



RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:
Christine Picknell
TPSGC.PADivisionQE-APQEDivision.PW
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

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
Security and Information Operations Division/Division
de la sécurité et des opérations d'information
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
8C2, Place du Portage
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet CFLEWM project	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W8476-196070/B	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8476-196070	Date 2020-08-25
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$QE-015-27791	
File No. - N° de dossier 015qe.W8476-196070	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2020-09-17	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
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: Picknell, Christine	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 015qe
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone () - ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
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

Canadian Forces Land Electronic Warfare Modernization

Request for Information – Amendment 03

This amendment is raised to answer questions from potential suppliers.

Questions and Answers:

Q1. What percentage of the envisioned capability can be derived from your current systems?

A1. This is not clear. The project is seeking to upgrade the Land EW capability, provide FP ECM against RC-IEC, and if possible to integrate these two. At this stage in the project development, it is more prudent to explore all possible solutions and are not constrained in terms of which equipment and in what configuration must be brought forward.

Q2. When will a GFE list of current or supplied items, systems, protocols and collective capability requirements be released on which to build an offer?

A2. Need-to-know GFE information will be released with the draft RFP. Security requirements and non-disclosure agreements should be expected. Information release regarding protocols is not yet scheduled and we are seeking protocols and standards recommendations from industry.

Q3. Is a common C2 management system with NATO standard interoperability protocols in place as a GFE 'Command Node' or being considered as a separate entity?

A3. No, a GFE that provides this capability does not exist.

Q4. How does the CFLEWM project fit with the other projects within the Land C4ISR Core Capital Projects Program in terms of IOC and FOC, for example the Land ISR Mod Project and the TacComms Mod Project?

A4. CFLEWM is one of several projects within the C4ISR program, and the timelines are generally aligned to achieve IOC and FOC near the same time. Projects dependencies will be addressed through close coordination throughout the project development cycle. The details regarding these dependencies are not fully defined and require further examination.

Q5. Regarding FP ECM/Counter-RCIED, how "deep" do you want to go, i.e. simple jamming, direction finding (DF), signal collection, exploitation, etc.?

A5. This will depend upon how much capability industry can provide and at what cost. Although Multi-Function EW (MFEW) is a proven concept, the project team has not determined how practical it will be for Industry to deliver all the related capabilities at this early stage of the project. Industry feedback is expected to inform this decision.

Q6. From the vignette – does the Authority wish to achieve all of the capability described with a single unit (the MFEW suite), operated by an EW specialist or by non-specialist BG troops, or does it envisage different units providing a holistic capability, i.e. task specific? Is it to be autonomous, if operated by non-specialist troops? If autonomous, what levels of reassurance are they looking for?

A6. The expectation is for the MFEW suite to operate autonomously as it will be primarily employed by non-specialists. The equipment will be used in mounted or dismounted scenarios to protect personnel from RC-IED, but these users will not interact with any ES/EA parts which will be monitored/controlled/tasked at either BG HQ or Bde HQ.

Q7. What do you envision being the distribution of this equipment? For instance, when you refer in the vignette to the top-level architecture of the MFEW suite, how far down/to which level do you envision being distributed?

A7. At this time, the project is expected to deliver an FP ECM/MFEW capability for a BG. All F Echelon vehicles within the BG should have a mounted FP ECM/MFEW and for the dismounted elements and each dismounted section should be provided with a man-portable FP ECM/MFEW. As this equipment will be distributed to combat personnel lacking specialized communications and EW training, robustness should be a design consideration.

Q8. Are you looking at changing mission fills such as through an open architecture?

A8. Yes, we want the ability to be able to update our mission fills. This will be done by government subject matter experts.

Q9. The MEWT, the SWaP is very important because the space in an armoured vehicle is usually limited. What kind of SWaP are you looking at?

A9. The SWaP requirements and/or limitations will be based on the solution provided. It should be noted that some equipment will go into vehicles as large as the LAV 6, while other sets will go into Light vehicles and/or carried by dismounted soldiers.

Q10. What weight limitation do you have on the man-portable systems?

A10. This is not currently defined. In the definition phase of the project, we will be conducting studies to investigate a lot of these details.

Q11. What is the current perception of the success of individual, team and collective training?

A11. Both Collective and Individual training remain challenging given such factors as cost, the individual battle rhythms of trained personnel, and time constraints. Although Collective and Individual training will remain a vital part of force readiness and generation, the resultant solution should include a simulation component to enhance and expedite training.

Q12: Is current collective training 'EW-Collective' or 'Whole-Force Collective'?

A12: It is currently what could be described as 'EW-Collective', but the envisioned expansion of land EW capabilities may result in whole-force collective training requirements.

Q13: Do you envision a reduction of the ratio of trainers to operational staff as essential to this prospect? What is the current ratio?

A13: The current ratio is not readily available; however, the resultant solution should be at least PY neutral or even result in a reduction to the number of required trainers.

Q14. Reference Appendix 1 to Annex A, page 1 - High Level Systems Design (HLSD), Figure 1. The relationships show a dotted line around Equipment and Data/Networking. To enable deployed collective training and access to individual and team training whilst deployed, would you consider the training solution being included at this level?

A14. Yes, we would. It should be noted that any feedback/suggestions on the HLSD would be greatly appreciated.

Q15. Would external integration also include using mobile assets from the proposed EW Range as stimulators to the land EW sensor assets? If so, is the COP/C2 integration and training data networking being considered at a national level?

A15. No decision has been made in this regard; however, it should be noted that the project seeks to achieve the greatest integration possible with other L1s.

Q16: Would you consider using Standards that allow for integrating into the systems currently being used by NATO nations or their future systems?

A16: While possible, this has not been defined beyond the need for an open architecture. A higher priority for integration is placed on CAF and FVEYs systems than on NATO integration, but an ability to readily integrate with all of these is superior.

Q17: Regarding the type and level of training to be provided, are you looking for strictly functional training specific to the equipment provided, or do you require training related to the CONOP and general EW training?

A17: This is not yet defined by the project and we are seeking input from industry. Training regarding the function of the provided hardware/software will be necessary and training related to the CONOP and general EW training may be required depending on the proposed solution.

Q18. Please summarize how the industrial and technological benefits policy applies to this effort?

A18. The Government of Canada seeks to leverage economic benefits from defence procurement through the Industrial and Technological Benefits (ITB) Policy which requires contractors to undertake business activities in Canada at a value equal to the contract. Within the context of a competitive procurement process, the ITB Policy will motivate bidders to put forward in their bid proposals their best

Value Proposition to highlight the bidder's commitment to supporting the Canadian economy. The Value Proposition would form a rated and weighted component of the bid evaluation.

A Value Proposition developed for this procurement will be based on market analysis, as well as industry engagement and written feedback throughout the RFI process. Industry's responses to the RFI questions regarding the ITB Value Proposition will inform the current development of Value Proposition requirements for this project.

Q19: Related to ITB, can you provide resources that will allow us to assess which Canadian businesses would be prudent or suitable partners?

A19: The first and easiest would be to sign up on the Buy and Sell CFLEWM RFI page as an "Interested Supplier". This can be a great way to find partnerships, however, please note that this list is open to the public. Please see all the terms and conditions of this service on Buy and Sell.

Suppliers are also encouraged to contact the Regional Development Agencies (RDA). If they have a Canadian office, they should contact the RDA responsible for their geographic location. If they do not have an office in Canada, contacting the Land procurement officers at each RDA would be a good first step. The RDAs are designed to facilitate business development in their regions, they have a solid working knowledge of Canadian defence procurement, and are often approached by suppliers and primes alike for partnership opportunities or to fulfill specific supplier requests. The list of RDAs and their contacts can be found here: https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/086.nsf/eng/h_00140.html

Q20. Are you leaning toward a particular procurement strategy?

A20. Not at the moment; however, we will likely have made a decision on procurement strategy by the time the draft RFP is released. Should a decision be made prior to the release of the draft RFP, it might be made public through an amendment on the BuyandSell website.

Q21. Would you elaborate on the key industrial capabilities and how you see cyber resilience, defence systems integration and artificial intelligence benefiting your program?

A21. The introduction of Key Industrial Capabilities (KICs) represents a strategic approach to leveraging economic outcomes through upcoming National Defence and major Canadian Coast Guard procurements with a continued focus on innovation, supplier development, exports, and economic growth for the defence industry and associated commercial applications. KICs may be utilized in the VP to support work directly related to the procurement or incentivize indirect investment activities that are part of other business operations unrelated to the CFLEWM procurement

KICs reflect potential areas of investment in emerging technologies and established domestic capabilities, which are competitive in the global marketplace and essential to national security. The Value Proposition, unique to each procurement, could be used to drive investments from industry in certain KICs. The Value Proposition Guide, found at

<https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/086.nsf/eng/00006.html>, provides insight into how KICs relate to the design of the Value Proposition.

Preliminary analysis has identified Cyber Resilience, Defence Systems Integration, and Artificial Intelligence as KICs applicable to the CFLEWM project. Feedback from industry on the inclusion of these three KICs is welcomed. Further information and the definitions of each KIC can be found at https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/086.nsf/eng/h_00175.html

From a technical perspective, the project seeks to leverage concepts and technologies like the three identified KICs where possible to improve capabilities and maximize systems resilience. A description of our assessment of the possible use of artificial intelligence to benefit human factors is found in the High Level System Design (HLSD).

Q22. Who are the in-country integrators you view as qualified to bid this effort?

A22. As the ITB Policy, including the Value Proposition, is a market-driven policy, ISED is not in a position to identify in-country integrators or suppliers.

Potential bidders are encouraged to contact the Regional Development Agencies (RDA). If they have a Canadian office, they should contact the RDA responsible for their geographic location. If they do not have an office in Canada, contacting the Land procurement officers at each RDA would be a good first step. The RDAs are designed to facilitate business development in their regions, they have a solid working knowledge of Canadian defence procurement, and are often approached by suppliers and primes alike for partnership opportunities or to fulfill specific supplier requests. The list of RDAs and their contacts can be found here: https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/086.nsf/eng/h_00140.html

Q23: Regarding demonstrations, when do you foresee these taking place and what form will they take?

A23: The opportunity to demonstrate potential solutions will be provided at a future date, but current uncertainty regarding travel conditions prevents us from developing firm plans. We currently envision a two-week window in which all potential bidders will be assigned a date and time to visit Ottawa and demonstrate their solution, in whole or in part.

Q24. Have you considered having both the ES and EA systems being identical for redundancy and added capability?

A24. We would consider this but would need input from industry to better define the benefits and risks.

Q25. Regarding procurement strategies, do you foresee signing a single contract or multiple contracts?

A25. Neither procurement strategy has been selected, and the analysis of this is ongoing. We welcome input from industry on this matter.

Q26: Will your FVEY requirement reach down to the equipment? In other words, will everything have to be FVEY compatible; the system integrator, the Standards used, the hardware, software, etc.?

A26: A decision has not been made and is expected to be released in conjunction with the draft RFP. If a decision is made sooner, an amendment will be published on BuyandSell.

Q27. How can we engage with other suitable Canadian partners (Primes or SMBs)?

A27. Companies seeking collaborating with other suitable Canadian partners should use the BuyandSell site to indicate this interest. An icon can be selected to submit their name to a list that will be accessible there. Should this list fail to populate and you are seeking this engagement, notify PSPC to attempt an alternate means of engagement.

(ISED) Suppliers are encouraged to contact the Regional Development Agencies (RDA). If they have a Canadian office, they should contact the RDA responsible for their geographic location. If they do not have an office in Canada, contacting the Land procurement officers at each RDA would be a good first step. The RDAs are designed to facilitate business development in their regions, they have a solid working knowledge of Canadian defence procurement, and are often approached by suppliers and primes alike for partnership opportunities or to fulfill specific supplier requests. The list of RDAs and their contacts can be found here: https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/086.nsf/eng/h_00140.html

Q28. We believe Canada will accept partial response to the RFI, please confirm this is accurate?

A28. Yes, you can reply to the RFI with what you can offer. Whether this is being a prime contractor or a sub-contractor or whatever it may be to fulfill the requirement, we encourage any feedback. Any commentary or input on other areas of the RFI is encouraged.

Q29. The mention of the FVEY requirement in the RFI seems to be only a requirement for interface with the FVEYs systems. Do you think it is going to be the only FVEY requirement once we get to the ITQ stage or you are anticipating an FVEY security requirement that would extend down to the equipment?

A29. There is a requirement to be able to interface with FVEY systems. However, no decision has been made on the security requirement. The security requirement for the equipment may be FVEY and this decision should be made by the ITQ. If the decision is made before the ITQ, this information will be posted on buy and sell for in an RFI amendment.

Q30. Do you anticipate issuing the ITQ next summer?

A30. It is our current plan/schedule. We are looking at providing opportunities to companies to provide demos/presentations, once the issue with COVID-19 is over, hopefully by next summer we have a better idea.

Q31. If you decide to use ITQ, when will it be conducted? Will the ITQ qualify both System Integrators and OEMs?

A31. The timing of the ITQ, if utilized, is TBD, but it will most likely be next summer and could include a demonstration portion. No decisions have been made, but the ITQ could be used to qualify both Systems Integrators and OEMs.

Q32. Would the ITQ be used as a down-select for the RFP?

A32. We are not sure at this time, it depends when the RFP is released.

Q33. During the last one-on-one, somebody on the team mentioned that the procurement could be done through FMS, is it still an option?

A33. It is still a possibility. The method of procurement has not yet been identified.

Q34. In the RFI there was mention that Canada must have the sufficient IP required to do low-level upgrades in-house, can you clarify?

A34. Although DND does not require ownership of the solution's Intellectual Property (IP), it does require enough access to the IP to facilitate in house upgrading of waveforms and the threat library.

Q35. Are you allowed to say what the budget is for the project?

A35. The project was put in the investment plan for \$250-500M.

Q36. Regarding the requested costing information, are you looking for specific unit costs? Only minor change was made to the Annex D (costing) added a column to indicate your level of confidence in the level costing information you provided.

A36. Yes, we are looking for unit costs, in addition to any other information you can provide on costing, i.e. unit cost, hardware/firmware/software, installation costs, cabling, training, ILS, ISS, etc. We are aware that at this point you can only provide us with very Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) costs, and that these costs will likely change significantly; however, any costing information you can provide will greatly enhance our internal processes and allow us to release the draft RFP in a more timely fashion.

Q37. In the costing table, what is the purpose of the +/- Variance?

A37. The purpose of the +/- variance inclusion was to better assess the possible range of costing responses for comparative purposes. While details such as skew and distribution related to costing estimate range would be superior, this was determined to provide some balance between excess complexity and better information. Understanding that unique factors from each response affect this range, we encourage a disclosure of your assumptions and factors to boost our ability to conduct effective analysis.

Q38. If LCSS is utilized, will the Systems Integrator be responsible for integrating the solution and LCSS?

A38. We have not determined if the integration is the solution yet. If not, there will likely be some sort of gateway requirement between CFLEWM and LCSS. This will be determined in the definition phase of the project.

W8476-196070/B

03

Q39: Utilization of Software Defined Radios (SDR) was mentioned; are you still interested in these systems?

A39: Yes, we are still interested in exploiting SDR; however, we are looking to Industry for recommendations on their use within the project.

Q40: Do you anticipate a “one box” solution, i.e. ES/EA or MFEW from one box?

A40: We are not looking at a specific configuration at this time. Our priority is finding a solution that provides the capabilities needed. In other words, we are currently hardware agnostic.

Q41: What types of threats/Signals of Interest (Sol) do you want to Sense? Comms, Radar?

A41: The specific threats, Sol, and emissions to be detected have not been identified at this time.

Q42: Up to what Frequency level should the Direction Finding (DF) equipment operate?

A42: We have not determined this yet and are looking for Industry recommendations.

Q43: Regarding project Definition, are you limiting yourselves to what is currently available, or are you considering emerging technologies and threats?

A43: We are not limiting ourselves as we are aware of emerging technologies related to UAS, Cyber Threat, 5G, AI/ML, etc., and are looking for Industry feedback in this regard.

Q44: What are the current technical risks to the project? Will you need help with risk reduction activities from Industry?

A44: We have not identified any technical risks and have proven the concept of MFEW in the lab and during a field exercise. However, risks may be identified moving forward and it is possible that Industry will be engaged as a risk reduction strategy.

Q45: Can you share any of your internal project milestones?

A45: We are not planning to publicize our internal processes and milestones at this point, but we will investigate the possibility of doing so in the future.

Q46: Does your preferred Procurement Strategy lean towards a turn-key solution, or do you foresee awarding multiple contracts?

A46: We have not decided on a Procurement Strategy, and see value in both approaches. A preferred strategy will be decided upon by the time the draft RFP is released.

Q47: Regarding ITB, have you developed your Value Proposition?

A47: As CFLEWM is in the RFI stage, the Value Proposition (VP) has not been fully developed. Industry is encouraged to provide feedback to questions related to the Value Proposition development, found in Annex C of the RFI. When the Draft-RFP is released, the Draft-VP will be included for comment/feedback from industry.

Q48: What would you say is the major difference between the LOI and the RFI?

A48: The LOI process validated the project and illustrated that Industry can indeed provide us with a modern, agile EW capability within the scope. The RFI will now inform the project team in much greater detail regarding Cost, Technical Readiness Levels, and the achievability of specific project objectives. Ultimately, RFI returns will focus and inform the project as it enters Definition. We intend for the RFI to encourage broader input and commentary on all aspects of the technology.

Q49: Do you see higher data links being provided? If not, how will you deal with the significant increase in data?

A49: Given the envisioned increase in sensors, we do realize that transferring data will be a challenge. We are looking for Industry feedback on how to address this issue.

Q50: Do you foresee adding an HMI, such as a GUI, to existing hardware?

A50: It is too early in the project to predict which existing equipment, if any, will be utilized as part of CFLEWM. However, should existing equipment be brought forward, we are open to the idea of adding an HMI.

Q51: Can you speak to the process with which you will decide upon an Open Architecture?

A51: Not at this time. The process will be decided upon and utilized during the Definition Phase and encourage input regarding this decision-making process.

Q52: How flexible do you need to be regarding current and future Standards, software languages, etc.?

A52: Given the pace of technological change, we must remain extremely flexible regarding the solutions we pursue. At the end of the day, we must achieve interoperability with other L1s, CAF C4ISR initiatives, and the FVEY community.

Q53: The CONOP seems to depict analysis being done at both the Bde EWCC and in an EWAS at the ASIC. As this may require significant bandwidth for the transfer of data, have you considered the possibility of analysis being done remotely?

A53: Yes, we are open to analysis being done remotely, but must address the inherent security issues.

Q54: Have you decided on UAS employment? If so, how large of a platform will it be? What will be its maximum payload?

A54: No decision has been made on the employment of UAS, platform, or payload size. However, several options exist, including the use of non-CFLEWM specific platforms, such as the ISTAR project's Blackjack, which can carry a 17kg payload.

Q55: What is meant by "CEMA" in the context of CFLEWM?

A55: Cyber and Electromagnetic Activities. Although the disciplines of EW and Cyber Warfare are blurring, in the context of CFLEWM, CEMA refers to the combined effects of Cyber Warfare and Electronic Warfare such as leveraging EW to deliver a CEMA effect. Further, although the extent to which Cyber capabilities will be pursued is still to be decided, we would greatly appreciate feedback from Industry on this issue.

Q56: From a Technical Standpoint, what do you mean by Artificial Intelligence (AI)?

A56: In the context of CFLEWM, when we refer to Artificial Intelligence we are speaking about software programs, processes, algorithms, and capabilities, including Machine Learning, that mitigate the cognitive overload which our EW operators are likely to experience due to the increased number and effectiveness of sensors in the Battlespace. At the very least, AI/ML should prioritize and categorize Sol for the EW operator, while disregarding neutral or unimportant signals. Ultimately, AI would even recommend courses of action (COAs) given the information/intelligence available. Again, we are looking for Industry feedback in this regard.

Q57: What activities will be undertaken between now and 2023?

A57: Internal processes, reports/returns, and official gateways will be pursued. Externally, or those activities relevant to Industry, will include RFI response reviews, possible ITQ and Demonstration scheduling in spring/summer 2021, and draft RFP release in 2022 and the RFP release in 2023.

Q58: What equipment is currently going into the ACSV EW variants? What can you tell us about the antenna being installed?

A58: 18 Armoured Combat Support Vehicles (ACSV) EW variants will be provided for the project. These vehicles will be equipped with a mast. We cannot provide you with details regarding the antennas being installed or the current equipment fit. This information may be included in a GFE list released with the draft RFP.

Q59: Based on the MFEW HLMR of the project, and the limitations of Canadian industry to provide an organic capability to these requirements from one vertically integrated supplier, do you think there is a cost savings in different acquisition models, as opposed to paying margin-on-margin and getting less capability for the project budget?

A59: There may be cost-saving given the differing approaches to procurement; however, they have not yet been identified.

Q60: Does the project team view the CFLEWM modernization project as an integration problem (i.e., the capability exists in the market place, we just need someone to bring together the best of breed technology... as the first RFI noted that technology is moving at a rapid pace in this domain)... or does the project team see this as a COTS/MOTS problem... we want a solution.

A60: Although both statements can be considered true, we will not be able to address this question fully until after the RFI returns have been reviewed.

Q61: Considering the significant time that goes into responding to these RFIs, does, or can the project team facilitate a 1-on-1 feedback session post RFI submission?

A61: Yes, the project team can facilitate feedback on RFI submissions; we will look into the possibility of conducting feedback sessions during the demo/presentation event. The details will put communicated through an RFI amendment.

Q62: We note that Canada has asked about Bidders' views on including micro-SMBs, defined in the question as being below 50 FTEs. Given that there is no mention of this in previous RFPs in Canada that we are aware of, nor is in ISED's ITB Model T's and C's, is this a new and permeant policy direction for Canada? If so, can Canada share their economic analysis with Bidders as to the importance of this subsector of the Defence Sector and as to any specific and unique economic outcomes Canada wishes to leverage from Bidders in this sub-sector?

A62: At this time, there are no changes to the ITB Model Terms and Conditions to include micro-SMBs. With regard to the Key industrial Capabilities (KICs) of Cyber Resilience and Artificial Intelligence, market analysis and industry feedback have indicated that those market segments include a large number of micro-SMBs. The purpose of the question is to ascertain opportunities and constraints suppliers may have with integrating smaller companies in their supply chains. Industry is encouraged to provide feedback to this and other ITB related questions as found in Annex C of the RFI.

Q63: The RFI states that 18 Armoured Support Combat Vehicle (ACSV) EW variants will be provided as GFE for the CFLEWM project. Figure 1 in the relevant Annex describes the MEWT vehicle as "Sense" only. Appendix 1 to Annex D identifies 18 MEWT Sense hardware sets, five DF sets, and 10 EA sets to be included in ROM costs. Since the design and qualification of Vehicle Installation Kits constitutes a relatively significant project cost, we would like to receive the following clarifications: will all ACSV EW vehicles be allocated to the MEWT role; will a subset of MEWT vehicles receive DF sets; and in which vehicles will the EA sets be installed? Will any of the ACSV EW variants host the EWCC or EWOC?

A63: Currently, not all 18 ACSV EW Variants will be outfitted as MEWTS. At this time, we do not know if these vehicles will include EA and ES capabilities, or if an additional platform will be procured. Further, it is assumed that up to 5 of these vehicles could perform as EWCC or EWOC.

Q64: Regarding MFEW, MEWT, and LEWT definitions: are all platforms labeled MFEW expected to have the same EW sensor and effector architecture?

A64: No, MFEW will be an FP ECM platform with some ES and EA capability.

Q65: Related to the above, are platforms labeled MEWT and LEWT expected to have the same EW sensor and effector architecture as MFEW platforms?

A65: We envision that the MEWT will remain our principle high-resolution Sense platform, and the LEWT will be a lighter version of Sense platform, but will likely have both a mounted and dismounted capability. The MFEW is principally an FP ECM capability with some ES and EA capabilities.

Q66: In Annex D, Table 2, page 32, Sustainment Costs" include some activities that are non-recurring and normally provided as part of an initial capital contract and several recurring activities that (after an initial two year period) are often provided by an in-service support contract. Does Canada seek separate ROM costs for non-recurring and recurring sustainment activities?

A66: Yes, please indicate your ROM costs as either non-recurring or recurring.

Q67: The ABCANZ CEMA Architecture has been released to industry in other FVEY countries except Canada. Will this architecture be mandated for CFLEWM? When does Canada expect to release this architecture to Canadian industry?

A67: We cannot answer this question at this time, but we will seek to secure the document in question and promulgate to Industry if appropriate.

Q68: Can you provide an accurate ORBAT and equipment holding based on the envisioned CONOP?

A68: This information is not currently available as the CONOP has yet to be defined to the appropriate level. Once RFI returns have been reviewed and Definition has begun, a more accurate CONOP and CONEMP with the requested information may be released.

Q69. In the RFI you have vehicles that are dedicated to specific of EW missions, for example, a vehicle dedicated to SENSE or ACT. If you were able to have all of those functions on a single system or vehicle, would that be a preferred way of operating in the field or you have a preference in keeping those functions separated in different platforms?

A69. At this point we are not discarding any possible options; we are looking for your recommendations.

Q70. One of the aspects that were mentioned in the document (RFI) was the Cyber capability in the system. Is it something that you expect to be part of the initial baseline system or it is something that you would look to incorporate in the future?

A70. We would like to be able to deliver cyber effect at the tactical level on the battlefield, this is a desirable capability. The details have not been defined yet; we are exploring options on this. We are looking for your recommendations.

Q71. Do you plan to publish details on frequency coverage or threat matrix, in terms of the typical types of threats of priority threats that you hope to address?

A71. These technical details will be defined in the next phase of the project, in the definition phase. We are too early to be able to provide this information.

Q72. Have you been collaborating with DRDC for some of the things you are looking to procure that are at a lower TRL?

A72. Yes, some work has been done with DRDC in terms of testing and proof of concept. An example is the Maestro project that was done a couple years ago where DRDC evaluated the proof of concept on the MFEW system. The collaboration is still ongoing and as the project moves forward, DRDC involvement will increase.

Q73. The CONOPs of Figure 1 corresponds to a centralized mode of operation. Do you anticipate a distributed mode of operation where a Brigade, for example, operates with a great level of autonomy (>90%) from the HQ? This involves full control of the EW assets of the brigade from the brigade itself rather than the HQ.

A73. In most operations, EW assets are decentralized whereas the control of the effects is centralized. Maximizing flexibility and modularity will be superior. The system should be capable of adapting to as many types of environments/threats/tasks as possible across the spectrum of conflict.

Q74. In the context of question 1.8.24 of page 40, do you have a preferred priority and updating scheme for (radar) signals of interest?

A74. The priorities will be defined later in the definition phase. You can assume that we want flexibility on what is displayed through the GUI depending on if it is an EW operator/Int/Comd staff.

Q75. Page 24 of the RFI suggests that ITB policy “may” apply to the CFLEWM. Why isn't the ITB policy mandatory for this project given its (monetary and strategic) value to Canada and the expected life cycle of the program?

A75. The ITB Policy, including the Value Proposition, will apply to all eligible Department of National Defence and Canadian Coast Guard procurements over \$100 million for which the National Security Exception applies. All eligible defence procurements with contract values between \$20-100 million will be reviewed for the use of Value Propositions. The review will determine whether the application of a Value Proposition is consistent with achieving the appropriate balance between capability, cost and benefit to Canada.

As this project is currently in the Options Analysis phase, feedback from industry is critical in determining how the project will leverage economic benefits. Once the project reaches Definition Phase, a decision on the applicability of the ITB Policy will be made.