



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. 004
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 6000412936	Date 2020-10-15
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 2020-11-06	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST	
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

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

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
004
File No. - N° du dossier
036qd. W8476-185751

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

This RFP Amendment 004 is raised to:

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

1.1: At page 1, delete in its entirety:

**Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin
at - à 02:00 PM
on - le 2020-10-30**

Replace with:

**Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin
at - à 02:00 PM
on - le 2020-11-06**

1.2: At page 24, 28, 31 and 34, delete in its entirety:

4002 (2010-08-16), Software Development or Modification Services, apply to and form part of the Contract.

1.3: At page 143, Annex F1 – Demonstration Plan delete paragraph 1.2 in its entirety and replace with:

1.2. In accordance with RFP's para 4.1.1.4. *Phase III: Final Evaluation of the Bid* the Bidder must be ready to demonstrate, within twenty (20) business days of notification of an invitation for demonstration, and at a mutually agreed location, the TACS requirements mentioned in the Demonstration Scoring Matrix of the Annex F0 – Compliance and Evaluation Matrix.

1.4: At page 104, Annex A1 – System Performance Specification of the French version only, delete 6.8.43 in its entirety and replace with:

6.8.43. Le TDC2I devrait permettre à l'opérateur de sélectionner et de transférer des zones géographiques, des Overlays et des pistes vers un élément d'affichage géographique basé sur la Web, au moyen du format KML.

1.5: At page 12, 4.1.1.4 c) and 13, 4.3 1-c), replace Appendix H1 with Appendix F1

2: Industry's questions and answers

1	<p>In the frame of our researches regarding the VMF specification and standards, it appears that these documents (MIL-STD-6017, STANAG 5519) are ITAR controlled.</p> <p>Could we ask the customer in which timeframe he foresees to sign a TAA to be able to get and use these standards for implementation during project execution.</p>	<p>It is expected that a TAA will be in place within 30 days of contract award, in order to release controlled documents.</p> <p>Any delay beyond 30 days will be considered out of the contractor's control, and will lead to equivalent delay in specifically the delivery of the affected requirements.</p>
2	<p>It seems that there are many Mandatory and Rated requirements from ANNEX A1 - SYSTEM PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS (we found around 100 of them) that are missing and not listed in the RFP TACS-F0-Annex-Compliance Evaluation Matrix-EN-2020-09-08 table, in either sheet; "SPS Compliance Matrix" and "Scoring Matrix". For example; the rated requirements 6.7.2.57.3 and 6.7.2.57.4 are not listed in the Scoring Matrix sheet in the table and therefore these rated requirements don't have a Maximum Score attached to them.</p> <p>Could you please clarify?</p>	<p>See Amendment 003, question 8.</p> <p>If there are other specific rated requirements that have been found in Annex A1, but not in Annex F0, please advise as soon as possible.</p>
3	<p>Are "Annex" and "Appendix" interchangeable terms in this RFP? As we cannot find Appendices (only Annexes), we assumed that they are. Still, when looking for Appendix H1 as referenced in 4.3 Basis of Selection, 1. C), it doesn't make sense as Annex H is LIST OF ACRONYMS AND DEFINITION. What are we missing?</p>	<p>Yes - in the case of this RFP, Annex and Appendix are synonymous.</p> <p>With respect to the reference to Appendix H1 in Part 4, this is due to a change in appendix identification that was not updated. All current reference to "Appendix H1 - Demonstration Plan" should be in reference to "Appendix F1 - Demonstration Plan".</p>

4	<p>In Table, Annex F0 – Compliance and Evaluation Matrix \ Demonstration Scoring Matrix, has the “State of Readiness at Demonstration” (Under development, Implemented, Operational) any impact on the “Demonstration Score”? If it has, how much?</p>	<p>Yes - the state of readiness at demonstration directly impacts the demonstration score received for a given requirement. If one selects from the pull down menu for each requirement in the "State of Readiness at Demonstration" column, the associated demonstration score will be shown.</p> <p>The current scheme for state of readiness at demonstration is: Under development - 0 demonstration points; Implemented - 50% demonstration points (of maximum); and Operational - 100% demonstration points (of maximum).</p>
5	<p>In both of these sections, reference is made to “Appendix H1 – Demonstration Plan”. Please confirm the Annex number of the Demonstration Plan in the RFP. It appears to be Annex F1.</p>	<p>See Amendment 004, question 3.</p>
6	<p>In this clause 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)?</p>	<p>Clause 2035-24 is the default liability clause and will not be changed. Altering it would render the bid non-compliant.</p>
7	<p>Please confirm that the heading numbering is correct. Assume that it should read: "5. Software Delivery" and not "2. Software Delivery".</p>	<p>Correct - the amendment should have referred to Para 1: Software Delivery and Para 5: Software Delivery.</p>

8	<p>It appears that there is no limitation of liability or indemnity provision applicable to the resultant contracts. We request Canada to limit contractor's liability to Canada with each party responsible for any damages that it causes to third parties. Therefore we are requesting inclusion of SACC ID N0001C (2008-05-12), 'Limitation of Contractor's Liability for Damages to Canada', with liability capped at the contract value, for each of the resulting contracts. Limitation of liability capped at the contract value provides adequate protection to Canada.</p>	<p>See Amendment 004, question 6.</p>
9	<p>Please differentiate between the terms "license(s)" and "corporate license", with specific information on the number of individual users required per license.</p>	<p>In the current TACS RFP context, a. the term "license" is referencing to a single operational "key" per independent instance (the key could be unique per machine in this case). b. The term "corporate license" is used for a single operational "key" for all independents instances.</p> <p>If the OEM offers the same operation "key" (license) for each independent instance in (a.) then there's no different between these two terms and only difference is the number of independent instance authorized.</p>
10	<p>Please advise where to include rates for the annual licenses required for the operation of the TACS system, which per SACC 4003 03 (2008-05-12) Maintenance Releases (included in both contracts per RFP pages 25/160 and 32/160), must include at least on Maintenance Release during any twelve (12) month maintenance period.</p>	<p>Canada does not require regular, annual maintenance releases for the software.</p> <p>As stated in Annex B Para 4.1, Canada will issue a DND 626 Task Authorization Form when specific maintenance tasks are required.</p> <p>The bidder should include regular project support costs in the monthly program management rate in Annex D Section 7. Any tasks considered beyond those stated in Annex B Section 5</p>

		will also be tasked via a DND 626 Task Authorization Form.
11	<p>The 'Resulting Contract Clauses' for both Acquisition and In-Service Support include SACC 4007, which includes:</p> <p>4007 03 (2008-05-12) Ownership of Intellectual Property Rights in Foreground Information</p> <p>1. All Intellectual Property Rights in the Foreground Information belong to Canada as soon as they come into existence. The Contractor has no right in or to any such Intellectual Property Rights in the Foreground Information, except any right that may be granted in writing by Canada.</p> <p>4007 01 (2008-05-12) Interpretation</p> <p>3. If supplemental general conditions 4001 and 4003 are also incorporated in the Contract, the provisions of those supplemental general conditions concerning the ownership of Intellectual Property will prevail in relation to the subject matter of those supplemental general conditions.</p> <p>Please confirm that Canada seeks to own Intellectual Property Rights in the Foreground as mentioned above, since the Contract includes SACC 4003 but not 4001.</p>	<p>Yes, Canada seeks to own the foreground intellectual property.</p>

12	<p>The 'Resulting Contract Clauses' for both Acquisition and In-Service Support include SACC 4007, which includes:</p> <p>4007 04 (2008-05-12) License to Intellectual Property Rights in Background Information</p> <p>3. The Contractor agrees to make the Background Information, including in the case of Software, the source code, promptly available to Canada for any purpose mentioned above. The license does not apply to any Software that is subject to detailed license conditions that are set out elsewhere in the Contract. Furthermore, in the case of commercial off-the-shelf software, the Contractor's obligation to make the source code promptly available to Canada applies only to source code that is within the control of or can be obtained by the Contractor or any subcontractor.</p> <p>Please confirm that Canada does in fact wish to obtain the source code for software that is Background Information, that "can be obtained by the Contractor or any subcontractor."</p>	<p>See Amendment 003, question 12. Canada does not require any foreground or background source code.</p>
13	<p>In the RFI titled Tactical Air Coordination Suite (W8476-185751/B), the post RFI clarification included the following statement:</p> <p>"4.3. The Link-16 related functions implementation is required to be compliant to only MIL-STD or STANAG at the first delivery of TACS (IOC). The TACS must be compliant to both standards at the final delivery (FOC)."</p> <p>This wording does not appear to have been included in the RFP release. Can you please confirm that the IOC delivery requires compliance to either the MIL-STD or the STANAG.</p>	<p>Canada confirms that IOC delivery requires compliance to either the MIL-STD or the STANAG.</p>
14	<p>Per this section, we are suggesting two Improvement of Requirement on ANNEX A1 – SYSTEM PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS (page 41/160) :</p> <p>A. The Canadian Air Force uses MIL-STD 6016E (similar to STANAG 5516 Edition 7) on the CP-140 Aurora. We suggest a revision of the required STANAG support from STANAG 5516 Edition 8, which has not been adopted operationally by Canada or its partner nations, to STANAG 5516 Edition 7 which would better match the current operational implementation and ensure a greater compatibility with the existing Link 16 users.</p>	<p>Agreed with the move to MIL-STD 6016E but the STANAG 5516's required edition (Ed. 8) stays unchanged. Canada would like to take this opportunity to remind that as specified in the RFP's Annex A1, the MIL-STD 6016 and STANAG 5516 implementation must be backward compatible and when there's conflict between</p>

	<p>B. The LAPM and RAPM have requirements to support IFF mode 5. MIL-STD 6016D does not include support for IFF mode 5. If you update the required MIL-STD 6016 support from revision D to revision E it will include IFF mode 5 support and also be more compatible with the STANAG 5516 Edition 8. Per (A) above, we still suggest that Edition 8 be revised to Edition 7.</p>	<p>revisions and/or editions the latest revision and/or edition will be applied.</p>
<p>15</p>	<p>As currently drafted, SACC Manual Clause (2030) (2008-05-12), Liability, does not provide for any limit of liability to the Contractor for the performance of the Contract, which, in our view, does not reflect the diminished level of risk inherent to the project, given that Canada is seeking a mature and pre-existing solution that is readily available on the market and that has proven technology. Consequently, the insurance cost incurred by the Contractor to provide protection in an unlimited liability scenario will necessarily affect the total cost incurred by Canada for the TACS solution.</p> <p>Would Public Services and Procurement Canada agree to amend this clause in order to introduce the following paragraph or similar language that limits the liability of the Contractor:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Limitation of Liability</p> <p>Notwithstanding the previous paragraph, the Contractor's total liability to Canada for all damages suffered by Canada caused by the Contractor's performance of or failure to perform the Subcontract is limited to the cumulative Contract Price, as increased from time to time by all Task Authorizations, whether the claim is based in contract, tort, or any other cause of action. This limitation of the Contractor's liability does not apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Any infringement of intellectual property rights; (2) Any breach of warranty obligations; (3) Any liability of Thales to a third party arising from any negligent act or omission of the Contractor in performing the Contract; and (4) Any loss caused by the Contractor's gross negligence or malfeasance. 	<p>See Amendment 004, question 6.</p>
<p>16</p>	<p>Based on the definition of proof of compliance in Part 4, Section 4.2.1 Technical Evaluation, please indicate what proof of compliance you expect to see for Annex F0 SOW Compliance Matrix. As examples, 4.1.1 Priority-One (P1), 5.1 Project Management Plan, 5.2 Contract Award Meeting, what proof of compliance or evidence is acceptable to Canada for other than to state compliance</p>	<p>See Amendment 003, question 58.</p>

	<p>and that all P1 requirements will be delivered in the time frame requested or that a PMP will be established and maintained throughout the contract or that a Contract Award meeting will be held 30 days after Contract Award?</p>	
<p>17</p>	<p>Appendix A1 of the RFP (System Performance Specifications) includes multiple requirements with regard to the technical readiness of the Tactical Air Coordination Suite (TACS) and its future implementations to and compatibility with the Local Air Surveillance networks, the Land Command Support Systems (LCSS), and the Joint Tactical Data Link (TDL) network (collectively, the “networks”). In addition, the System Performance Specifications in section 7 (Readiness of the solution) state that “(a)ll components of the proposed TACS solution should be proven, integrated and ready to achieve operational state with minimal Engineering or Developmental effort” (our emphasis). Furthermore, the specifications set forth in Appendix A0, Statement of Work, do not describe what “Custom Software”, if any, would need to be developed by the Contractor for the purpose of the TACS, pursuant to SACC 4002 (2010-08-16) Software Development or Modification Services (“SACC 4002”).</p> <p>SACC 4002 requirements present software manufacturers with the dilemma of disclosing their trade secrets in that any “Pre-existing Software”, forming part of the “Custom Software”, must be delivered to Canada, which would allow for the disclosure of manufacturing know-how and special design know-how.</p> <p>Furthermore, with the application of SACC 4003 (2010-08-16) Licensed Software (“SACC 4003”) and SACC 4004 (2013-04-25) Maintenance and Support Services for Licensed Software (“SACC 4004”) in this RFP, it would appear that Canada is seeking a mature and pre-existing product that is readily available on the market and that has proven technology – in essence, a commercial off-the-shelf product to be purchased and used by Canada immediately.</p> <p>However, it is difficult to reconcile, in this context, the simultaneous application of both SACC 4002 and SACC 4007 (2010-08-16) Canada to Own Intellectual Property Rights in Foreground Information (“SACC 4007”) and to understand what Canada is seeking to own in terms of “Background Information”. Given the requirements, it is unclear how the provisions of SACC 4002 in general, and how “Custom Software” in particular, interoperates with</p>	<p>1/2. SACC 4002 will be removed from this RFP. 3. The final contract will reflect SACC 4003, 4004 and 4007 to demonstrate that Canada will own only the foreground IP rights. To confirm, Canada is not seeking to own any background IP rights, ownership or source code information.</p>

	<p>respect to software that is already in existence at the bid closure date. Upon analysis of the requirements, if the proposed TACS solution entails merely the augmentation of Pre-existing Software, it is not clear how this would be implicated by the application of “Custom Software” in SACC 4002.</p> <p>The questions are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Given that Canada is seeking a proven solution, what, if any, “Custom Software” is required by Canada for the purpose of the TACS within the framework of SACC 4002? 2. If no Custom Software is identifiable under this RFP, would Canada accept to amend the RFP so as to remove the application of SACC 4002? 3. Given the application of SACC 4003, what is Canada seeking to own in terms of “Background Information” under SACC 4007? 	
18	<p>Annex B 4.2 states that the contractor must provide software upgrades via the DND 626 Task Authorization Form. Annex D Basis of Payment only allows for an hourly rate. Software updates are anticipated to include both labour and non-labour costs. How will the contractor include non-labour costs within the context of Annex D Basis of Payment which only allows for hourly rates and new license pricing? We recommend allowing the contractor to provide a markup to be applied to the non-labour costs.</p>	<p>DND 626 Task Authorizations provide Canada with the mechanism required to procure both labour and non-labour services. Though the DND 626 can contain both contract labour rates and reasonable, marked-up non-labour costs, only labour rates will be evaluated within this procurement.</p> <p>Markup on material and reasonable outsourced labour services must not exceed 15%.</p>
19	<p>The tests described in Annex A1 paragraph 6.7.1.33 for track correlation normally apply for local to remote correlation. Does this requirement apply to correlation</p>	<p>Unless specified otherwise, the track correlation requirements in the section 6.7.1 (LAPM) are applied to</p>

	between LAP and RAP tracks or between LAP tracks from different sensors.	the LAP tracks from different sensors.
20	Can Canada please advise what scores should be assigned to 6.8.6, 6.8.6.1, 6.8.6.2 and 6.8.16 within the evaluation matrix?	See Amendment 003, question 37.
21	(Company) hereby requests the Crown to extend the Solicitation Closing Date to December 4, 2020. The difficulties associated to reaching out to key individuals and key partners in this COVID-19 situation, the time required to fully analyse the recent amendment, and the volume of documentation to be prepared for a quality and fully compliant response are the main reasons for this request, notwithstanding the fact that additional requests for clarifications are most probably yet to come. As a result, we kindly request Canada to grant this request.	Canada will extend the closing date of the RFP to 6 Nov 2020.
22	If a Bidder rejects or modifies any of the articles in SACC 4007, will its bid be deemed non-compliant and therefore non-responsive, and, as such, will no longer be considered for evaluation by the Crown?	Modification or rejection of any included SACC clause will render a bid non-compliant. The RFP period is the appropriate time to voice any concerns with specific requirements.
23	Typically, an RFP contains CDRLs and DIDs on for management plans, engineering documents, operator & maintenance manuals and training documentation. The CDRL and DID clarifies the deliverables and ensures that the delivered technical solution is documented to meet DND and end-users documentation requirements. We ask the Crown to consider adding CDRLs and DIDs to the ASCCM RFP for the requested documentation in Annex A0 (Statement of Work).	Canada will not be including requirements for CDRLs and DIDs in this contract. If further clarification on any components of this requirement are required, please send specific questions during the RFP period.
24	Will there be any Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) provided to the Contractor during the execution of the ASCCM contract? If so, please include a list of the GFE in the ASCCM RFP.	With appropriate TAA and security measures in place, required GFE can be provided for the testing purpose during the execution of the ASCCM contract. This will be discussed during the project kick-off meeting.
25	Based on the requirements in the SPS, our understanding is that there will be different and concurrent operational roles for the TACS such as LAPM operation, RAPM operation and ASCC operation. How many ASCCM operational seats are required per license? If the answer is one seat per license, how many instances of TACS will be co-located in the same ASCCM shelter/vehicle/CP?	One license per operational installation (platform). As per requirements, the TACS sub-components / modules can be installed on the same or separate machines to provide the expected capability. Those sub-components /

		modules are operated under the same license.
26	What is the maximum number and type of interfaces that one TACS must concurrently support?	It depends on the usage scenarios (use cases). However TACS must be able to support the concurrent communication interface as specified in the Annex A1.
27	In the tab titled "Demonstration Scoring Matrix," Instruction b. states the following: "Mandatory requirements default as "Under Development", which is the minimum compliant level." If during the demonstration a bidder has one of the mandatory requirements for the demonstration listed as "Under Development" and does not demonstrate functionality of any sort related to that particular mandatory requirement, does this mean the bidder's bid will be deemed non-compliant and given no further consideration by the Crown?	A bidder may have a mandatory requirement under development at the time of demonstration, and still be compliant. A specific requirement being under development for the demonstration simply means that the bidder will receive no technical points in the demonstration for that requirement.
28	Paragraph 1.2 states the following: "In accordance with RFP's para 4.1.1.4. Phase III: Final Evaluation of the Bid the Bidder must be ready to demonstrate, within five (5) business days of notification of an invitation for demonstration, and at a mutually agreed location, the TACS requirements mentioned in the Demonstration Scoring Matrix of the Annex F0 – Compliance and Evaluation Matrix." The preparation of a demonstration requires engineering resources, equipment, a laboratory setup and, potentially, support from out-of-country and/or out-of-province resources. A one-week notice means that specific resources have to remain available and equipment reserved for an undetermined period between proposal submission and the demonstration date. Given the difficulties with Covid-19 travel restrictions and constraints, including corporate restrictions on access by employees to company facilities, we ask the Crown to consider increasing the time between the demonstration notice and the actual demonstration to three (3) months in order to afford the Bidder time to plan and prepare for the demonstration, including sufficient time to accommodate	Given the current climate, Canada will provide 20 business days notice for bid demonstration.

	<p>any required out-of-province/out-of-country resources. Does the Crown agree with this request?</p>	
<p>29</p>	<p>The rapid increase of Covid-19 cases recently across Canada and worldwide is forcing governments to implement tighter travel restrictions on top of existing restrictions/constraints for international and interprovincial travel (such as a 14-day quarantine period). Because of the Covid-19 travel restrictions/constraints, it could be that the last Bidder demonstration will occur several months after the first Bidder demonstration. This will create an unfair situation where the last Bidders visited for their demonstrations will have a significant advantage over the first Bidders visited. The last Bidders will have more time to prepare for their demonstrations. In particular, they will have more time to implement and integrate demonstration requirements into an operational software that scores maximum points during the demonstration. Given that the logistics of witnessing the demonstrations of each Bidder creates an unfair advantage for the Bidders visited last, and given that the ASCCM. Project Office has already witnessed informal product demonstrations at most if not all Bidders, we ask that the Demonstration Plan and the Phase III evaluation be deleted from the ASCCM RFP and that the evaluation of ASCCM proposals be based only on the Phase I (Financial Bid) and Phase II (Technical Bid) evaluations. Does the Crown agree with this request?</p>	<p>Cancelling the demonstration requirement represents an enormous risk to Canada and ASCCM project and is not currently being considered.</p> <p>The sequence of demonstrations will be planned based on limiting the impact of travel restrictions and quarantines on the project office as a result of the current pandemic, in order to complete the demonstration period as quickly as possible.</p> <p>No advance notice of a bidder's demonstration sequence will be given prior to RFP closure, and as such, all bidders must be prepared to perform their bid demonstration as early as 20 business days after RFP closure, limiting the implied unfair benefit to bidders that will be later in the sequence, and therefore conceivably able to do additional development prior to demonstration.</p> <p>Additionally, all bidders will receive the same 20 business day advance notice of their requirement to perform their bid demonstration, which means that even as the demonstration period</p>

		proceeds, bidders will not be able to rely on having additional time beyond that of their peers to develop their product further.
30	<p>Because of the logistical difficulties and potential unfairness issues in carrying out the Phase III (Demonstration) evaluation for ASCCM, it could take the Crown many months to complete the Phase III evaluation. This could significantly delay the anticipated contract award date by the Crown for ASCCM. Our recommendation is to delete the Phase III evaluation from the ASCCM RFP. Given that Annex A (STATEMENT OF WORK) includes a PDR and CDR, we recommend that each of these activities be modified to include a demonstration of the TACS software and to provide comments on the GUI interface. Our experience has been that if members of the air defence user community are included in the review of the GUI interface, the user community is more accepting of the final delivered product. By deleting Phase III from the ASCCM RFP and instead augmenting the PDR and CDR as recommended, we believe that this approach will pose less risk to the overall program schedule for ASCCM. We ask that the Crown implement these recommendations for the ASCCM RFP. Does the Crown agree with this request?</p>	<p>As Canada will not be cancelling the demonstration requirement, the current requirements of the PDR and CDR will stand.</p>

31	<p>The suggested demo configuration in Figure 3 indicates an ADS-B receiver and an encapsulated serial IP. The understanding is that these materials are not TACS deliverables. As such, we assume that these materials are not required for the demonstration. Is this assumption correct?</p>	<p>The ADS-B device in the Figure-3 is for the representative purpose only. As specified in the demo plan a simulation tool of choice that can generate a typical ADS-B message can be used in place.</p>
32	<p>Our understanding is that the demonstration requirements do not require the integration of GFE equipment. However, the demonstration requirements have references to SPS requirements that include interfaces to GFE. For example, demonstration requirement 7 references to SPS requirements 6.5.1. and 6.4.4.1. Please confirm that GFE are not required for the demonstration.</p>	<p>There will be no GFE provided at the demo. However Bidder must demonstrate the required functionalities using the well-known simulator or emulator of choice as specified in the demo plan.</p>
33	<p>The English version of paragraph 6.4.43 of the SPS differs from the one included in the French version of the SPS as shown below. The question is which one should we consider as the correct version:</p> <p>English version: 6.8.43. The TDC2I should allow the operator to select and forward tracks, geographic areas and overlays to a Web map based viewer, in KML format.</p> <p>Version française : 6.8.43. Le TDC2I devrait permettre à l'opérateur de sélectionner et de transférer des zones géographiques, des Overlays et des pistes qui rencontrent les conditions de filtrage basant sur les mesures de contrôle, l'identité, la classification, catégorie environnementale etc. ..., vers un élément d'affichage géographique basé sur la Web, au moyen du format KML.</p>	<p>The English version is correct. The corrected French version is as follows:</p> <p>6.8.43. Le TDC2I devrait permettre à l'opérateur de sélectionner et de transférer des zones géographiques, des Overlays et des pistes vers un élément d'affichage géographique basé sur la Web, au moyen du format KML.</p>

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.