



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux
Canada

Place Bonaventure,
800 rue de la Gauchetière Ouest
Voir aux présentes - See herein
Montréal

Québec
H5A 1L6

FAX pour soumissions: (514) 496-3822

**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

Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Place Bonaventure, portail Sud-Oue
800, rue de La Gauchetière Ouest
7^e étage, suite 7300
Montréal
Québec
H5A 1L6

Title - Sujet EOSC - Pre-concept Studies	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 9F044-190081/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 001
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 9F044-190081	Date 2020-02-11
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-SMTB-550-15642	
File No. - N° de dossier MTB-9-42040 (550)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2020-03-20	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Heure Normale du l'Est HNE	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Mirfatahi, Kaveh	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur mtb550
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (514) 260-4106 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (514) 496-3822
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 No. - N° de l'invitation
9F044-190081/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
9F044-190081

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
001
File No. - N° du dossier
MTB-9-42040

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
mtb550
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

Project Title

Concept Studies for Earth Observation for Service Continuity

The above mentioned Request for Proposal (RFP) is hereby amended as follows:

A. Answer the following bidders' questions:**Question 1:**

At Annex A – Statement of Work, the reference documents below are not in the Request for Proposals. How can we get access to them?

Table2.2-1: Reference Documents

RD No.	Document Number	Document Title	Rev. No.	Date
RD-1.		Department of National Defence and Canadian Armed Forces Space-Based Surveillance Requirements	Rev. 2.0	
RD-2.	CSA-RC-RD-0002	RADARSAT Constellation: Mission Requirements Document	H	July 2019

Answer 1:

Supplier can get access to the abovementioned reference documents by submitting a written request to the contracting authority by email or mail.

B. Bring the following changes to the RFP**Change 1:**

At **Attachment 1 to Part 4 of the Bid Solicitation – Technical and Management Evaluation Criteria:**

DELETE in its entirety and **REPLACE** by the **Attachment 1 to Part 4 of the Bid Solicitation – Technical and Management Evaluation Criteria** hereby attached.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
9F044-190081/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
9F044-190081

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
001
File No. - N° du dossier
MTB-9-42040

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
mtb550
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

ATTACHMENT 1 to PART 4 OF THE BID SOLICITATION

TECHNICAL AND MANAGEMENT EVALUATION CRITERIA

The technical and management evaluation criteria are hereby attached.



Canadian Space Agency
Agence spatiale
canadienne

1. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Evaluation Criteria	Minimum Score	Weighted Maximum Score
1) State of the art knowledge		18
2) Methodology		30
3) Earth observation concept study experience		24
4) Team Experience		24
5) Project Management		24
Total score	80	120

1. State of the art knowledge

This criterion assesses how the proposal demonstrates the bidders understanding of the state of the art in earth observation to address Canadian challenges. Element to be considered include:

- Spacecraft platform and technologies
- Measurement Technologies
- Ground segment
- Data exploitation (Cloud storage and processing, Artificial intelligence, Data analytics)
- Free and Open data availability and use
- Commercial available data

The point rated evaluation criteria:

0 points	The proposal does not contain a review of the state of the art applicable to the SoW requirements.
6 points	The proposal contains a review of the state of the art applicable to the SoW requirements.
12 points	The proposal contains a review of the state of the art applicable to the SoW requirements. The proposal identifies the relevant source of information/data (commercial system, free and open data, etc.) that would need to be considered in the study.

18 points The proposal contains a review of the state of the art applicable to the SoW requirements. The proposal identifies the relevant source of information/data (commercial system, free and open data, etc.) that would need to be considered in the study. The proposal provides a preliminary analysis of the impact of the available information sources on the compliance to the overall HUN, and how they will influence the selection of a solution. The proposal identifies emerging technologies and applications and how they could influence the proposed solution.

2. Methodology

This criterion assesses how the proposal demonstrates the bidder's methodology will be efficient to produce the deliverables within the required timeframe.

To be fully compliant with this evaluation criteria, the contractor must:

- Provide a complete description of the methodology planned for the study
- Demonstrate it has access to sufficient information to generate the required solution, Business Model, schedule and costing information within the required timeframe.
- Provide evidence to support the methodology with a preliminary description, preliminary performance analysis, preliminary costing and preliminary schedule of a potential solution/business model to be studied.
- Identify technology development roadmap and key area(s) for R&D
- Identify relevant trade-off(s) to be performed.
- Describe how the proposed methodology will lead to an unbiased solution.

The point rated evaluation criteria:

0 points	The proposal does not contain a methodology.
10 points	The proposal contains a methodology but its ability to produce the deliverables identified in the SoW is not justified or credible. A preliminary list of key technologies to be developed is provided.
20 points	The proposal contains a methodology to produce the required deliverables identified in the SoW. The proposed methodology to produce the deliverables within the required timeline is credible and is supported by some of the elements of a preliminary solution (preliminary description, preliminary performance analysis, preliminary costing and preliminary schedule). A preliminary list of key technologies and/or developments (including development needed because of obsolescence as relevant) required is provided.
30 points	The proposal contains a methodology to produce the required deliverables identified in the SoW. Relevant trade-offs to be performed

are identified. The ability of the methodology to produce the deliverables within the required timeline is credible and is supported by all elements (description, preliminary analysis, preliminary costing and preliminary schedule) of a preliminary solution. A Technology development roadmap (including developments needed because of obsolescence as relevant) and key areas for R&D is provided. The proposal clearly highlights how the proposed methodology will lead to an unbiased solution.

3. Earth observation concept study experience

This criterion assesses the bidder's experience in undertaking concept study for Earth Observation mission of comparable complexity and scope.

The key technical fields required to perform the work include but are not limited to;

- Payload Analysis and Trade-off
- Mission Concept Design
- Mission Development Planning
- Data service delivery

The point rated evaluation criteria:

0 points	The proposal does not demonstrate the bidder's experience.
8 points	The proposal demonstrates the bidder's experience with at least one Earth Observation Concept Study in the last 10 years.
16 points	The proposal demonstrates the bidder's experience with at least two Earth Observation Concept Studies in the last 10 years. The proposal clearly demonstrates how the previous bidder's studies experience address the key technical fields of the current study. The proposal demonstrates that these studies have been successful (i.e. completed in time and within budget). The tools/software/standard practices of the bidder are clearly described.
24 points	The proposal demonstrates the bidder's experience with at least two Earth Observation Concept Studies in the last 10 years. The proposal clearly demonstrates how the previous bidder's studies address the key technical fields of the current study. The proposal demonstrates that these studies have been successful (i.e. completed in time and within budget). The previous concept studies must be of similar scope and complexity. The tools/software/standard practices of the bidder are clearly described and their applicability to the current work is demonstrated.



The bidder shall provide complete contact information of a point of contact for each study used to demonstrate compliance to this criteria with the submission of the bid. CSA may contact these points of contact to validate the successful completion of the study.

4. Team Experience

This criterion assesses the accumulation of knowledge and skills resulting from direct participation in relevant activities to this project for each of the team members.

The key technical fields required to perform the work include but are not limited to:

- Payload Analysis and Trade-off
- Mission Concept Design
- Mission Development Planning
- Data service delivery

The point rated evaluation criteria:

0 points	The proposal does not demonstrate the team possesses the experience required to perform the work.
8 points	The proposal demonstrates the team possesses some of the experience required to perform the work.
16 points	The proposal demonstrates the team possesses all of the experience required to perform the work. The proposal states, verifiable projects and activities to support all experience claims. Role and responsibilities as well as the level of effort of each team member is clearly defined.
24 points	The proposal demonstrates the team possesses all of the experience required to perform the work. The proposal states, verifiable multiple projects and mandates performed in the last five (5) years in support of all experience claims. Role and responsibilities as well as the level of effort of each team member is clearly defined.

5. Project Management Plan

This criterion assesses the Project Management Plan (PMP) to execute what is cited in the proposal. The project management plan should be **complete**, **coherent** and **credible**.

Components of the PMP include, but are not limited to:



- Scope management (requirements tracking, work packs and activities, change management etc.)
- Time management (schedules, actuals, forecasts etc.)
- Cost, expenditures and added value (budget containment and control, cost breakdowns etc.)
- Quality control (benchmarks, management plan, etc)
- Human resources management (complementarity of teams members, back-ups, Resources Allocation Matrix, etc.)
- Communications and reporting (timeliness, relevancy, transparency etc.)

Complete: includes all PMP components outlined above

Coherent: orderly, logical and consistent

Credible: substantiated by factual demonstration and valid assumptions

The point rated evaluation criteria:

0 points	The proposal does not contain a PMP.
8 points	The proposal contains an incomplete PMP.
16 points	The proposal contains a complete, coherent and credible PMP.
24 points	The proposal contains a complete, coherent and credible PMP. Additionally, the proposal demonstrates the project leader/manager has been delegated all the necessary authorities to efficiently deliver the work.