



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -
TPSGC

Place du Portage, Phase III
Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2
11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

**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

Shared Systems Division (XL)/Division des systèmes
partagés (XL)
Terrasses de la Chaudière
4th Floor, 10 Wellington Street
4th étage, 10, rue Wellington
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet SMMS Request for Information (RFI)	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W8474-218069/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8474-218069	Date 2020-09-22
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$XL-111-38443	
File No. - N° de dossier 111xl.W8474-218069	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2020-09-24	
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: Hansen, Cendrella	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 111xl
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 558-6219 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-3584
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

This amendment 02 is raised to provide answers to questions received from respondents:

QUESTIONS / ANSWERS :

Q.02: In response to A.1.2 in Amendment #001 for this RFI: Our solutions are a strong match for Canada's requirements across most areas except for COSPAS-SARSAT, which has never previously been included. While confident of our technical capabilities to update our solutions based on specifications, the RFI timeline for Interim Capability (6-8 months) is likely insufficient to complete an acceptable COSPAS-SARSAT interface. Canada's legacy command and control and logging software (currently used to support the National SAR Program) includes COPSAS-SARSAT capabilities today. We are asking, in part, if pre-existing elements of the current COSPAS-SARSAT interface (source code, design documentation, etc.) are available for use in development, to accelerate development schedule and reduce cost. We are also asking whether the legacy architecture may already implement COSPAS-SARSAT as a modular component which lends itself to ready translation to our – or any other – SAR solution, again to aid in improving schedule and cost benefits. If such elements / components are available, is Canada able to provide additional details on their nature? If COSPAS-SARSAT elements / components are not available as asked, is Canada agreeable to the possibility of an extended Interim Capability timeline, and if so by what degree? If any of the answers to the above questions are positive in nature, we respectfully request an extension of the RFI submission timeline by two (2) weeks to allow us – and any other interested vendors – time to consider and react to the information. Otherwise, we would like to advise that Canada presently enjoys ownership / license to solutions which align to RFI requirements in a manner similar to solutions we offer (as alluded to in earlier questions from us). We suggest that Canada's consideration of the "Computer Integrated Information and Dispatch Systems" ("CIIDS"), which is owned and used by the RCMP across Canada for dispatch, resource and incident management purposes, may offer schedule, cost, inter-agency situational awareness, and interoperability benefits in the context of this RFI.

A.02: The ability to receive, interpret, and disseminate COSPAS-SARSAT alerts is a critical component of SAR case management. The solution proposed by a supplier for the interim replacement should be an off-the-shelf solution that already includes this COSPAS-SARSAT capability and is currently in operation with another nation, so that it would not require developmental effort to be ready for use in Canada for Canadian SAR operations. Regarding the availability of pre-existing components, legacy software/modules (or components thereof) are not available for development or re-use. Regarding whether Canada agreeable to

the possibility of an extended Interim Capability timeline, the desire is to quickly replace the legacy capability within the timeline described in the RFI (or shorter); however, interested suppliers are welcome to describe a timeline which they would reasonably be able to meet. The recommendation regarding “Computer Integrated Information and Dispatch Systems” (“CIIDS”) is noted.

Q.03: Section 1.2 - Interim Capability. There is a requirement that reads Scalable and allow for integration with existing infrastructure and applications. Can you further explain and describe what existing infrastructure and applications are referenced in this requirement?

A.03: In terms of scalability, the proposed solution must be capable of supporting multiple groups of users located at different physical sites simultaneously (see Section 1.4 of the RFI and the response to Q4 below), and should be adaptable if/as the number of concurrent users increases. The number of concurrent users should not degrade the performance of the proposed solution. As for integration with existing infrastructure and applications, the answer is dependent on the nature of the proposed solution; therefore, respondents are encouraged to provide the technical details of how their system integrates into their customers’ infrastructure and applications, and to describe any technical requirements and/or limitations for the hosted solution and end-user desktops (e.g., minimum system specifications, web browser requirements, etc.). For the purpose of the RFI, it is important for respondents to provide as much information as possible on their solution’s hosting environment requirements (especially for the interim capability solution). Any feature or interface for data exchange with external data sources (e.g., GeoJSON support, WMS/WFS support, etc) should be included in the response. Note that if any information or clarification is desired, Canada will contact the respondent in accordance with RFI section 4(d).

Q.04: Section 1.4 - Application User Community. Since our understanding is that the Canadian MCC is co-located with the RCC Trenton (ON), will the CMCC users share the same SAR mission management system used by RCC Trenton; or will they require their own independent system?

A.04: All of the application’s users identified in Section 1.4 must be on the same system; this includes the CMCC (which is co-located with the Trenton JRCC). There is no requirement for an independent system.

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.