Implementation strategy;

- iii. Problem/Issue management;
  - iv. Communications management;
  - v. Risk mitigation;
  - vi. Technologies used or implemented;
  - vii. Resource management;
  - viii. Project schedule management (including complete project timeline).
- 4. Budget management;
  - 5. Performance management, including continuous improvement and performance incentives (if used);
  - 6. Description of users;
  - 7. Volumetrics, including number of internal users, number of transactional requests, and diversity of transactions; and
  - 8. Contract Disputes and Performance Issues

For the purpose of this solicitation, a “Team Member” or “Bidder’s Team” is the entity whose experience is being used to meet evaluation criteria of this bid. Where a Bidder cites the experience of a Team Member, Canada will only consider this experience if the experience is accessible to the Bidder and the Bidder can rely upon and use the experience in the performance of any resulting Contract. The Bidder is required to demonstrate this accessibility through the certification that cooperation agreement are in place at the time of bid closure. Experience listed without providing any supporting data to describe where, how and by whom such experience was obtained or failure to demonstrate that the Bidder has a teaming agreement with the Team Member whose experience satisfies the requirement may result in the experience not being considered for evaluation purposes. The experience identified by the Bidder to meet criterion 1.4 b and 1.4 c, identified above, must be for Work for which the Bidder’s Team was directly responsible.

#### **1.4.1 Program Management Experience**

The Bidder’s Team program management capability will be evaluated based on actual relevant recent experience. The Bidder’s Team should provide documentary evidence of two (2) recent examples in performing work of similar scope and scale for a maximum of 200 points per example. If more than two (2) examples are provided, only the first two (2) examples in the order listed in the bid will be evaluated. The minimum passing score for each example is 20 points. Recent experience is limited to the last five years. The rating scale is based on the following criteria:

- a. The work was performed outside of Canada in a Defence and Security context without the ability to perform a reference check by Canada -20 points
- b. The work was performed outside of Canada in a Defence and Security context with the ability to perform a reference check by Canada -40 points
- c. The work was performed in Canada in a Defence and Security context with an unsuccessful reference check. -60 points
- d. The work was performed outside of Canada in a C4ISR context with a successful

- e. reference check. -80 points
- e. The work was performed in Canada in a C4ISR context with an unsuccessful reference check. -100 points
- f. The work was performed in Canada in a C4ISR context with a successful reference check demonstrating the Bidder's Team met the contractual requirement -125 points
- g. The work was performed in Canada in a C4ISR context with a successful reference check demonstrating the Bidder's Team exceeded the contractual requirement of the example being provided. -150 points
- h. The work was performed in Canada in a Land C4ISR context with a successful reference check demonstrating the Bidder's Team met the contractual requirement of the example being provided. -175 points
- i. The work was performed in Canada in Land C4ISR context with a successful reference check demonstrating the Bidder's Team exceeded the contractual requirement of the example being provided. -200 points

**Table A3-1 – Program Management Experience Total**

Example	Description	Maximum Score	Actual Score	Comments
1		200		
2		200		
Total		400		

#### 1.4.2 Performance Based Contracting Experience

The Bidder's Team performance based contracting (PBC) capability will be rated based on actual relevant recent experience. The Bidder's Team must provide documentary evidence of two (2) recent examples of work performed under a performance based contracting regime for a maximum of 250 points per example. If more than two (2) examples are provided, only the first two (2) examples in the order listed in the bid will be evaluated. PBC is define as a regime where the contractor's performance is rewarded through incentives based on Key Performance Indicators (KPI) and/or System Health Indicators (SHI). The minimum passing score for each example is 20 points. Recent experience is limited to the last five years. The rating scale is based on the following criteria:

- a. The work was performed outside of Canada in a Defence and Security context with an unsuccessful reference check. -20 points
- b. The work was performed outside of Canada in a Defence and Security context with a successful reference check. -40 points
- c. The work was performed in Canada in a Defence and Security context with an unsuccessful reference check. -60 points
- d. The work was performed outside of Canada in a C4ISR context with a successful reference check. -75 points
- e. The work was performed in Canada in a C4ISR context with an unsuccessful reference check. -100 points



- f. The work was performed in Canada in a C4ISR context with a successful reference check demonstrating the Bidder's Team met the contractual requirement of the example being provided. -150 points
- g. The work was performed in Canada in a C4ISR context with a successful reference check demonstrating the Bidder's Team exceeded the contractual requirement of the example being provided. -175 points
- h. The work was performed in Canada in a Land C4ISR context with a successful reference check demonstrating the Bidder's Team met the contractual requirement of the example being provided. -200 points
- i. The work was performed in Canada in a Land C4ISR context with a successful reference check demonstrating the Bidder's Team exceeded the contractual requirement of the example being provided. -250 points

**Table A3-2 – Performance Based Contracting Experience Total**

Example	Description	Maximum Score	Actual Score	Comments
1		250		
2		250		
Total		500		

### 1.4.3 System Engineering Management Experience

The Bidder's Team System Engineering Management capability will be rated based on actual relevant recent experience. The Bidder's Team must provide documentary evidence of two (2) recent examples of implementing the proposed Engineering Management Plan for a maximum of 100 points per example. If more than two (2) examples are provided, only the first two (2) examples in the order listed in the bid will be evaluated. The minimum passing score for each example is 10 points. Recent experience is limited to the last five years. The rating scale is based on the following criteria:

- a. The work was performed outside of Canada in a Defence and Security context with an unsuccessful reference check. -10 points.
- b. The work was performed outside of Canada in a Defence and Security context with a successful reference check. -20 points
- c. The work was performed in Canada in a Defence and Security context with an unsuccessful reference check. -30 points
- d. The work was performed outside of C4ISR context with a successful reference check. -40 points
- e. The work was performed in Canada in a C4ISR context with an unsuccessful reference check. -50 points
- f. The work was performed in Canada in a C4ISR Context with a successful reference check demonstrating the Bidder's Team met the contractual requirement of the example being provided. -80 points
- g. The work was performed in Canada in a C4ISR Context with a successful reference check demonstrating the Bidder's Team exceeded the contractual requirement of

- the example being provided. -100 points
- h. The work was performed in Canada in a Land C4ISR context with a successful reference check demonstrating the Bidder's Team met the contractual requirement of the example being provided. -125points
- i. The work was performed in Canada in a Land C4ISR context with a successful reference check demonstrating the Bidder's Team exceeded the contractual requirement of the example being provided. -150 points

**Table A3-3 – System Engineering Management Experience Total**

Example	Description	Maximum Score	Actual Score	Comments
1		150		
2		150		
Total		300		

#### 1.4.4 Core Engineering Experience

The Bidder's Team core engineering capability will be rated based on actual relevant recent experience. The Bidder's Team should provide documentary evidence of capability in the four (4) core engineering disciplines identified below for a maximum of 100 points per example. The minimum passing score for each example is 10 points. Recent experience is limited to the last five years. The rating scale is based on the following criteria:

- a. The work was performed outside of Canada in a defence and security context with an unsuccessful reference check. -10 points
- b. The work was performed outside of Canada in a defence and security context with a successful reference check. -20 points
- c. The work was performed in Canada in a defence and security context with an unsuccessful reference check. -30 points
- d. The work was performed outside of Canada in a C4ISR context with a successful reference check -40 points
- e. The work was performed in Canada in a C4ISR context with an unsuccessful reference check. -50 points
- f. The work was performed in Canada in a C4ISR context with a successful reference check demonstrating the Bidder's Team met the contractual requirement of the example being provided. -80 points
- g. The work was performed in Canada in a C4ISR context with a successful reference check demonstrating the Bidder's Team exceeded the contractual requirement of the example being provided. -100 points
- h. The work was performed in Canada in Land C4ISR context with a successful reference check demonstrating the Bidder's Team met the contractual requirement of the example being provided. -125 points
- i. The work was performed in Canada in a Land C4ISR context with a successful reference check demonstrating the Bidder's Team exceeded the contractual

requirement of the example being provided. -150 points

**Table A3-4 – Core Engineering Experience Total**

<b>Example</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Maximum Score</b>	<b>Actual Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1	System-of-Systems Engineering Architecture, Management, Integration and Testing	150		
2	Harsh Environment Network/Communication Complex Electronic Product Development, Integration and Testing	150		
3	Ground Mobile Platform – Electronic Networked Systems Installation Integration Engineering	150		
4	EMSEC and E3 Engineering	150		
Total		600		

#### **1.4.5 Resource Capability Experience**

The Bidder's Team should provide documentary evidence of capability of eight (8) resources available to meet the requirement of task-based work, one for each of the eight (8) resource types listed in table A3-5 below. Canada must have the ability to perform reference checks based on the information provided in the bid. The minimum passing score for each resource type is 20 points. The rating scale is based on an evaluation of breadth and depth of knowledge and experience:

#### **1.4.6 Knowledge and Experience**

Breadth and depth of knowledge and experience will be evaluate based on 100 points for each resource. The breadth of experience will be marked based on the diversity of experience level when compared to the area identified in Appendix 6 to Annex A, item No. 2 within the table for each individual resource category:

- a. The proposed resources has relevant knowledge and experience in one of the areas identified in Appendix 6 - 20 points
- b. The proposed resources has relevant knowledge and experience in less than half of the areas identified in Appendix 6 - 40 points
- c. The proposed resources has relevant knowledge and experience in more than half but not all of the areas identified in Appendix 6 - 60 points

- d. The proposed resources has relevant knowledge and experience in all the areas identified in Appendix 6 - 80 points
- e. The proposed resources has relevant knowledge and experience that exceeds the areas identified in Appendix 6 - 100 points

**Table A3-5 – Resource Capability Experience Total**

Example	Description	Max Score	Breadth	Total	Comments
1	Systems Architect / Systems Engineering Manager (Senior)	100			
2	Certified Tempest Professional (Senior)	100			
3	Electromagnetic Environment Effects Engineer	100			
4	System Engineer	100			
5	Hardware Engineer	100			
6	Software/Firmware Architect/Engineer	100			
7	Project Manager	100			
8	Test Engineer	100			
Total		800			

### 1.5 Rated Total Score

**Table A3-6 - Total Rated Criteria Point Summary**

Rated Criteria Elements	Max Points Available	Total Points
<b>Program Management Experience Summary</b>	400	
<b>Performance Based Contracting Experience Summary</b>	500	
<b>Systems Engineering Management Experience Summary</b>	300	
<b>Core Engineering Experience Summary</b>	600	
<b>Resource Capability Experience Summary</b>	800	
<b>Total</b>	2,600	

## 2 FINANCIAL BID EVALUATION

The evaluated cost will be calculated using the firm all-inclusive rates and mark-ups proposed by the Bidder and the quantities indicated in the financial evaluation tables. The number of persons, units and days are based on “Proxy” usage rates. They are for evaluation purposes only and do not represent any promise or representation by Canada of any particular volume of work. Bidders shall complete and submit Tables A3-7 through Table A3-12 with their Financial Bid.

### 2.1 Personnel Costs

#### 2.1.1 Hourly Rates

Bidders shall enter their rates, as defined by the Personnel Rate Category in Appendix 6 of the SOW, into A3-7. If Team Members are used, the hourly rates will also apply to any Work performed by the Team Members personnel during the Contract.

**Table A3-7 – Hourly Rate**

Personnel (Pers) Rate Category	Qty Pers (A)	Contract Hourly Rate (B)					Evaluated Cost (Ax B x 7.5 hours/day x 235 days)				
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 1 (C)	Year 2 (D)	Year 3 (E)	Year 4 (F)	Year 5 (G)
Senior Project Manager	1	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Intermediate Project Manager	1	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Junior Project Manager	1	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Senior Project Administrator	1	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Intermediate Project Administrator	2	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Junior Project Administrator	1	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Senior System Architect/System Engineering Manager	1	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Senior System Engineer	2	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

[illegible]



[illegible]

### 2.1.2.2 Total Evaluated Personnel Cost Calculation

The total of the Per Diem Rate is calculated at Table A3-8. These are the personnel costs that will be used for the cost per point calculation determined at Table A3-12:

### Table A3-8- Total Evaluated Personnel Cost

Personnel (Pers) Category	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Sub -Total
Sub Totals	\$ (C)	\$ (D)	\$ (E)	\$ (F)	\$ (G)	\$ (C+D+E+F+G)
	Total Evaluated Cost					\$(Enter Value into Table A3-12)

## 2.2 Core Work

Bidders shall enter their rates, as defined by the Core Work Category in Annex A - SOW, into Table A3-9. The total value of the Core Work costs will be used for the cost per point calculation determined at Table A3-12. Core Work (combined value of Core Management Work and Core Engineering Work) must not exceed an annual rate of \$13 million dollars.



Table A3-9 - Total Evaluated Core Work Cost

Core Work	Monthly Fixed Rate (A)					Annual Rate (B) (A*12)					3 Year Cost	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	SUM of B	
Core Management Work	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
Core Engineering Work	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
						<b>Total:</b>					\$ (Enter Value into Table A3-12)	

### 2.3 The Facility

The Bidder shall provide their proposed firm monthly rate for The Facility, as defined in Appendix 7 of the SOW, in Table A3-10.

Table A3-10 - The Facility – Firm Annual Rates Evaluation

Facility 5.4	Monthly Rate (A)	Annual Rate (A*12)
Facility rate – Year 1	\$	\$
Facility rate – Year 2	\$	\$
Facility rate – Year 3	\$	\$
Facility rate – Year 4	\$	\$
Facility rate – Year 5	\$	\$
<b>Total:</b>		\$ (Enter Value into Table A3-12)

**2.4 Mark-ups**

Bidders shall propose firm mark-up rates, including overhead, general and Administration, profit and any other mark-up normally charged, for the acquisition of hardware, system equipment and software (HW/SE/SW), and the services of individuals with specialized knowledge (SK's) and Sub-Contracted services during the contract period utilizing Table A3-11. The mark-up amounts determined in the Table 4-5 below will be evaluated as part of the overall Bid price.

**2.4.1 Acquisition of hardware, system equipment and software (HW/SE/SW) Mark-Up**

For the purposes of bid evaluation only, acquisition costs for hardware, system equipment and software during the Contract period is hypothetically set at \$10,000,000.00. Bidders must provide a Mark-up rate for the acquisition of HW/SE/SW in Table A3-11. The Mark-up rate proposed must not exceed 20%.

**2.4.2 Acquisition of the services of individuals with Specialized Knowledge (SK) and Sub-Contracted Services**

For the purposes of bid evaluation only, the acquisition costs for SK and Sub-Contracted Services during the contract period is hypothetically set at \$20,000,000.00. Bidders must provide a Mark-up rate for the acquisition of SK and Sub-Contracted Services in Table A3-11. The Mark-up rate proposed must not exceed 20%.

**Table A3-11 - Cost of Mark-ups**

Activity	Mark-up Rate (%) (A)	Acquisition Costs (Not a Guarantee) (B)	Evaluated Amount (AxB)
Acquisition of HW/SE/ SW	(A1)	\$10,000,000.00	(C)
Acquisition of SK & Sub- Contractors	(A2)	\$20,000,000.00	(D)
Total Evaluated Cost of Mark-ups = C+D:			\$(Enter Value into Table A3-12)

2.5 Travel and Living Expenses

The cost of travel and living expenses for contractors is not considered in the bid pricing.

2.6 Financial Bid Worksheet

Table A3-12 is a summary of all evaluated costs as determined in Tables A3-8 through A3-11. Bidders shall populate this table using the totals determined in Tables A3-8 through A3-11 where indicated by “\$Enter Value into Table A3-12”. Bidders shall include Tables A3-7 through A3-12 with their Financial Bid. If there are any discrepancies between the amounts in Table A3-12 and those in Tables A3-8 through A3-11, the cost will be recalculated using the values determined in Tables A3-7 through A3-11.

Table A3-12 - Total Evaluated Cost of Bid

Cost Summaries	Total Evaluated Cost
Personnel Cost Summary	\$
Core Work Cost Summary	\$
Cost of Facilities	\$
Cost of Mark-ups	\$
Total Evaluated Cost	\$

### 3 INDUSTRIAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL BENEFITS AND VALUE PROPOSITIONS

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The purpose of the Value Proposition (VP) Evaluation Plan (Evaluation Plan) is to describe the methodology that will be used to evaluate the VP Proposal (Bid) submitted by the Bidder.
- 1.2. The Bid will be evaluated as either responsive or not responsive. The Bid will be deemed responsive if it: i) meets all of the mandatory requirements outlined in Section 2; and, ii) meets the minimum assessment values outlined in Section 3.
- 1.3. All responsive bids will then be evaluated based on rated criteria, as outlined in Section 4.
- 1.4. The results of the evaluation will be conveyed to the Contracting Authority. The results will then be integrated into the overall bid evaluation results, as outlined in section 4 of the Land C4ISR Engineering and Integration Support Contract (LEISC) (the Project) Evaluation Plan.
- 1.5. The Bidder is strongly encouraged to closely review the entire Bidder Instructions document.
- 1.6. Defined terms not otherwise defined in this document have the meaning given to them in the ITB Terms and Conditions and the Request for Proposal, including appendices, to which this Evaluation Plan is attached.

#### 2. MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

- 2.1. The chart below details each mandatory requirement and how the ITB Authority will assess whether it has been met. The Bid will be assessed as responsive or not responsive. To be considered responsive, all mandatory requirements must be met.

**Table 2-1, Mandatory Requirements Evaluation Chart**

<b>Mandatory Requirement</b>	<b>Method to Confirm</b>
1. Bidder commits to achieving Transactions, measured in Canadian content value (CCV), valued at not less than 100 percent of the Contract Price (including options exercised) or the total CCV of identified Transactions, whichever is higher, to be achieved within the Achievement Period.	Mandatory requirements certificate is duly signed and submitted.
2. Commits to achieving Direct Transactions valued at	Mandatory requirements

not less than 70 percent of the Contract Price in CCV, or the total CCV of Direct Transaction Commitments in the Bid, whichever is higher, including options exercised, to be achieved within the Achievement Period. .	certificate is duly signed and submitted
3. Bidder has specified its Total Evaluated Cost of Bid , not including taxes, and not including options, and rounded to the nearest dollar.	Mandatory requirements certificate is duly signed and submitted, with Total Evaluated Cost of Bid provided.
3a. Bidder has identified Transactions which are detailed, fully described and equal in total to not less than 30 percent of the Total Evaluated Cost of Bid in CCV. All Transactions identified in the Bid must align with one or more of the rated criteria specified in Sections 4.1.1 to 4.1.3 of the Evaluation Plan	Alignment of the Transaction with one or more of the rated criteria is confirmed. CCV value of each Transaction in the Bid is totalled, then compared against the Total Evaluated Cost of Bid . Mandatory requirements certificate is duly signed and submitted.
3b. Bidder commits to identifying one (1) year after the Effective Date of Contract, Transactions that are detailed, fully described and bring the cumulative total of identified Transactions to not less than 60 percent of the Contract Price, measured in CCV.	Mandatory requirements certificate is duly signed and submitted.
3c. Bidder commits to identifying three (3) years after Effective Date of Contract, and for each additional contract option year exercised, Transactions that are detailed, fully described and bring the cumulative total of identified Transactions to 100 percent of the Contract Price, measured in CCV	Mandatory requirements certificate is duly signed and submitted.
4. Commits to achieving Small and Medium Business Transactions valued at not less than 10 percent of the Contract Price in CCV, or the total CCV of Small and Medium Business Commitments in the Bid, whichever is higher, including options exercised, to be achieved within the Achievement Period.	Mandatory requirements certificate is duly signed and submitted.
5. Commits to achieving Research and Development Activity Transactions valued at not less than 1 percent of the Contract Price in CCV, or the total CCV of Research and Development Commitments in the Bid, whichever is higher, including options exercised, to be achieved within the Achievement Period.	Mandatory requirements certificate is duly signed and submitted.
6. Bidder accepts all of the ITB Terms & Conditions.	Mandatory requirements certificate is duly signed and submitted.
7. Bidder submits all the required components in its	Presence of each required

<b>Bid:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Company Business Plan</li><li>• ITB Management Plan</li><li>• Regional Development Plan</li><li>• Small and Medium Business Development Plan</li><li>• Detailed transaction sheets, accompanied by a summary chart of all Transactions.</li><li>• Signed Mandatory requirements certificate</li></ul>	component in the Bid and the Mandatory requirements certificate is duly signed and submitted.
---	---

### 3. MINIMUM ASSESSMENT VALUES

3.1. The Plans will be evaluated to determine if they meet the minimum assessment values below.

3.1.1. The Bidder's four Plans will be evaluated to confirm that they are present in the Bid. The Plans are then assessed for quality and for risk, using the assessments in Tables 3-1 and 3-2.

3.1.2. Quality will be assessed as to whether the Plans respond to the requested components outlined in Section 5 of the Bidder Instructions, the level of detail in the component, and how well the content of the Plan meets the ITB Objectives outlined in Section 3 of the Bidder Instructions.

3.1.3. Quality will be assessed on a scale of one (1) to four (4), using the values below in Table 3-1.

**Table 3- 1, Plan Quality Assessments**

<b>VALUE</b>	<b>3 PLAN – QUALITY ASSESSMENTS</b>
4	<b>SUPERIOR</b> Plan contains detailed responses to four or more of the requested items in Section 5.4 to 5.7, both inclusive, as applicable, of the Bidder Instructions. The Plan demonstrates that many of Canada’s ITB Objectives will be met.
3	<b>GOOD</b> Plan contains detailed responses to three of the requested items in Section 5.4 to 5.7, both inclusive, as applicable, of the Bidder Instructions. The Plan demonstrates that several of Canada’s ITB Objectives will be met.
2	<b>POOR</b> Plan contains detailed responses to two of the requested items in Section 5.4 to 5.7, both inclusive, as applicable, of the Bidder Instructions. The Plan demonstrates that some of Canada’s ITB Objectives will be met.
1	<b>VERY WEAK</b> Plan contains detailed response to one or less of the requested items in the Section 5.4 to 5.7, both inclusive, as applicable, of the Bidder Instructions. The Plan does not demonstrate that Canada’s ITB Objectives will be met.

3.1.4. Risk will be assessed as to whether the Plans respond to the risk areas outlined in Section 5 of the Bidder Instructions and the level of detail provided.

3.1.5. Risk will be assessed on a scale of one (1) to four (4), using the values below in Table 3-2

**Table 3- 2, Plan Risk Assessments**

<b>VALUE</b>	<b>PLAN - RISK ASSESSMENTS</b>
4	<b>SUPERIOR</b> Plan contains a detailed response to four or more of the risk areas in Section 5.3 of the Bidder Instructions, such that the probability of failure to achieve is extremely low.

VALUE	PLAN - RISK ASSESSMENTS
3	<b>GOOD</b> Plan contains a detailed response to three of the risk areas in Section 5.3 of the Bidder Instructions, such that the probability of failure to achieve is low.
2	<b>POOR</b> Plan contains a detailed response to two of the risk areas in Section 5.3 of the Bidder Instructions, such that the probability of failure to achieve is moderate.
1	<b>VERY WEAK</b> Plan contains a detailed response to one or less of the risk areas in Section 5.3 of the Bidder Instructions, such that the probability of failure to achieve is significant.

3.1.6. The Quality and Risk assessments agreed to by evaluators will be multiplied together and the sums added together to determine the final Plans assessment value for the Bid.

3.1.7. The Bidder must achieve or exceed a final Plans assessment value of thirty-two (32) (out of a possible sixty-four (64)).

#### EXAMPLE:

Table 3-3 - Example

Plan	Quality (A)	Risk (B)	Assessment Value (C) (C) = (A) x (B)
Company Business Plan	4	3	12
ITB Management Plan	2	3	6
Regional Development Plan	4	4	16
SMB Development Plan	4	2	8
<b>Final plans assessment value</b>			<b>42</b>

### 3.2. Evaluation of proposed Transactions

3.2.1. The Bidder's proposed Transactions will be evaluated to determine whether they comply with the Bidder Instructions and with the ITB Terms and Conditions, with respect to eligibility criteria, valuation, banking and transaction types.



- 3.2.2. If a proposed Transaction does not meet the criteria outlined in 3.2.1, it will be rejected and will receive no further consideration during the mandatory or rated evaluation, or in the Contract.
- 3.2.3. If a proposed Transaction meets the criteria outlined in 3.2.1, it will then be assessed in accordance with the Mandatory Requirements in Section 2, specifically paragraph 3a of Table 2-1 Mandatory Requirements Evaluation Chart.
- 3.2.4. Any Transactions identified in the Bid will be assessed to determine whether they align with one or more of the three rated evaluation criteria identified in sections 4.1.1 through 4.1.3. The Bidder should provide a level of detail sufficient to support the claim that the Transaction fits within a given criteria.
- 3.2.4.1. Transactions where the Bidder does not demonstrate alignment with the rated evaluation criteria will be rejected and will receive no further consideration during the mandatory or rated evaluation, or in the Contract.
- 3.2.4.2. Transactions where the Bidder demonstrates alignment with the rated evaluation criteria will be included as part of the Bidder's Commitments in the rated evaluation, outlined in Section 4 of the Evaluation Plan. These Transactions would also be included as an Obligation to be achieved in the Contract.

#### 4. RATED EVALUATION

- 4.1. The Bidder's proposed Commitments will be evaluated against the rated criteria as described below.

Land C4ISR – Engineering and Integration Support Contract (LEISC) Value Proposition Strategic Objective
The strategic objective of the Value Proposition (VP) Framework for the Project is to ensure that Canadian capabilities are utilized directly on the procurement, while incentivizing high-quality research and development investments that support innovation and the competitiveness of Canada's Defence Sector, as well as supply chain integration opportunities for Canadian small and medium-sized businesses (SMB).

##### 4.1.1 Direct Transactions

The Direct Transactions pillar will incentivize high-value work activities in Canada directly related to the Project. The Mandatory Requirement in this area ensures that a minimum amount of Canadian content is used for the provision of goods and services, where Canada has capabilities, while Value Proposition points seek to incentivize bidders to compete on the basis of maximizing Direct Transactions.

Table 4 – 1, Direct Transactions

Criteria	Available Points	Basis of Evaluation
<b>Direct Transactions</b>		
Commitments to undertake Direct Transactions above 70 percent of Contract Price, up to a maximum of 100 percent	30	<p>Points will be awarded for Commitments to achieve Direct Transactions based on the following:</p> <p>The Bidder with the highest commitment to undertake Direct Transactions above seventy (70) percent of Contract Price up to a maximum of one hundred (100) percent, stated as a percentage of the Bidder's Total Evaluated Cost of Bid , not including options and measured in CCV, will receive thirty (30) points. All other bidders will be pro-rated down.</p> <p>Formula: Bidders total Direct Transaction Commitment above 70 percent (up to a maximum of 100 percent) divided by the highest bidder's Direct Transaction Commitment above 70 percent (up to a maximum of 100 percent), multiplied by 30 points.</p>

#### 4.1.2 Research and Development:

The Research and Development (R&D) pillar will incentivize bidders to identify R&D Transactions with Canadian Companies, Canadian Post-Secondary Institutions, and/or Public Research Institutions that support Canada's high-value Defence Sector research capabilities.

Table 4 – 2, Research and Development

Criteria	Available Points	Basis of Evaluation
<b>Research and Development</b>		
Commitments to undertake R&D Activity Transactions with Canadian Companies and/or Post-Secondary Institutions or Public Research Institutions, above 1	50	<p>Points will be awarded for Commitments to achieve R&amp;D Transactions based on the following:</p> <p>Commitments for each category of R&amp;D Activity Transactions should be expressed as a commitment to undertake R&amp;D Activity Transactions above one</p>

percent of Contract Price, up to a maximum of 100 percent		<p>(1) percent of Contract Price.</p> <p>Commitment to R&amp;D Activity Transactions in the Defence Sector with Canadian Post-Secondary Institutions or Public Research Institutions up to a maximum of one hundred (100) percent, stated as a percentage of the Bidder's Total Evaluated Cost of Bid , not including options and measured in CCV, will receive two (2) points for every percentage of Total Evaluated Cost of Bid committed.</p> <p>Commitment to R&amp;D Transactions in the Defence Sector with Canadian Companies up to a maximum of one hundred (100) percent, stated as a percentage of the Bidder's Total Evaluated Cost of Bid , not including options and measured in CCV, will receive one (1) point for every percentage of Total Evaluated Cost of Bid committed.</p> <p>The R&amp;D point accumulation is calculated by totalling the points accumulated in R&amp;D Activities in the Defence Sector with Canadian Companies and Post-Secondary Institutions or Public Research Institutions. The Bidder with the highest point accumulation for such commitments above one (1) percent of Contract Price up to a maximum of one hundred (100) percent, will receive fifty (50) points. All other bidders will be pro-rated down.</p> <p>Formula: (Bidder's R&amp;D Activity point accumulation divided by the highest bidder's R&amp;D Activity point accumulation) multiplied by 50 points.</p>
---	--	--

#### 4.1.3. Small and Medium Sized Businesses (SMBs):

The Small and Medium-sized Business (SMB) pillar will incentivize bidders to work with SMB across Canada, to integrate them into supply chains, and invest in developing their skills, capacity, quality and productivity so they can remain competitive in the global market.

**Table 4 – 3, Small and Medium Sized Businesses**

Criteria	Available Points	Basis of Evaluation
<b>Small and Medium Sized Businesses</b>		
Commitments to undertake Transactions with SMBs above 10 percent of Contract Price, up to a maximum of 100 percent	20	<p>Points will be awarded for Commitments to achieve Transactions based on the following:</p> <p>The Bidder with the highest Commitment to undertake Transactions with SMBs above ten (10) percent of Contract Price up to a maximum of one hundred (100) percent, stated as a percentage of the Bidder's Total Evaluated Cost of Bid , not including options and measured in CCV, will receive twenty (20) points. All other bidders will be pro-rated down.</p> <p>Formula: Bidders total SMB Commitment above 10 percent (up to a maximum of 100 percent), divided by the highest bidder SMB Commitment above 10 percent (up to a maximum of 100 percent), multiplied by 20 points.</p>

- 4.2. In the event that the Bidder identifies Commitments or proposed Transactions in its Bid valued at more than 100 percent of the Total Evaluated Cost of Bid , no additional points will be earned in the rated evaluation, above those outlined in the Evaluation Plan. Additionally in this event, the Obligation values in Article 3.1.1 of the Terms and Conditions (including the sub-obligations) would be increased to match the total value of those
- 4.3. One identified Transaction may be aligned with multiple criteria and will be scored as such, up to the maximum total points. All Transactions that meet the criteria in Section 3.2 and Commitments identified in the Bid will be included as an Obligation to be achieved in the ensuing Contract.
- 4.4. In the event that the Bidder's total identified Transactions in the Bid align with any of the three rated VP criteria, expressed as a percentage of Total Evaluated Cost of Bid , is greater than the Bidder's Commitment in the same VP criteria as expressed in the Rated Criteria Certificate, the higher value will both be considered as the Bidder's Commitment in the rated evaluation described in Section 4, and as the Obligation to be achieved in Article 3 of the ensuing Contract.

4.5. Table 4-4 below summarizes the rated evaluation scoring:

**Table 4-4 – Transaction Scoring**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Available Points</b>	<b>Basis of Evaluation</b>
<b>Direct Transactions</b>	<b>30</b>	
Commitment		Commitment above 70 percent, expressed as CCV percentage of Total Evaluated Cost of Bid on signed rated criteria certificate (or CCV percentage of identified Direct Transactions, whichever is higher)
<b>Research and Development</b>	<b>50</b>	
Commitment		Commitment above 1 percent, expressed as CCV percentage of Total Evaluated Cost of Bid on signed rated criteria certificate (or CCV percentage of identified Research and Development Transactions, whichever is higher)
Portion of commitment involving Canadian Companies		Commitment expressed as CCV percentage of Total Evaluated Cost of Bid on signed rated criteria certificate (or CCV percentage of identified Research and Development Transactions with Canadian Companies, whichever is higher)
Portion of commitment involving Post-Secondary Institutions or Public Research Institutions		Commitment expressed as CCV percentage of Total Evaluated Cost of Bid on signed rated criteria certificate (or CCV percentage of identified Research and Development Transactions with Post-Secondary Institutions or Public Research Institutions, whichever is higher)
<b>Small and Medium Sized Businesses</b>	<b>20</b>	
Commitment		Commitment above 10 percent, expressed as CCV percentage of Total Evaluated Cost of Bid on signed rated criteria certificate (or CCV percentage of identified SMB Transactions, whichever is higher)
<b>Total Points</b>	<b>100</b>	

4.6. Total VP Score: The Bidder's scores for commitments will be totaled to reach a Total VP Score, which will then be weighted at seventeen (17) percent of the total available score for the Project's overall bid evaluation.

## 5. PROCESS

- 5.1. The evaluation is led by the ITB Authority, with participation from representatives of the regional development agencies, and, if required, other subject matter experts.
- 5.2. Evaluation assessments and scoring will be carried out by consensus, wherein the Bid will be read, discussed and each evaluator will agree to a score for each rated element. Consensus on broader issues will be sought, such that evaluators agree on the need for and nature of any clarifying questions or advice sought from outside experts. Where consensus on scoring, issues or other questions cannot be reached following discussion, the ISED Evaluation Lead will make the final decision.
- 5.3. The ITB Authority will hold overall responsibility for ensuring that the members of the evaluation team carry out their responsibilities. The ITB Authority will act as the liaison between the evaluation team and outside officials.