Public Works and Government Services Canada | Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada

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 Signal Processing Dev & Support	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W7707-196494/A	**Amendment No. - N° modif.** 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W7707-19-6494	**Date** 2020-02-27
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-$HAL-309-10876	
File No. - N° de dossier HAL-8-81253 (309)	**CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME**
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin **at - à 02:00 PM** **on - le 2020-03-13**	**Time Zone** **Fuseau horaire** Atlantic Standard Time AST
F.O.B. - F.A.B. **Plant-Usine:** ☐ **Destination:** ☑ **Other-Autre:** ☐	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: MacNeil, Blaine A.	**Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur** hal309
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (902) 403-3918 ( )	**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**	

Canada

Amendment 2

Q1. In the point-rated criteria (section 2) questions P4 to P21, column 2 of the table refers at various places to "the technical resource", "the technical resources", and "the technical resource(s)". The contractor wishes to know whether the identified expertise for each of the six identified technical resources (that is, excluding the project manager) must be contained within a single named individual, or can it be shared across two or more named members of the team when computing the technical score. Where up to 2000 hours per year (one full person-year) are required for some of the technical positions we feel it is not reasonable to expect that only a single resource be allowed in the scoring, and the Crown will receive better value and be ensured of a quicker delivery time if "the technical resource" can be shared across two or more individuals.)

No, the technical resource does not need to be contained to a single named individual, it can be shared across multiple individuals.

Q2. P2 of the point-rated criteria, states: The bidder should demonstrate that the technical resource, software engineer or scientific programmer has previous experience (has worked on one or more projects **as defined in 1.c**) generating synthetic data for the testing of acoustic DCLT algorithms in the past 60 months. The Contractor can find no reference to **1.c** in the RFP. Please clarify what is actually meant by 1.c or correct this requirement if it is a typographical error.

"(has worked on one or more projects as defined in 1.c)" can be removed from P2. We took out that giant preamble about what project definitions were at the top of the EC, it was originally contained there.

Q3. P7 of the point-rated criteria, states: "The bidder must demonstrate that the scientific programming resource has a minimum of **60 months of experience programming ...within the past 36 months**". Please correct the text to what the actual requirement is.

I see what the issue is: it's impossible to gain 60 months of experience within the last 36 months! This must have been a copy-paste error that occurred somewhere along the way. So, let's change the wording to the following to be consistent with the criteria for the senior programming resource:

The bidder must demonstrate that the scientific programming resource gained experience programming in one or more of C/C++, MATLAB/IDL, or PYTHON, within the past 36 months.

Q4. Please expand on or clarify what "algorithm development" implies for evaluating the scoring. That is to say, does this refer to translating scientific algorithms that have already been derived by other technical experts (which the Contractor believes is the more natural use of the software development team) or is the scientific programmer actually required to derive the scientific algorithms (which the

Contractor believes lies more naturally within in the scientific expertise of the signal processor team member and/or the senior acoustic analyst)?

"Algorithm development" can be defined as one of, or a combination of, the following:

- developing algorithms from scientific principles, possibly in consultation with scientific/technical experts, or
- refining previously developed code to find efficiencies.

An example of the second point would be taking "scientific" code developed by a technical expert in a programming language like MATLAB and implementing it in C, or re-working it in such a way that it takes best advantage of available computer processing power.

Q5. There is substantial overlap and crossover of technical expertise within the SOW. For example, many if not all of the requirements of the senior acoustic analyst identified in P14-P19 lie just as naturally within the expertise of the signal processing expert. Therefore, the Contractor wishes to know if: for scoring purposes, can individuals be cross-listed in more than one technical area? Example: Person A and Person B collectively fulfil ALL requirements for full points for technical resource X and technical resource Y. However, due to the somewhat arbitrary choice of the technical split within the scoring matrix, there is not a perfect match for Person A or Person B to technical resource X or technical resource Y. The contractor notes that no resource will ever be used at more than 100% capacity within the scoring matrix but wishes to optimize its technical expertise to ensure the project has access to its full capability.

Yes, individuals can be cross-listed in more than one technical area.

Q6. The Contractor wishes to know if all members of the supporting team (that is, those listed, but not used in the scoring matrix) are required to possess Canadian Secret or NATO secret clearance, or only those individuals who will be working on classified components of the project. The contractor is concerned that disallowing contributions from those without this qualification for supporting technical tasks will have a negative impact on contract delivery.

No, not everyone needs to have a secret clearance. There will be tasks that require only a reliability clearance. Only the individuals working on classified components need have a secret clearance; however, all individuals scored in the bid evaluation must have a clearance, or attain a clearance during the course of this contract. At the start of the contract there must be a core group of individuals capable of conducting classified work.

Q7. The Contractor wishes to know if all members of the supporting technical team (that is, those listed, but not used in the scoring matrix) are required to possess Controlled Goods certification, or only those individuals who will be working on Controlled Goods during the project. The contractor is concerned that disallowing contributions from those without this qualification for supporting technical tasks will have a negative impact on contract delivery.

Response pending.

Q8. This question expands on concerns related to Q6 and Q7. The content of the IT Security Requirements Document, specifically Section 1.3 (*definition of proprietary information*) and Section 2.3 *Personnel Security*, seem to be in conflict with the statements contained in the SRCL as regards IP, controlled goods, security requirements, and citizenship status of those working on the contract. Please disambiguate the requirements. We believe the intention of the RFP is that non-Canadian citizens on the team and those who do not hold a security clearance can perform UNCLASSIFIED theoretical/technical work in support of the contract but the text is unclear. We feel that excluding contributions on unclassified work from anyone not holding a valid security clearance or non-Canadians will have a negative impact to the Crown, especially as regards Task 5.2 (algorithm development).

The IT Security Requirements are specifically for the production and storage of PROTECTED/CLASSIFIED information and/or data. Thus, all restrictions in this document apply only to those who will access the PROTECTED/CLASSIFIED IT system. The SRCL indicates that there will be tasks for which only reliability screening is required. Exact security requirements will be more clearly established on a task-by-task basis.

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.