



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -
TPSGC

11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier

Place du Portage, Phase III

Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2

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

Defence Communications Division. (QD)

11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier

Place du Portage, Phase III, 8C2

Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Tactical Air Coordination Suite	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W8476-185751/C	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 6000412936	Date 2020-10-08
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$QD-036-27880	
File No. - N° de dossier 036qd.W8476-185751	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2020-10-30	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Specified Herein - Précisé dans les présentes Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Briere-Provost, Mathieu	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 036qd
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (891) 790-1635 ()	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

This RFP Amendment 003 is raised to:

1. Modify the RFP; and
2. Provide answers to Industry's questions.

1.1: At page 7, delete in its entirety:

Section II: Financial Bid

3.1.1 Bidders must submit their financial bid in accordance with the Basis of Payment in Annex B and C.

Replace with:

Section II: Financial Bid

3.1.1 Bidders must submit their financial bid in accordance with the Basis of Payment in Annex C and D.

1.2: At page 7, delete Section II, III and IV in its entirety, and replace with (Numbering correction only):

Section II: Financial Bid

3.2.1 Bidders must submit their financial bid in accordance with the Basis of Payment in Annex C and D.

3.2.2 Exchange Rate Fluctuation

[C3010T \(2014-11-27\), Exchange Rate Fluctuation Risk Mitigation](#)

3.2.3 SACC Manual Clauses

Section III: Certifications

Bidders must submit the certifications and additional information required under Part 5.

Section IV: Additional Information

3.2.4 Bidder's Proposed Sites or Premises Requiring Safeguarding Measures

3.2.4.1 As indicated in Part 6 under Security Requirements, the Bidder must provide the full addresses of the Bidder's and proposed individuals' sites or premises for which safeguarding measures are required for Work Performance:

Street Number / Street Name, Unit / Suite / Apartment Number
City, Province, Territory / State

Postal Code / Zip Code

Country

- 3.2.4.2** The Company Security Officer must ensure through the [Contract Security Program](#) that the Bidder and proposed individuals hold a valid security clearance at the required level, as indicated in Part 6 – Security, Financial and Other Requirements.

1.3: At part 4.2.1, Technical Evaluation on p.12, delete in its entirety and replace with:

Each proposal will be evaluated from a technical point of view to verify whether and how the mandatory requirements are satisfied and to score the rated requirements per Annex F0 – Compliance and Evaluation Matrix. If and when required or requested, each proposal may have to provide further evidence of compliance with selected mandatory and/or rated requirements.

Rated Technical Score Calculation.

The Technical Points for each proposal will be obtained from the evaluation in accordance with Annex F0 – Compliance and Evaluation Matrix.

- a) The maximum potential technical point total is 10000. Based on the percentage of technical points achieved on a bid, the maximum technical evaluation score is 75.
b) The example below depicts how the Technical Points are calculated.

	Total Score	Technical Points Calculation	Technical Points
Bidder 1	6500	$6500 * 75 / 10000$	48.75
Bidder 2	6200	$9500 * 75 / 10000$	71.25
Bidder 3	3250	$3250 * 75 / 10000$	24.38

1.4: At part 7.10, Priority of Documents on p.28, delete in its entirety and replace with:

7.10 Priority of Documents

If there is a discrepancy between the wording of any documents that appear on the list, the wording of the document that first appears on the list has priority over the wording of any document that subsequently appears on the list.

- (a) the Articles of Agreement;
(b) the supplemental general conditions;
1) 4002 (2010-08-16), Software Development or Modification Services
2) 4003 (2010-08-16), Licensed Software
3) 4004 (2013-04-25), Maintenance and Support Services for Licensed Software
4) 4007 (2010-08-16), Canada to Own Intellectual Property Rights in Foreground Information
(c) the general conditions;
(d) Annex A, Statement of Work, Acquisition;
(e) Annex C, Basis of Payment, Acquisition;
(f) Annex J, Security Requirements Check List;
(h) the signed Task Authorizations (including all of its annexes, if any);
(i) the Contractor's bid dated _____

1.5: At part 8.10, Priority of Documents on p.34, delete in its entirety and replace with:

8.10 Priority of Documents

If there is a discrepancy between the wording of any documents that appear on the list, the wording of the document that first appears on the list has priority over the wording of any document that subsequently appears on the list.

- (a) the Articles of Agreement;
- (b) the supplemental general conditions;
 - 1) 4002 (2010-08-16), Software Development or Modification Services
 - 2) 4003 (2010-08-16), Licensed Software
 - 3) 4004 (2013-04-25), Maintenance and Support Services for Licensed Software
 - 4) 4007 (2010-08-16), Canada to Own Intellectual Property Rights in Foreground Information
- (c) the general conditions;
- (d) Annex B, Statement of Work, ISS;
- (e) Annex D, Basis of Payment, ISS;
- (f) Annex J, Security Requirements Check List;
- (h) the signed Task Authorizations (including all of its annexes, if any);
- (i) the Contractor's bid dated _____

1.6: At Annex A1 – System Performance Specifications on p.73, Delete:

6.7.2.57.3. Subsurface (Maritime); and

6.7.2.57.4. Space.

1.7: At Annex A1 – System Performance Specifications on p.95, Delete 6.8.23.5 in its entirety:

1.8: At Annex A2 – Priority of Delivery on p.122, Delete 6.7.2.84 and replace with:

6.7.2.84	R		*	
----------	---	--	---	--

(Changed from Priority 1 to Priority 2)

1.9: At Annex A2 – Priority of Delivery on p.133, Delete 6.8.23.5 in its entirety:

2: Industry's questions and answers

1	<p>Can you please provide an interface description for SADL and VMF (official I/F version)?</p> <p>It is assumed that DND is asking for these interfaces not commonly used in other NATO nations in order to be compatible with some specific equipment. Would DND provide the specific specification to which they need support for these interfaces?</p>	<p>The Situational Awareness Data Link (SADL) is a direct Ground-to-Air (G/A) communication link between the joint/support air platform and troops on the ground. The SADL is primary used by the Army to provide the friendly positions (BPA) approximate to (or within) the targeted zone to the joint mission air platform.</p> <p>Similar to SADL the VMF interface will be used for G/A/G communication (on different radio/waveform), in supporting the joint operation. Additional to BPA, the VMF interface supports also the operational information exchange (as specified in the paragraph 6.7.2.9 and 6.7.2.10) between participant platforms.</p> <p>The communication between TACS and those radio systems are relied mainly on the Ethernet IP communication protocol with VMF as the message format. The first and foremost objective of this capability is to share the vulnerable ground positions (K05.1) and exchange free text message (K01.1) with air platforms.</p>
2	<p>Will non-ITAR solutions be preferred? Will this be considered in the evaluation?</p>	<p>While the preference is a non-ITAR solution, the Project team don't see the challenges introduced by an ITAR solution as compelling justification to eliminate all the bidders with an ITAR solution from the competition. As mitigation the RFP does requires all bidders to comply with Canada's requirements for technical access and flexibility in customization, support and deployment of the proposed solution.</p>
3	<p>Are we right in assuming that the Financial Bid shall include the prices in accordance with the Basis of Payment in Annex C and D, instead of Annex B and C as stated in 3.1.1?</p> <p>Are we allowed to include any other missing or to be detailed financial information, such as method of payment? Or would such approach render our bid non-compliant?</p>	<p>Section 3.1.1 on Page 7 of the RFP is incorrect. Annex C and Annex D are the correct locations to include all pricing associated with a bid.</p> <p>Bidders can submit amplifying information in their financial bid, however it must not be in Basis of Payment Annex C or D, and must not be contradictory to Basis of Payment Annex C or D. Only Annex C and D will be used in the evaluation of a bidder's Financial Score.</p> <p>With respect to method of payment, refer to the answer to question 5.</p>
4	<p>Is it expected to conduct a price audit and, if yes, at which time/phase?</p> <p>If a price audit shall be conducted, in which manner will the price audit take place for foreign Bidders, e.g.</p>	<p>As a competitive procurement, no price audit will take place.</p>

Contract No. - N° du Contrat
W8476-185751
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
W8476-185751

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
003
File No. - N° du dossier
036qd. W8476-185751

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
036qd
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

	will a (National) authority conduct a price audit on behalf?	
5	Are we right in assuming that the Bidder can choose the mode of payment according to the options provided in the Contract and display the offered method in Section II: Financial Bid?	Section 7.6.3 of the RFP outlines possible methods of payment associated with PSPC contracts. Specific terms related to this contract are specified in the Basis of Payment tables at Annex C and D. In this contract, single payments are used for all line items, except for a single milestone payment upon delivery of P1 capabilities, as specified in Annex C.
6	Are we right in assuming that the prices must be provided excluding Goods and Services Tax or the Harmonized Sales Tax?	As specified in section 4.2.2, prices submitted in Annex C and D must be excluding Goods and Services Tax or Harmonized Sales Tax.
7	Are we right in assuming that, if the Bidder submits prices e.g. in EURO, the contract prices and payments will be made in EURO according to the prices submitted?	Yes, please refer to section 4.2.2 of Part 4 on p. 13 for further details related to foreign currency.
8	The prioritization for the following requirements is missing. Are they to be excluded or what is the desired priority, category and max points assignment? - 6.7.2.57.3 - 6.7.2.57.4	Paragraphs 5.7.2.57.3 and 6.7.2.57.4 are no longer part of the current scope and had accidentally been left in. They will be removed from the SOW/SPS.
9	What interface simulation tools (SADL, VMF, JREAP-A, JREAP-B, Link 16, MIDS Terminal, ...) are used for the system acceptance? - Are the tools used for acceptance available for the contractor during the project execution phase?	The interface of the emulator and simulation tools can be Ethernet IP-Based or Serial communication depending on the implemented functionality. Canada can arrange to make certain simulation tools available to the Contractor during the project execution and acceptance test. However, the Contractor should not rely entirely on Canada to provide suitable test tools during the implementation of required functionalities and capabilities.

10	<p>In this sections the priority of documents is defined in case of discrepancies. It is unclear to us, what the content of the Articles of Agreement would be in order to properly assess the priority of documents. To our understanding the Articles of Agreement shall be the governing document and would include those terms and conditions or elements which are (i) either not defined or addressed in the other listed documents (gaps), (ii) referenced to be addressed in the Articles of Agreement from elsewhere in the list of documents (references) (i.e. Article 2035 24, see related separate query) or (iii) would include deviating conditions from those included in the other documents (deviations). Accordingly and noting, that bidders who submit a bid "agree to accept the clauses and conditions of the resulting contract"; are we correct to understand that still the contractor would be allowed to address in its bid those (i) gaps, (ii) references or (iii) deviations as described above in case otherwise a comprehensive and complete contractual set of provisions would not be available. Or would such approach render our bid non-compliant? Please provide a detailed answer.</p>	<p>The contents of the Articles of the Agreement is the entire part 7 and 8 of each contract.</p> <p>If you wish to address any gaps or deviations you must do so at the RFP posting period through the Q&A process.</p> <p>Also, Altering the RFP and inputting your own clauses when submitting your bid would make your bid non-compliant.</p>
----	--	---

11	While the order of precedence to the listed different categories of documents is noted. What is the priority of documents amongst the Supplemental General Conditions 4002, 4003, 4004, 4007?	<p>Canada has updated the RFP and the priority of documents has been specified. It is now:</p> <p>7.10 Priority of Documents</p> <p>If there is a discrepancy between the wording of any documents that appear on the list, the wording of the document that first appears on the list has priority over the wording of any document that subsequently appears on the list.</p> <p>(a) the Articles of Agreement; (b) the supplemental general conditions; 1) 4002 (2010-08-16), Software Development or Modification Services 2) 4003 (2010-08-16), Licensed Software 3) 4004 (2013-04-25), Maintenance and Support Services for Licensed Software 4) 4007 (2010-08-16), Canada to Own Intellectual Property Rights in Foreground Information (c) the general conditions; (d) Annex A, Statement of Work, Acquisition; (e) Annex C, Basis of Payment, Acquisition; (f) Annex J, Security Requirements Check List; (h) the signed Task Authorizations (including all of its annexes, if any); (i) the Contractor's bid dated _____</p>
12	Are we right to understand that, in case Custom Software will be developed, the Contractor must deliver the source code for the Pre-existing Software or would the Customer accept to limit the delivery of source code to only New Source Code?	The Contractor isn't required to deliver the source code of either pre-existing software or newly developed as part of the delivery. However, Canada maintains the right to exercise its IP rights IAW the conditions stipulated in the 'Supplemental General Conditions' section of the RFP.
13	Subpara 3. states that the intellectual property rights in the information stored on the media become the property of either Canada or the Contractor, as indicated in the intellectual property provisions of the Contract. Which intellectual property provisions exactly are meant with this provision?	<p>Please refer to 4007 for the IP provisions.</p> <p>https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual/4/4007/3</p>

14	Subpara 2. states that the Developed Custom Software belongs either to Canada or to the Contractor, whichever is indicated in the intellectual property provisions of the Contract. Which intellectual property provisions exactly are meant with this provision? Would the Contractor be willing to accept that Developed Custom Software will be owned by the Contractor and only be licensed to the Customer?	Canada maintains its IP rights IAW the conditions stipulated in the 'Supplemental General Conditions' section of the RFP. Refer to 4007 for the IP provisions https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual/4/4007/3
15	Are we right to understand that Customer acknowledges that ownership to software to be delivered under the Contract but existing prior to the Contract award belongs to the Contractor and that the Contractor would be allowed to incorporate and apply its or its Subcontractor's/Suppliers Standard License Terms and Conditions for those software deliveries, even in case they would deviate from the set of clauses provided by the Customer with the RFP? With subpara 2 of clause 4003 13 it is our understanding that this is allowed if the conditions are being written out in full in the Articles of Agreement or an annex to the Contract listed in the Priority of Documents section.	Altering the RFP and inputting your own clauses when submitting your bid would make your bid non-compliant. Only conditions specified in the RFP are to be applied. Please refer to 4003-13, para. 2: 2.The Parties agree that only the conditions that expressly form part of the Contract by being written out in full in the Articles of Agreement or an annex to the Contract listed in the Priority of Documents section in the Articles of Agreement form part of the Contract. Any conditions accompanying or enclosed with the Licensed Software, if any, do not form part of the Contract and, therefore, are not part of Canada's license and do not affect the rights of the Parties in any way. The Contractor agrees that in no event will Canada or any Client or User be required to enter into any additional license agreement with respect to the Licensed Software or any portion of it. The Contractor acknowledges that any additional license agreement relating to the Licensed Software signed by anyone other than the Contracting Authority is void and of no effect.
16	In Subpara 2 of clause 4003 13 it is stated that "The Contractor agrees that in no event will Canada or any Client or User be required to enter into any additional license agreement with respect to the Licensed Software or any portion of it." Can we assume that Free and Open Source Software (FOSS) or COTS software that may be included, if any, in the software to be delivered will not be affected from this requirement, as usually with FOSS/COTS software the user of such software would be required to adhere to the respective licenses of the relevant FOSS/COTS software directly.	It's the responsibility of the Contractor to insure that any FOSS/COTS included in offered solution must be covered properly and fully compliant with the licensing conditions of the delivered software for this contract.

17	Clarification on ANNEX C – Basis of Payment, Acquisition Contract, Line item “TACS 12 Operational Independent Instances of Licenses**”	The bid price for this line item must be inclusive of all NRE developmental and any other associated work that will allow an existing and/or off-the-shelf solution to meet all the requirements as stipulated in the ANNEX A1, System Performance Specifications and ANNEX A0, Statement of Work. This deliverable must also provide for a minimum of 12 instance of any proposed solution to be deployed independently and simultaneously.
18	Delivery of the SW, documents and training are Firm Fixed Price. Will all other deliverables and work be based on the issuance of a DND 626 for the following? • PMP • Meetings • SDS • SRR • PDR • CDR • FAT • SAT • ILS • Integration • Etc.	The pricing submitted in Annex C Section 1 must include all costs associated with the deliverables as specified in Annex A0.
19	Could DND please define “communicate simultaneously”? Fast protocols and transmission are often sequential, but they happen very fast and seem simultaneous. Is this what is meant by communicate simultaneously?	In the TACS context the terms 'communicate simultaneously' must be interpreted as "be able to exchange (tx/rx) information independently and concurrently"
20	In regards to communication through PRC-117G, we request that DND provide the Interface Control Document, and provide other relevant information related to the integration requirements. The lack of this information prevents us from adequately assessing work required to be compliant.	As per COTS/MOTS procurement, Canada has assumed this well-known technology/system is familiar or accessible to the Contractor and will only release further documentation on the subject interface for the adaptation work under the contractual context and with an appropriate TAA. The interface with the PRC-117G is heavily relied on message-oriented such as, but not limited to, VMF for data communication and analogue audio for voice.
21	In regards to communication through KOR-24A SST, we request that DND provide the Interface Control Document, and provide other relevant information related to the integration requirements. The lack of this information prevents us from adequately assessing work required to be compliant.	As per COTS/MOTS procurement, Canada has assumed this well-known technology/system is familiar or accessible to the Contractor and will only release further documentation on the subject interface under the contractual context and with an appropriate TAA. The interface with the STT is mainly based on message-oriented such as J-Series and VMF for data communication and analogue audio for voice. The second channel of STT is equivalent to a PRC-152A.

22	In regards to communication using CNR-E additional information is required for integration to its data capability. We request that DND provide relevant information such as Interface Control Document. The lack of this information prevents us from adequately assessing work required to be compliant.	As per COTS/MOTS procurement, Canada has assumed this well-known technology/system is familiar or accessible to the Contractor and will only release further documentation on the subject interface under the contractual context and with an appropriate TAA. The interface with the CNR-E is mainly based on message-oriented such as, but not limited to, VMF for data communication.
23	Voice interface information for the PRC-117G and KOR-24A is required, such as radio interface/protocol used for voice, voice codec, voice stream packet details and composition, etc. We request that DND provide relevant documents for the work involving voice integration. The lack of this information prevents us from adequately assessing work required to be compliant.	As per COTS/MOTS procurement, Canada has assumed this well-known technology/system is familiar or accessible to the Contractor and will only release further documentation on the subject interface under the contractual context and with an appropriate TAA. The voice interface with the PRC-117G and KOR-24A is the analogue audio..
24	Network health, performance and connectivity monitoring can be done by injecting status traffic (overhead) on the network to gain this information. This could affect performance of low-bandwidth networks. Is this allowable? We also need to understand for what networks (ie. Does this include LCSS, PRC-117G, CNR-E)? What are the current network health monitoring tools in place? Can they be leveraged? We request that DND clarify the limitations of this requirement and provide all documentation for current Network monitoring.	This requirement has nothing to do with the network's health or performance assessment. It simply requires the software to display the connectivity diagram and the perception on the status (active/inactive) of participant units based on the data exchange activity (tx/rx) on each network interface.
25	We request that DND clarify the recording requirement. Details such as length of recording storage duration should be included. In addition, what is the allotted storage available in the Data Terminal for this purpose?	The length of recording storage is specified in the paragraph 6.7.1.80, 6.7.2.115 and 6.7.2.116 for the corresponding interface. In general, it's a 1-Gigabyte rollover file.
26	Which MOSID (Trade) will operate the TACS?	The TACS suite will be operated by Artillery officers and soldiers.
27	Which MOSID (Trade) will maintain the TACS?	The TACS suite may be maintained by Artillery officers and soldiers, but may also be maintained by other trades.

28	The 1st & 2nd columns for the rates state 'initial 5 years and 'averages over initial 5 years'. However the single asterisk states 'Rates are averaged using rates over the entire possible eight (8) year In Service Support Contract for a given category.' How many years is being used to determine the average; five or eight?	The asterisked comment is correct. The rates will be averaged over the entire eight (8) year period. There are two locations where the table incorrectly states averaging over five (5) years. PSPC will release an updated Annex E.
29	Are the totals shown for Projected Acquisition Contract Hours and Projected ISS Contract Hours per contract year or the sum of all years in each specific table? I.e., Acquisition 750 hours = 3 years and ISS 1,650 hours = 8 years?	The projected hours shown in the Basis of Payments (Annex C and D), as well as the in the Basis of Evaluation (Annex E) are totals for their respective contracts. The projected hours shown are NOT annual. Please note that these are simply estimates of anticipated levels of effort for various labour categories.
30	Is the requirement for clearance based on the need for access to their military bases for installation?	No.
31	Section stipulates "at cost, without any allowance for profit and/or administrative overhead". This clause may conflict with some businesses cost accounting standards. Can the allowance for profit/administrative overhead be permitted if it is within the business' standard accounting practices?	Travel and living expenses will be reimbursed at-cost, without any allowance for profit and/or administrative overhead. Individual labour rates (which are incurred during approved travel) are to already include indirect costs such as general and administrative (G&A), associated with the administrative burden of managing business travel.
32	Requirements 6.7.2.57.3 and 6.7.2.57.4 do not have assignment within the Prioritization Matrix, Annex A2. Please provide the Prioritization and Category assignment for these.	Paragraphs 5.7.2.57.3 and 6.7.2.57.4 are no longer part of the current scope and had accidentally been left in. They will be removed from the SOW/SPS.
33	Are the STAT requirements within SPS 6.7.4 to be included within each TACS-Operational license, or only within the TACS-Training License?	They're not required for the operational license.
34	I have been asked by my bid team that if functionality that is requested at IOC but in fact, we can guarantee it by FOC and state as such in the response, would that render us non-compliant or would it be assessed on a case by case basis?	Altering the priority of delivery of a requirement yourself would render your bid non-compliant. If there are concerns with the priority of delivery for specific requirements, the RFP period is the appropriate time to raise those concerns with PSPC.
35	Rated requirements 6.7.2.57.3 & 6.7.2.57.4 in Annex A1 are absent from the table in Annex A2. Please confirm that these requirements	Paragraphs 5.7.2.57.3 and 6.7.2.57.4 are no longer part of the current scope and had accidentally been left in. They will be removed from the SOW/SPS.

	should be removed from Annex A1 as well. MIL-STD 6016 and STANAG 5516 does not provide for track deconfliction rules of subsurface and space.	
36	Several requirements reference MIL-STD 6016 (Rev. D and earlier) and STANAG 5516 (Ed. 8 and earlier). There is a risk that implementing a solution that is compliant to earlier revisions of these documents will lead to conflicting requirements and outdated capability. Would Canada revise the requirements to reference only MIL-STD 6016 Rev D and STANAG 5516 Ed. 8?	In the event of a conflict due to standard revision differences, the information in the latest revision specified in Annex A1 will be used.
37	P1 rated requirements 6.8.6.1, 6.8.6.2, and 6.8.16 appear in Annex A1 and A2, but not in Annex F0. Could Canada please confirm the point values of these requirements?	These missing requirements have been added to Annex F0, and an updated version will be released by PSPC. Note that requirement 6.8.39 has undergone a minor change in point allocation as a result of the addition of these three requirements, as well as the removal of requirement 6.8.23.5 (noted in a question/answer below). This is done in order to maintain the same total technical point allocation.
38	Annex A2 identifies requirements 6.7.2.24 & 6.7.2.25 as Mandatory P2 requirements. However, Annex F0 identifies these as Mandatory P1 requirements. Could Canada please confirm that these requirements are Priority 2 (P2)?	Annex A2 is correct. Annex F0 has been corrected, and an updated version will be released by PSPC.
39	Can Canada confirm that Demo Requirement 2 should reference TACS SPS Para Ref Number 6.4.2 vice 6.4.3 as currently indicated?	Annex F0 should reference both 6.4.2. and 6.4.3. This is reflected in the updated Annex F0 to be released by PSPC.

40	<p>(Company) would like to formally request the release of the following Government Standards for use in the review of the subject solicitation.</p> <p>VMF MIL-STD-6017A – VARIABLE MESSAGE FORMAT (VMF), Rev. A MIL-STD-6017B – VARIABLE MESSAGE FORMAT (VMF), Rev. B MIL-STD-6017C – VARIABLE MESSAGE FORMAT (VMF), Rev. C STANAG 5519 Ed.1 – TACTICAL DATA EXCHANGE – VARIABLE MESSAGE FORMAT (VMF) K-SERIES MESSAGES, Ed.1</p> <p>Multilink MIL-STD-6020 – DATA FORWARDING BETWEEN TACTICAL DATA LINKS (TDLs) MIL-STD-6016C – TACTICAL DATA LINK (TDL) 16 MESSAGE STANDARD, Rev. C MIL-STD-6016D – TACTICAL DATA LINK (TDL) 16 MESSAGE STANDARD, Rev. D MIL-STD-3011 – INTEROPERABILITY STANDARD FOR THE JOINT RANGE EXTENSION APPLICATION PROTOCOL (JREAP) STANAG 5516 Ed.8 – TACTICAL DATA LINK EXCHANGE – LINK 16, Ed.8 STANAG 5518 – INTEROPERABILITY STANDARD FOR JOINT RANGE EXTENSION PROTOCOL (JREAP) STANAG 5602 – STANDARD INTERFACE FOR MULTIPLE PLATFORM LINK EVALUATION (SIMPLE)</p> <p>Other STANAG 4609 Ed.3 – NATO DIGITAL MOTION IMAGERY STANDARD, Ed.3</p>	<p>As per COTS/MOTS procurement, Canada has assumed those well-known and limited-distribution standards/technologies/systems are familiar or accessible to the Contractor and will only release further supporting documentation and/or standards for the interface adaptation work under the contractual context and with an appropriate TAA.</p>
----	---	--

41	In a full TACS setup, will Canada use concurrent operators on individual workstations to manage the LAP, RAP, and perform Airspace coordination (i.e. a maximum of three operators concurrently).	This is a possible use case, but the software must allow for other operator configurations.
42	<p>In Annex A1 several references are made to Voice communication:</p> <p>6.5. Network and Communication Interfaces. The TACS is mandated to provide data and voice communication on supported networks and data link interfaces with, as a minimum, the following specifications:</p> <p>6.5.6. The TACS should allow for voice communication by using the AN/PRC-117G and second channel (VHF/UHF) of the KOR-24A radio.</p> <p>6.5.7. The TACS should allow for the selection of the following communication devices for the satellite and voice communication:</p> <p>6.7.3.26. The ASCM should enable the selection of a communication device and establish voice communication with the aircraft and Air Control Center through a dedicated voice radio channel.</p> <p>Can DND clarify the role of TACS for voice communication?</p>	The TACS should allow the operator to select the desirable audio communication channel on its GUI and perform the voice chat. As an example, this could be done through an external audio switch box which is connected to the workstation through a serial or IP interface.
43	<p>Annex A1 paragraph 6.7.1.42 states:</p> <p>The LAPM must be able to process and display Automatic Dependent Surveillance - Broadcast (ADS-B) information received, including as a minimum, the location, identification, platform and specific type.</p> <p>Given that platform and specific type are not received within ADS-B messages, how does Canada envision this requirement be satisfied?</p>	Whenever the information is available, TACS must be able to retrieve and display the platform and specific type from the pre-loaded ATO or IFF Codes based on the Mode 3/A received in the ADS-B message.

44	What is the / What are the applicable versions of the MIL-STD-6017 to be supported for the required VMF messages? (Note: The versions A, B and C of the MIL-STD-6017 are mentioned within the requirements and applicable documents section of the RFP)	Annex A1 is correct - all three revisions (A, B and C) must be supported by the TACS.
45	Within the RFP, a "Canadian adapted version of the MIL-STD 6017C's K05.13 message is referenced". Can the authority please provide the specification of the Canadian adapted version of the MIL-STD 6017C's K05.13 message?	Due to restrictions, the Canadian version of Threat Warning message specs is going to be released within the contractual scope only. However, the Canadian version is shorter and simpler than the K05.13 standard the level of effort to implement the Canadian version will be simpler to implement when compared to the full K05.13 message.
46	The category for the exchange of tactical information via SIMPLE links is inconsistent in the RFP. Could the authority clarify, if the category for the SIMPLE links is mandatory (M) or desirable (R)?	The implementation of data exchange over SIMPLE (req. 6.7.2.21, 6.7.2.35) are desirable (R) and the implementation data link forwarding matrix control mechanism (req. 6.7.2.39 and 6.7.2.40) are mandatory.
47	Can the authority confirm that MIL-STD-6020 applies to the forwarding of tracks on VMF/SADL interfaces?	Correct. The MIL-STD 6020 applies to the forwarding between data links, specifically between Link-16 and VMF/SADL.
48	The NMEA 0183 protocol is specified for RS-422 and RS-232 only. Does the required "NMEA 0183" via IP mean "IP encapsulated serial protocol" or is a proprietary Application Layer protocol used. If so, can the authority provide more information about the desired application layer protocol?	NMEA 0183 via IP in this requirement context means an external application (not part of TACS) is receiving the NMEA 0183 sentences from DARG/GPS through a serial interface and forward the exact sentences to the TACS using the TCP/IP and/or UDP/IP (including multicast).
49	As the RFP requires compliancy with STANAG 5519 and MIL-STD-6017, could the authority define, which standard has precedence in case of deviations/contradictions?	STANAG 5519 has priority over MIL-STD-6017, in case of discrepancy.
50	Could the authority confirm that the communication with the Defense Advanced GPS Receiver (DAGR) requirement is fulfilled with the reception of location and time data?	Yes - location and time data meet the requirement.
51	What serial communication protocol(s) are required to be exchanged with external and peer systems? - If the protocol stack needs to be implemented in the TACS software, can a specification for the protocols be provided?	RS-232 (Para 6.1.4.1), RS-422 (Para 6.1.4.2), and MIL-STD-188-220 C/D (Para 6.5.15.1, 6.7.2.38). The MIL-STD and applicable specs will be provided within the contractual context and with an appropriate TAA.

52	Can the applicable version of STANAG 5519 be provided?	As per COTS/MOTS procurement, Canada has assumed those well-known and limited-distribution standards/technologies/systems are familiar or accessible to the Contractor and will only release further supporting documentation and/or standards for the interface adaptation work under the contractual context and with an appropriate TAA.
53	What strategic information and what commands are requested to be exchanged via EPLRS or CNR-E using which protocols?	The information exchanged over EPLRS and CNR-E is relied on VMF, and in most of cases, the information would be the Land SA and Threat Warning.
54	Can the authority confirm that the TACS software needs send/receive VMF messages encoded in an application header according to MIL-STD-2045-47001 to/from communication devices, while the lower protocol layers are handled by the communication devices (e.g. according to MIL-STD-188-220D w/Change 1)?	As specified in the requirement 6.7.2.37 the TACS should be capable exchange the VMF data using the MTL-STD-188-220 C and D w/Change 1. In other term the TACS should has the MIL-STD-188-220 protocol layer incorporated in the solution.
55	All J12.X related requirements are marked as P2 except for 6.7.2.84 (J12.6 Target Sorting). As the implementation of J12.6 is dependent on roughly 80% of the J12.X messages, could Canada confirm that requirement 6.7.2.84 should be changed to P2?	This is acceptable. Requirement 6.7.2.84 will be moved from a P1 to a P2 requirement. This will be reflected in the updated Annex F0 released by PSPC.
56	Requirement 6.8.23.5 refers exclusively to a LINK-11 capability. Other LINK-11 capabilities such as J7.4 Track Identifier (T/R) had been removed from the draft RFP (ref: 6.7.2.13.11). Therefore, please confirm that it is Canada's intent to remove requirement 6.8.23.5 as well.	This is acceptable. Requirement 6.8.23.5 will be removed from Annex A1. This will be reflected in the updated Annex F0 released by PSPC.
57	Requirement 6.2.4.6 in Annex A1 refers to a hardware-based flaw that can only be resolved by patching the firmware and BIOS on the affected motherboards. As hardware is not within the scope of this RFP, it is not possible for tenderers to include it within their solution. Please confirm that CANADA will remove this requirement. https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/architecture-and-technology/intel-amt-vulnerability-announcement.html	Even though the subject vulnerability is linked to the Intel manageability firmware, Canada's intention, through this specific requirement, is insure the installation and operating of TACS will not change/affect to, by any means, the system's low level firmware, in the negative sens. The validation of this requirement would be based on the compliance check results of before and after the installation of TACS.

58	Please confirm that reference to "proof of compliance" is only in respect of a Bidder's declared compliance to mandatory requirements within their existing solution. Although a Bidder may state compliance to developmental requirements, both mandatory and rated, it would seem unreasonable for such "proof of compliance" evidence to be provided for work yet to be developed. Therefore it is recommended that Canada permit bidders to claim full compliance for capabilities that are included within their bid price, without the need to provide objective evidence for developmental elements.	The reference to proof of compliance will be removed from Part 4. As part of the completion of Annex F0, bidders must complete the columns labeled "Compliance Reference" for each of the three compliance and scoring matrices. The completion of these compliance reference columns must include a paragraph reference for each requirement, referring to where in the bidder's proposal each particular requirement is responded to.
59	Can it be confirmed that all questions from all bidders will be published with responses prior to the RFP deadline?	Yes.
60	In clause 2035-24 it is stated that "no limitation of liability or indemnity provision applies to the Contract unless it is specifically incorporated in full text in the Articles of Agreement". As the Request for Proposal (RFP) does not provide for any Articles of Agreement at all and hence the answer whether the Parties agree to incorporate a deviating limitation of liability remains unaddressed, would it be acceptable to the Customer to agree on a limitation of liability provision? Or would such approach render our bid non-compliant? Also would this approach be acceptable for work provided under 2030 (General Conditions Higher Complexity Goods)?	Clause 2035-24 is the default liability clause and will not be changed. Altering it would render the bid non-compliant.
61	The email address for the bid receiving unit does not seem to work.	It's the right address but if you copy paste from the RFP, it seems to remove the "-" before "abbid" and makes it undeliverable. Here is the address: tpsgc.dgareceptiondessoumissions-abbidReceiving.pwgsc@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca

Contract No. - N° du Contrat
W8476-185751
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
W8476-185751

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
003
File No. - N° du dossier
036qd. W8476-185751

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
036qd
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.