



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving Public Works and Government
Services Canada/Réception des soumissions Travaux
publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada

1713 Bedford Row

Halifax, N.S./Halifax, (N.É.)

Halifax

Nova Scotia

B3J 1T3

Bid Fax: (902) 496-5016

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

Atlantic Region Acquisitions/Région de l'Atlantique
Acquisitions

1713 Bedford Row

Halifax, N.S./Halifax, (N.É.)

Halifax

Nova Scot

B3J 1T3

Title - Sujet Maritime Information Warfare	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W7707-196524/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W7707-19-6524	Date 2019-09-17
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-SHAL-104-5926	
File No. - N° de dossier HAL-9-82018 (104)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2019-10-08	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Atlantic Daylight Saving Time ADT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Nowakowski, Leanne	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur hal104
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (902) 403-7112 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (902) 496-5016
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

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

Solicitation Amendment 002 is being issued to provide the questions and answers received to date.

Questions and Answers:

- 1) Evaluation criteria M4, M7, M10 require B.Eng degrees in relevant fields or B.Sc. degrees in Computer Science. It seems restrictive with respect to the experience asked for Software Engineer/Designer, Database Engineer and Computer Programmer roles. Are the following diplomas acceptable for each of these positions: PhD or Master in Physics? And are the following diplomas considered in relevant fields: Master Eng Physics, B.Sc. Eng Physics?
 - a. No, a PhD or Master in Physics will not be accepted for each of these position. No, a Master Eng Physics, B.Sc. Eng Physics will not be considered relevant fields for this requirement.
- 2) Can a resource be proposed for more than one position? For instance, can the same person be proposed as Project Manager and SME or can the same person be proposed as Software Engineer and Database engineer?
 - a. Yes, a resource can be proposed for more than one position.
- 3) Considering the RFP was published during the summer vacation period, would it be possible to extend the closing date by one month to October 11, 2019?
 - a. The closing date has been extended until October 8th, 2019.
- 4) Could you please provide more information on the expected value of the contract and the funding available for this project?
 - a. No, this information will not be provided for this Project.
- 5) Could you please provide more information on the reasoning behind the points related criteria weighting of training certificates in addition to demonstrated experience. To that end, would the Technical Authority consider waving the requirements for training certificates if an application demonstrates a high level of competency, such as having delivered a specific level of projects in the related field?
 - a. First, it is acknowledged that both formal training and experience are important and have scored according. Second, a mandatory requirement for training/certificates is not present and the requirements for training certificates will not be waved.
- 6) **Annex B – Basis of Payment for Material:** Canada has instructed bidders to include pricing for labour at “firm rates including profit, overhead and travel fees (unless travel is required/specified as per the Task Authorization), GST/HST extra.” But with regard to ‘Materials’, Canada states that ‘All equipment purchased and invoiced against this contract will be billed at cost and will be identified at each issued Task Authorization form.’ Would Canada agree to change the basis of payment for Materials as follows:

CHANGE FROM: All equipment purchased and invoiced against this contract will be billed at cost and will be identified at each issued Task Authorization form.

CHANGE TO: All equipment purchased and invoiced against this contract will be billed fully burdened, inclusive of General & Administrative expense, overheads and profit, and will be identified at each issued Task Authorization form.

- a. The wording in the Basis of Payment will not be changed. As indicated, materials will be paid for at cost.

- 7) **Annex B – Basis of Payment for Labour:** Canada has instructed bidders to include pricing for travel in the labour rate table. But the National Joint Council Travel Directive will apply for any travel, accommodation and living expenses. Would Canada agree to change the basis of payment for Labour as follows:

CHANGE FROM: Labour: at the following firm rates including profit, overhead and travel fees (unless travel is required/specified as per the Task Authorization), GST/HST extra.

CHANGE TO: Labour: at the following firm rates fully burdened, inclusive of General & Administrative expense, overheads and profit, GST/HST extra.

- a. The wording in the Basis of Payment will not be changed, as this is standard wording.

- 8) **Time Sheets:** Paragraph 6.8a, Invoicing Instructions, states that each Claim for Progress Payment on form PWGSC 1111 form must be supported by 'a copy of time sheets to support the time claimed'. Would Canada please delete this requirement to submit time sheets to support our claims?

We can and do provide all of the information required by the PWGSC 1111 form including labour categories, hourly rates, and number of hours, which our financial system can readily produce. However, it is time-consuming to extract the relevant information from time sheets given that employees may work on several programs in any given time period. Canada has the right to conduct a government audit and interim time and cost verifications upon request. We believe that this fulfills the requirement of the Government of Canada in a way that is efficient; the proposed time sheets would unnecessarily burden the management of the program, resulting in added indirect costs to the government.

- a. In order to confirm the work being claimed in a progress payment, time cards are required.

- 9) **Certification Scoring:** Canada has allocated a significant score weighting to technical certifications. Additionally, the score allocated to each engineering resource far outweighs the score that can be assigned to available for SMEs. This weighting heavily skews scoring towards Bidders that focus on certifications rather than those Bidders that have considerable program execution and delivery experience. As a Bidder that focuses on delivering complex technical Maritime Awareness solutions and products and used by DND, our experience with delivering these technologies would not be correctly reflected in the scoring. The same applies to the value that is fundamental to the program that is brought by the SMEs. With regard to certifications this scoring appears to be redundant; for example an experienced Linux developer can easily work with both Ubuntu and Red Hat, but there are additional points available for certification in Red Hat and CentOS. Given that Red Hat is the paid support version of CentOS, having both certifications appears to be redundant.

Will Canada agree to reduce the scoring values attributed to certifications and alter the weighting of the individuals in such a manner that the SME scoring is at least equivalent in weight to the technical resource scoring? We believe that doing so will allow a Bidder that has a mature history of

implementing complex program design, execution and delivery to DND along with extensive subject matter expertise to be represented fairly to the ultimate benefit of Canada.

- a. No, the scoring will not be altered.

- 10) **Ownership of Foreground Intellectual Property:** Paragraph 6.2.2 SACC Manual Clauses states that the applicable clause is "SACC Manual Clause K3410C (2015-02-25) Canada to Own Intellectual Property Rights in Foreground Information". Would Canada consider changing this requirement such that SACC Manual Clause 4006 (2010-08-16) or equivalent applies, such that the Contractor would Own Intellectual Property Rights in Foreground Information instead?

Alternatively, would the Government of Canada consider granting the Contractor a license to use or sell such developed Foreground IP, either within Canada or for export, in association with licensing agreements that could be made between Contractor and the Government that could attract mutual economic benefit?

- a. No, the SACC Manual Clause will remain unchanged. However, The Government of Canada would consider granting the Contractor a license to use or sell developed Foreground (This would be negotiated separately in another agreement).

- 11) According to chapter 10 of the RFP, the work must be performed on Contractor site, at DRDC Atlantic or at a third-party site chosen by the Technical Authority. Provided that we are not based in Nova Scotia, can we assume that most of the work can be performed at the contractor's site with only occasional visits at DRDC Atlantic?

- a. Yes, it can be assumed that most of the work will be performed at the Contractor's site with occasional visits to DRDC Atlantic.

- 12) For the rated criteria P1 to P11, does a course followed as part of a university degree count as a certification?

- a. Yes, as long as the course is a minimum length of 20 hours.

- 13) For the evaluation of criteria P12, does all the peer reviewed publication count or only those relevant to the SME's speciality area or those related to the topics mentioned in criteria M13?

- a. Only those publications contributing to INFO or MSA count towards the scoring of criteria P12.

- 14) For the evaluation of the mandatory criteria M13, are the proposed publications required to be relevant to the SME's speciality area?

- a. No. The papers are connected to one of the 6 categories indicated within the criteria and the SME must be an author.

- 15) **Annex E – Evaluation Criteria, 2. POINT-RATED EVALUATION CRITERIA (P):** The title for Paragraph 2.1 is 'Senior Engineer/Designer Experience'. And the title for Paragraph 2.2 is 'Senior Database Engineer Experience'. And the title for Paragraph 2.3 is 'Senior Computer Programmer Experience'. But within these sections the Bidder should demonstrate that 'each' proposed resource has experience.

Would Canada please confirm whether only the Bidder's 'senior' resources will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria given in these sections? If so, can Canada confirm on what criteria and for what points value the "junior" resources will be evaluated, if at all.

- a. This is a valid point. The word 'each' in those evaluation criteria should be replaced with 'the'. It is confirmed that only the senior resource will be evaluated according to the evaluation criteria in the noted sections for Point-Rated Evaluation Criteria. There is Mandatory Criteria that the "junior" resources will be evaluated against.