



Summary Report of Feedback from the Industry Engagement Process for

Gender Equality and Gender-Based Violence Research in Canada

1W001-180192/B

5 December 2018

Table of Contents

1. Introduction
2. Requirement
3. Engagement Process
4. General Overview of Feedback
5. Summary of Participant Feedback and Outcomes
6. Conclusion

1. Introduction

On 2 November 2018, PWGSC published a Letter of Interest (LOI) on the government electronic tendering service (GETS) seeking to engage with organizations on behalf of Status of Women Canada (SWC). As part of that engagement, organizations were asked to provide a written response to questions related to both the technical aspects of the Work to be undertaken and the procurement strategy. A draft Call for Proposal (CFP) was provided, which included the Statement of Work, Evaluation Criteria and the Basis of Selection.

The purpose of the Engagement was threefold:

- a) to provide organizations with general information about the requirement;
- b) to solicit feedback from organizations about their capability to undertake the requirement based on the draft Call for Proposal; and,
- c) to consult with organizations on ways to improve the solicitation, and increase accessibility and fairness to all potential suppliers.

Organizations were encouraged to ask questions and provide comments with the objective of ensuring a procurement that is fair and transparent to suppliers, enhances competition, and results in best value to Canada.

The publication of this document and resulting CFP effectively concludes the Engagement process. The information gathered through this process was considered when finalizing the procurement strategy and should meet the needs of the Government of Canada and be compatible with standard practices.

2. Requirement

SWC is seeking knowledge synthesis and/or research proposals in two Research Areas:

- 1) Gender-based violence (GBV), including, but not limited to, the following themes -
 - Prevention of GBV
 - Supports to Survivors and Families
 - Promotion of Responsive Justice Systems
- 2) Gender equality (GE), specifically in the following domains -
 - Economic participation and prosperity
 - Leadership and democratic participation
 - Education and skills development
 - Poverty reduction, health and well-being
 - Access to justice

For knowledge synthesis proposals, contractors will analyse and synthesize information, identify knowledge gaps and needs, and propose innovative responses on how to fill the knowledge gaps and needs through research. Knowledge synthesis proposals may also include proposals for further research for consideration of funding. Canada may, at its sole discretion, execute the option to support the proposed research.

Research proposals could include qualitative or quantitative methods, or a combination of both approaches (mixed-methods). Research proposals involving clinical trials are not eligible.

Proposals must fill knowledge gaps in support of key populations, which could include: Indigenous Peoples; women and girls; men and boys; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and non-binary individuals, queer, two-spirit (LGBTQ2) individuals; visible minorities; those living in northern, rural, and remote communities; people with disabilities; newcomers; children and youth; and seniors.

Contracts may be awarded for a 24 month period.

SWC also has special interest in accepting Indigenous-led and/or co-created research proposals related to the research areas that meets needs identified by Indigenous communities.

3. Engagement Process

Engagement Period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posting of Letter of Interest (LOI): 2 November 2018 • Responses to LOI requested: 15 November 2018 • Estimated Publication of Summary Report of Feedback: 3 December 2018 • Estimated Publication of the Call for Proposal: 10 December 2018
Participants	<p>Eight responses to the LOI were received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Association for Canadian Studies ➤ Alana Cattapan ➤ Criterion Institute ➤ Students for Consent Culture ➤ Social Research and Demonstration Corporation ➤ Diane-Gabrielle Tremblay ➤ Université du Québec à Montréal – Le Protocole UQAM/Relais-femmes du Service aux collectivités ➤ Whiteduck Resources Inc.

4. General Overview of Feedback

The consultative process provided Industry with an opportunity to participate in the procurement process by providing comments, questions and recommendations for improvement of the Draft CFP, and to seek clarification on technical issues.

Participants provided valuable feedback on technical details of the CFP and the proposed procurement strategy. Canada has adjusted some requirements to address technical questions, and some changes have been made to the CFP to address key issues raised herein. The final CFP will better describe Canada's requirements in relation to the technical capability available in Canada.

This document summarizes the feedback received during the Engagement Process and the outcome on the CFP.

4.1 *Call for Proposal*

It quickly became clear that many of the respondents did not understand the purpose of the Call for Proposal. There were a number of suggestions requesting that Canada be more specific or define the relationship(s) between research area and sub-topic. Others requested more detailed background information or a discussion of the current state of knowledge in the two research areas.

The Call for Proposal method of bid solicitation is used for complex R&D projects; or for scientific study and experimentation directed toward advancing the state-of-the-art; or, increasing knowledge or understanding or exploiting potential scientific discoveries and improvements in technology. Bidders respond to the CFP with a proposal, statement of requirement or technical approach in response to a statement of the problem, or general research interest, priority or gap. In this case, we have defined themes and domains. The proposed solutions can vary significantly, which requires an open and flexible evaluation strategy.

The CFP was chosen for this project to allow for the greatest amount of flexibility and diversity from bidders. SWC is seeking a wide variety of proposals from bidders related to the two research areas; each area was broadly defined to encourage proposals addressing any and all facets of the area. It is up to the bidders to support their proposal submission as being relevant to Gender Equality or Gender Based Violence and how their research will contribute to the knowledge base in a meaningful way.

The evidence generated through this process will help inform policy and program development to advance GE and address GBV. The two research areas reflect key priorities related to the mandate of Status of Women Canada. By calling upon stakeholders and experts in the fields of GE and GBV to identify critical knowledge gaps in these broad areas through the submission of proposals, SWC expects to build on current knowledge and advance new research to support their mandate to the benefit of all Canadians.

4.2 *Contracts v Grants*

The opportunity identified in the Letter of Interest and the future Call for Proposal reflect a contractual process. This is not a grant or a funding opportunity. The Call for Proposal will result in contracts.

Contract	Grant
Contractor is performing work required by Canada	The supplier is not acting on behalf of the government
Legally enforceable in a court of law; both parties are accountable for non-compliance	No legal accountability – no damages for non-performance or non-compliance
Canada directly benefits from the contract	Canada does not directly benefit; no deliverables
Reflects the mandate or core business requirement of Canada	No deliverable is provided to Canada; however, the goals or objectives of the organizations may align in some way
Contract document is the result – a fee is paid for a good/service provided for which there are clear terms and conditions and a pricing basis	Grant is the result – funding is provided which may have some conditions, none of which are enforceable

4.3 Proposals Received

A number of potential bidders submitted proposals in response to the Letter of Interest. These bidders were contacted as advised to resubmit their proposal to the final Call for Proposal.

Bidders are advised to follow the instructions provided in the Call for Proposal. Specific criteria have been included and Bidders must demonstrate how that criteria is met and provide sufficient information for Canada to determine that the information provided meets the criteria. It is recommended that Bidders follow the structure of the evaluation criteria (i.e., respond to M-1, M-2, etc.) in order to ensure you have addressed each criterion individually. Bidders may submit their research proposal and direct the evaluation team to the page number in the proposal the information can be found.

It is also important that bidders not submit their bids early. All bidders will be able to ask questions during the solicitation period and the response may result in a change to the criteria. No questions can be asked in the last seven days before the closing date. Thus, in order to ensure bidders have all the required information prior to bidding, it is recommended that bidders submit their bids within five days of the closing date and time.

5. Summary of Participant Feedback and Outcomes

The following represents questions posed in the Letter of Interest and the resulting responses from organizations. Not all questions posed by Canada were answered, and not all answers represented a conflict.

SECTION 1: Project Details	
1.1 Are any aspects of the Project unclear?	
Respondents identified the following questions or concerns:	Canada's Response:
a. Will only projects located in Ottawa will be funded?	Contracts will be awarded from bidders across Canada.
b. Clarify whether proposals limited to one province or territory can be submitted.	It is up to the bidder to define the work, including its scope. Canada has placed no conditions or constraints on the scope other than that defined in the CFP.
c. Can organizations submit an application that covers more than one of the research topics listed in the CFP?	There is no application; bidders must submit a proposal or a bid. It is up to the bidders to define the research area, topic and scope of the work. The topics provided are illustrative and not firm. Bidders may submit any topic(s) related to the Research Area. The same proposal must not be submitted for different Research Areas.
d. The relationship between some of the research topics and their sub-topics not clear.	Please refer to 4.1 above. It is up to the bidder to define the relationship between their chosen topic and the research area. The list provided was illustrative only.
e. The themes of the call were broad.	Yes, the themes are broad to encourage unique submissions. Please refer to 4.1 above.
f. Clarify what the budget is for each project and the number of projects that will be funded.	There is no specific budget for each project. Bidders must identify in their financial proposal the associated cost to perform the work. Bidders' financial proposals must not exceed \$1M. An overall budget of \$5M has been identified by SWC. A portion of that budget will be allocated to pre-qualified proposals until Canada reaches that maximum amount. The minimum number of proposals is five; however, it is

		anticipated that most projects will not reach the \$1M figure resulting in more contracts. Please refer to MMR-2 of the CFP.
g.	What is the minimum education level required to submit a proposal?	Please refer to MMR-2 of the draft CFP.
h.	Suggest a number of changes to the sequencing and organization of information in the CFP (e.g. moving the definition section, reformatting the evaluation criteria section, etc.).	SWC will consider these suggestions.
i.	Suggest Canada describe eligible and ineligible costs.	Bidders should review the Contract Cost Principles 1031-2 prior to submitting their financial proposal. 1031-2 can be found at the following link: https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual/3/1031-2/6
1.2 Do the Project Details have enough information for Bidders to submit a quality bid? What, if any, additional information would you need to see included in the document?		
Respondents identified the following questions or suggestions:		Canada's Response:
a.	Suggest adding more background information on the current state of GE and GBV in Canada.	Background on GE and GBV in Canada can be accessed on the following web sites: https://www.statcan.gc.ca/eng/topics-start/gender_diversity_and_inclusion , https://www.swc-cfc.gc.ca/violence/strategy-strategie/gbv-vfs-en.html Ultimately, it is up to the Bidder to determine the current state of GE or GBV using their expertise in the topic.
b.	<p>i) Suggest making more explicit that proposals relating to the evaluation of alternative forms of justice for survivors of sexual violence and/or sexual harassment are in scope</p> <p>ii) section 4.3 "Promotion of Responsive Justice Systems" be made more explicit with the inclusion of reference to indigenous community mechanisms such as community banishment, re-integration, restorative justice, alternative justice systems, etc.</p> <p>iii) section 4.6.3.2 Economic Participation and Prosperity include system barriers that impact women in indigenous communities and how</p>	<p>Please refer to 4.1 above. The list provided is illustrative. Bidders are required to submit proposals on topics within one of the individual domain, but are not limited to those topics in the bulleted list. Bidders are free to identify any topic within the realm of GE or GBV.</p> <p>Incorporating specific definitions or being more explicit in this list is too prescriptive; bidders are encouraged to define their own topics and methodologies taking into the consideration the evaluation criteria.</p>

	<p>accessibility to resources is structured for and communicated to women especially, as it relates to gender equality.</p> <p>iv) Suggest specifying which aspects of the GE and GBV domains are out of scope.</p> <p>v) Suggest clarifying and refining various topics in sections 4.6.2, 4.6.3.</p>	
c.	Suggest inviting research projects involving demonstration or experimentation may encourage more submissions of innovative and pioneering research.	Refer to 4.1 above. All qualitative and quantitative research methods are eligible (with the exception of clinical trials), including experimentation and innovation.
d.	Recommend clarifying what is meant by intersectionality, including an explicit delineation of intersectionality, and of GBA+, as related to the types of proposals that are being sought. The assumption is that SWC is interested in intersectionality as an analytical approach to projects.	Intersectionality and GBA+ are not required analytical approaches that proposals must use. Researchers should propose an approach that is most appropriate for achieving their project's objectives, and considers the evaluation criteria. More information on GBA+ can be found on SWC's web site: https://swc-cfc.gc.ca/gba-acrs/resources-ressources-en.html .
e.	Suggest clarifying whether the requirement that proposals fill knowledge gaps in support of key populations (section 4.5.2) applies only to research or to both research and knowledge synthesis proposals.	This requirement applies to both research and knowledge synthesis. The final CFP will be updated to clarify.
f.	Suggest indicating what GE and GBV outcomes are priorities for SWC and for which populations.	SWC's 2018/19 Departmental Plan contains information on outcomes, see section "Planned Results." https://swc-cfc.gc.ca/trans/account-resp/pr/dp-pm/1819/dp-pm-en.html
g.	It is unclear if SWC seeks demonstration projects (testing new and innovative solutions) or evaluations of existing or promising policies and programs.	While the implementation of innovations/programs/policies is not in scope, if the project to evaluate an innovation/program/policy would be considered research or knowledge synthesis as per the call's definitions, then this type of project would be eligible.

h.	Suggest providing additional information for specific research topics, such as whether they emerged out of existing research or whether a particular approach is preferred. Some topics are associated with a large body of existing research, and may be more effectively addressed through knowledge synthesis (and not new research).	Please refer to 4.1 above. Background information is not necessary to prepare a proposal. Some topics are associated with a large body of research, thus bidders are asked to justify the need for knowledge synthesis as per evaluation criteria SC-1.
i.	Having the deliverables (section 4.7) solely take the form of a report that will be available online on the Knowledge Centre will limit the types of knowledge translation strategies and suggested adding more information and/or requirements related to knowledge translation.	Section 4.7 indicates the minimum deliverable that will be required. Researchers are expected to define the results of their proposal and what will be delivered to Canada. Bidders may identify other deliverables in support of supplemental knowledge translation strategies. In terms of further elaborating requirements for knowledge translation strategies, as there are many valuable strategies depending on the type of project, it is left to the researcher to propose what is most suitable. Strategies will be evaluated as per evaluation criteria CEC-2.
SECTION 2: Evaluation and Basis of Selection		
2.1 Is it clear how Canada proposes to evaluate the bids?		
	Respondents generally felt the evaluation was clear or did not provide a response.	Canada's response:
a.	One respondent indicated it was unclear how the criteria in section 5.4.2 (Selection Committee) will be used to evaluate proposals, and if more information on these criteria are available.	<p>The Selection Committee will be provided with the top ranked proposals that fall within the overall budget of \$5M based on the financial proposal submitted by the bidder. These proposals will then be reviewed to determine alignment with the criteria in section 5.4.2.</p> <p>In order to exploit the most current information, the Selection Committee will also determine if the proposal is complementary to other initiatives funded by Canada or aligned with new or emerging operational and policy issues which cannot be defined in advance.</p> <p>SWC will consider the refining this criteria.</p>

2.2 Is it clear what information you must provide in your proposal to obtain the maximum points?		
The following clarifications were requested:		
Canada's Response:		
a.	It is unclear on what is being sought in terms of information for CEC-4 Interdependencies between tasks.	Interdependencies between tasks could be described in various ways. Interdependencies could be described using text, or visually depicted using a Gantt chart, a PERT chart, etc.
b.	Clarify CEC-4 to describe the required content and relevance of the WBS or PP.	CEC-4 clearly provides seven elements that should be included in the work breakdown structure / project plan. The work breakdown structure defines the milestones and tasks the bidder expects to undertake in the performance of the work and the time required to complete each task. This information is then used in coordination with the financial proposal to determine the cost of the project/resulting contract. Bidders must explain and justify why Canada should expend its budget on the project. A work breakdown structure details the bidders' time, resources, effort, interdependencies and, ultimately, the proposed budget to undertake the work.
c.	It was not clear what is required of bidders in preparing budgets and if any points are allocated.	No points are allocated to the financial proposal. The financial proposal should be aligned to the elements identified in the work breakdown structure / project plan.
d.	Section 3.5 states that the financial proposal ought to be aligned with the work plan detailed under 3.3; however no work plan appears mentioned in section 3.3.	The text should read "The bidder should provide a financial proposal aligned to the work plan defined in evaluation criteria CEC-4."
e.	Clarify evaluation criteria SC-2 that asks for evidence to be provided on the innovative nature of the research, for example what if there is no evidence base on the research topic proposed.	Innovation is defined in the criteria as representing "a new approach or a significant modification/improvement to an existing approach." Bidders are expected to explain how their research differs from existing approaches. Innovation can be applied to the research topic itself, the

		<p>research parameters (i.e., population, age, etc.) or to the proposed methodology to be utilized. It is up to the bidder to differentiate their proposed research from existing research.</p> <p>In the example provided by the respondent, one approach the researcher could consider is to provide evidence from existing literature reviews to show there is no evidence base for the research topic proposed.</p>
2.3 Are there any elements you believe should be included in the evaluation?		
The following suggestions were offered by Respondents:		Canada's Response:
a.	Continuous rather than discrete scores.	Canada will take this under consideration.
b.	Add sustainability of the project after SWC funding ends to the evaluation criteria.	Research projects are expected to be realistic to undertake within a one-year time period. Longer term sustainability of a program of research is outside the scope of this call.
c.	Refine evaluation criteria CEC-6 (Collaborators) to allow for the possibility that a contract through this call for proposals could instigate new partnerships.	If collaborators are required to carry out the proposed project, they must be identified at the time of proposal so CEC-6 can be evaluated. Instigating or sustaining relationships with partners is outside the scope of the contract.
d.	The experience of the team in collaborating with community groups working for the equality of women be evaluated.	Experience collaborating with community groups will be evaluated through the Collective Team Evaluation table, criteria related to experience in the proposal's methodology (assuming the proposal is using community-based research methodologies).
e.	Evaluation criteria CEC-2 (Knowledge Translation) was not sufficient as knowledge translation should be two way and begin from the start of the project.	SWC will clarify the wording of CEC-2. The intention is not to prescribe one-way knowledge translation strategies that only occur at the end of the research process.

f.	Table 5.3.3.3, Collective Team Evaluation, item A (Publications) in combination with the requirement for the Principal Investigator/Project Manager to hold a PhD (MMR-2), may favor universities and suggested community members with “lived experience” should be recognized, and the call should encourage more researchers undertaking community initiatives. Another respondent suggested removing MMR-2 and allowing for alternative qualifications.	Criteria MMR-2 will remain unchanged. This is not to favor universities as individuals with Ph.D. qualifications also work in settings outside universities. Lived experience of team members can make an impact on the point rating of the proposal in the following ways (not exhaustive): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • these team members may facilitate collaboration (CEC-6), • they may contribute their knowledge of community-based research methodologies or indigenous ways of knowing to the project’s methodology(CEC-3), or • have experience in Indigenous and/or community-based research methodologies (Collective Team Evaluation table, criteria related to experience in the proposal’s methodology).
g.	Add to the criteria an assessment of the estimated impact of the proposed projects with respect to advancing GE and reducing GBV.	The impact of research on advancing GE and reducing GBV are assessed indirectly via other criteria, e.g. CEC-1, CEC-2, CEC-6.
h.	Rephrase MR-1 to include, but not limit it to, written confirmations for the collaborators, of the relevance of the proposal’s objectives to First Nations, Inuit and/or Métis collaborators and communities could be based on multiple factors, including existing research and data, as well as the testimonies of communities and collaborators.	Criteria MR-1 will remain unchanged. Additional forms of evidence can be provided to support the written confirmation.
i.	Rephrase CEC-2 (Knowledge Translation) so knowledge translation is not limited only to engagement with stakeholders.	SWC will consider this suggestion.
j.	Split CEC-3 (Methodology) to allow more specific aspects of the methodology to be evaluated (e.g. appropriateness to the subject/population, limitations, etc.).	No changes will be made to CEC-3 text; however, consideration will be given changing the weight applied.
k.	Depth of experience should be assessed in criteria MGT-1.	The depth of experience is assessed via MGT-2 Collective Team Evaluation, which includes the Principal Investigator/Project Manager as well as other team members.

i.	Simplify MGT-2 and the associated table to assess the collective team.	Canada will not accept this suggestion at this time.
m.	Clarify if CEC-1 (Importance) applies to both knowledge synthesis and research projects.	The CFP will be updated to reflect that both knowledge synthesis and research projects will be assessed against this criteria.
n.	Remove reference to 3 project risks in CEC-5 (Risks) and reference to outcomes should be included.	Criteria CEC-5 will remain unchanged.
2.4 Are there any elements that you believe do not add value to the evaluation process?		
a.	One respondent suggested the weighting of CEC-6 (Collaborators) was high, and could be removed and integrated into other existing evaluation criteria.	SWC will keep this as a standalone criteria, but reconsider the weighting.
2.5 Will you be able to achieve the minimum required score?		
a.	Four respondents indicated they will be able to meet the minimum required score.	
2.6 Provide any suggestions that, in your opinion, could improve the evaluation process or contractor selection methodology.		
Two suggestions were offered by Respondents:		Canada's Response:
a.	Further explanation of the statement under MR-2 that reads "The Bidder must provide a Proposal detailing the requested information in Part 3, article 3.3.1."	Thank you. This will be corrected in the final version.
b.	Add a page limit for the technical proposal.	SWC will consider this suggestion.
SECTION 3: Contract Terms		
3.1 Do you understand the contractor obligations?		Canada's Response:

a.	One respondent did not find it clear what is required by way of certifications (Part 6) at time of submission and what may be provided after pre-qualification.	The Part 6 – Certifications clearly identifies this information: A Certifications Required with the Proposal B Certifications Precedent to Contract Award
3.2 Did you review the referenced general conditions? Are they acceptable?		
a.	Three respondents indicated the general conditions were acceptable. One respondent indicated they did not review them.	
3.3 Do you understand the option to extend the contract process?		
Four responses were received to this question:		Canada's Response:
a.	Two respondents suggested adding more clarity regarding optional services.	Optional services are defined in article 4.5.3 of Part 4, Project Details.
b.	One respondent did not understand who initiates this process, and how.	Canada initiates the process at their sole discretion. Discussions will take place between the Contractor and the Technical Authority in advance of exercising this article.
c.	One respondent indicated it was unclear whether the optional services entail a separate proposal or if they would be subsumed within an existing project and, if yes, under what conditions (e.g., an extension to project or modification to the scope of work).	Optional services may be defined in the original proposal submitted by the Bidder or may be further defined by the Contractor once the results of the initial stage of the work is complete. A separate proposal may be required in terms of defining the work; however, the rates identified in the Basis of Payment will remain the same.
SECTION 4: Other		
4.1 Please identify any other issues, concerns, recommendations not addressed above.		
A number of suggestions were posed by Respondents:		Canada's Response:

a.	Consider including hyperlinks throughout the document to sections of reference, as well as including the title of the content in question.	Hyperlinks will be included in the Table of Contents for the final CFP.
b.	Suggest you reduce the maximum amount per contract to permit more projects to be funded.	The maximum project funding specified in section 1.2 is to allow flexibility for researchers in proposing projects of varying cost, it does not indicate intent to fund five projects at \$1M each.
c.	Suggest eligible costs should include compensation for women's groups for their expertise and participation in a research partner committee.	Bidders should identify all costs associated with the work to be undertaken. Such compensation would fall within the category of Other Direct Costs as indicated in 1031-2 Contract Cost Principles.
d.	When contracts begin a first payment should be made immediately, instead of after submitting the first deliverable.	Such payment would constitute an Advance Payment which is strictly prohibited under the <i>Financial Administration Act</i> , except in very specific circumstances. Those circumstances are not in evidence here.
e.	It was odd to see Canada and not SWC as the offeror of the contract and that contracts would be offered to "contractors" and not "researchers."	From a legal standpoint, all federal government departments and agencies are a single entity: the Government of Canada. The contractor is the legal entity. Canada can only contract with legal entities. In the case of individual researchers, bidders are encouraged to register as a sole proprietor with the Canada Revenue Agency.
f.	A Procurement Strategy for Aboriginal Business (PSAB) set aside component for two Research Areas should be considered	The PSAB was considered in the development of the CFP; however, this would limit the call to Aboriginal firms registered with Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada to perform this type of work. It was decided to state in the CFP SWC's interest in proposals involving Indigenous-led and/or co-created research related to the research areas that meets needs identified by Indigenous communities.
g.	Section 7.2.1 states that the contractor owns intellectual property (IP) rights it is unclear from the subsequent section what limitations, if any, are placed on IP.	There are no restrictions placed on the IP. As detailed in section 7.2.2, Canada has a license to materials created under the contract.
h.	Suggest Canada extend the initial proposal period to be longer than one year.	SWC will consider this suggestion.

i.	Suggest that the list of Gender Equality research topics in Section 4.6.3 is not exhaustive, similar to the Gender-Based Violence research topics (Section 4.6.2).	Bidders must submit a proposal within one of the domains detailed in the CFP; the bulleted list, however, is illustrative. Bidders may submit any topic as long as it is aligned to one of the noted themes.
4.2 Will you submit a proposal? If not, why?		
	Four respondents indicated they would submit a proposal and one respondent indicated they would act as a partner on a proposal submitted by an eligible Canadian Bidder.	

6. Conclusion

The above feedback has informed Canada of areas of potential concern for some Participants which resulted in improvement of the procurement process through the implementation of changes to the final CFP that will address the key concerns.

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