



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. 007
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 6000412936	Date 2020-11-12
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 Eastern Standard Time EST on - le 2020-12-15 Heure Normale de l'Est HNE	
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 007 is raised to:

1. Update Annex F0 – Compliance Evaluation Matrix;
2. Modify the RFP; and
3. Provide answers to Industry's questions.

1.1: At Annex A1 on p. 57, delete 6.7.1.33 in its entirety and replace with:

6.7.1.33. The LAPM should allow for the adjustment, as it's applicable, of following control parameters for the track correlation test:

6.7.1.33.1. Positional error associated with Track Quality;

6.7.1.33.2. Minimum window size or Default scaling matrix;

6.7.1.33.3. Window size multiplier or Scaling matrix adjustment;

6.7.1.33.4. Speed threshold (lower) or Default sigma values set; and

6.7.1.33.5. Alternate speed test factor or Sigma values adjustment.

1.2: At Annex A2, starting on p.101, switch the following requirements from P1 to P2:

6.7.1.74
6.7.1.53
6.7.2.123
6.7.2.14.2
6.7.2.14.3
6.8.25

1.3 : At Annex A2 at p.136, delete in its entirety 6.1.52, 6.1.52.1 and 6.1.52.2 and replace with:

6.1.52.	C			One of the below sub-requirements must be delivered as P1 and the other as P2. The Contractor is allowed to make a suitable choice to his/her plan.
6.1.52.1.	M	(*)	(*)	
6.1.52.2.	M	(*)	(*)	

1.4: At 3.2.2 on p. 7, add:

C3015T (2017-08-17), Exchange Rate Fluctuation Adjustment

Answers to Industry's questions :

1	<p>Could the authority give more details about the "decision taken list" (e.g. desired content, origin of the data within the list, ...) as mentioned in the SpS requirement no. 6.8.14.3?</p>	<p>The 'Decision Taken List' in the current requirement's context is referencing to the actions executed by the operator (if there's any) in responding to the airspace alert and/or warning received.</p>
2	<p>Demo requirement 9 states "The TACS must be able to exchange information, as specified in demonstration requirement 14. and 15., simultaneously and independently on the following interfaces:"</p> <p>Must all demo requirements under 14 be operational in order to claim operational for 9.2 or is a subset of 14 sufficient to claim operational for 9.2. Must all demo requirements under 15 be operational to claim operational for 9.2, and 9.3 or is a subset of 15 sufficient for operational compliance to 9.1 and 9.3.</p>	<p>The demo requirement 9. is focused on the data exchange on the specified interfaces only, and it would be satisfied as long as the communication on those interfaces are not disturbed/interrupted by each to another.</p>
3	<p>The use of correlation windows and speed tests as required in 6.7.1.33.2-5, while perfectly applicable to AlphaBeta or AlphaBetaGamma correlators, have no real meaning when applied to multi-model, multi-hypothesis Kalman correlators. In these modern correlation engines, track to track distance as derived from the covariance matrix is all that really matters. The covariance matrix is initially derived from the sigma values of the RADAR and then modified by track behavior. The only way to apply windowing directly would be to add a pre-correlation filter which alters the covariance matrix. This alteration could be more directly accomplished by changing the sigma values or applying a scaling matrix to the track covariance.</p> <p>We request that Canada revises these requirements for adjusting track correlation parameters to also account for alterable sigma values, or replace them with the ability to create scaling matrices.</p>	<p>6.7.1.33. The LAPM should allow for the adjustment, as it's applicable, of following control parameters for the track correlation test: 6.7.1.33.1. Positional error associated with Track Quality; 6.7.1.33.2. Minimum window size / Default scaling matrix; 6.7.1.33.3. Window size multiplier / Scaling matrix adjustment; 6.7.1.33.4. Speed threshold (lower) / Default sigma values set; and 6.7.1.33.5. Alternate speed test factor / Sigma values adjustment.</p>

4	<p>There are 2 requirements for sharing ASTERIX messages with external systems; 6.7.1.74 and 6.7.1.76. The first one is marked P1, while the 2nd one is marked P2. As the provision of an external interface for those ASTERIX messages is using the same infrastructure, we would request the authority confirm that 6.7.1.74 should be changed to P2.</p>	<p>As per requirement, the ADS-B information is, in most of cases, combined with radar track information, therefore the need of sharing the system track with external systems is considered at a higher priority than the ADS-B information. However the sharing of system track by the mean of Cat062 message is targeted for the LCSS consumers which won't be fully operational for the IOC therefore the POD of this can be moved to FOC.</p>
5	<p>Could the authority give more details about the "decision taken list" (e.g. desired content, origin of the data within the list, ...) as mentioned in the SpS requirement no. 6.8.14.3?</p>	<p>Same question as #1</p>
6	<p>We would also request that the following desirable requirements be changed from P1 to P2 6.7.1.53. - The LAPM should allow the operator to manually create and delete the association(N26) between two tracks of the same and/or different environment/category. 6.7.2.123. - The RAPM should allow for auto scrolling and pausing the display of incoming and outgoing messages on a single and on multiple TDL interfaces and links. 6.7.2.14.2. - J7.7 – Association (T/R); 6.7.2.14.3. - J10.6 – Pairing (T). 6.8.25. - When operating in C2 mode, the TDC2I should allow the operator to manually select tracks and perform manual association (J7.7). 6.8.52.1. - USMTF;</p>	<p>6.7.1.53. Agreed. This is not a critical functionality for operating the airspace coordination (ASC) therefore it can be postponed to the FOC. 6.7.2.123. Agreed. This functionality is intended to facilitate the live troubleshooting but not an emergency need for the ASC operation and it can be delayed to the FOC. 6.7.2.14.2. & 6.7.2.14.3. Agreed. These are not critical functionalities for the ASC operation therefore they can be moved to FOC. As the TACS needs to meet at least one of 6.8.52.'s sub-requirement at the IOC therefore the Canada agrees to let the Contractor to choose to deliver one of them at the IOC instead of moving both to the FOC.</p>

7	<p>The TACS RFP clearly states that a software solution is expected. However there are many requirements related to serial interfaces. Are the devices that support serial interfaces part of the contractor scope (i.e. must be provided by the contractor for each TACS license)?</p>	<p>Serial / IP converter device is the GFE. However the Contractor must insure the functionality of TACS with such a device.</p>
---	---	--

8	<p>We submitted a question on the lack of limitation of liability on September 24, 2020. While we have not seen a response to our specific question in Amendments 1 to 4 inclusive, there have been separate 4 questions requesting the Crown limit of liability for this procurement. Response to each request has been "Clause 2035-24 is the default liability clause and will not be changed. Altering it would render the bid non-compliant" or "Refer to Amendment 4 and Q&A #6". It has been a standard practice for many years for the Government of Canada to include a limitation of liability for complex, multi-year procurements, including procurements of this nature in the SACC Manual as clause N0000C. As such we respectfully resubmit our question below:</p> <p>We understand from the RFP at Section 3.2 that the resulting contract will be governed by the SACC Manual General Conditions 2030 - Higher Complexity - Goods. General Conditions 2030 do not provide for any limitation of liability. It has been our consistent experience that the Crown modifies the General Conditions 2030 for procurements of this nature where acquisition is for military equipment, IM/IT requirements, large aviation requirements and requirements which generate intellectual property. This would also apply with respect to the in-service support element of the resulting contract which will be governed by SACC Manual General Conditions 2035 - Higher Complexity - Services.</p> <p>As the purpose of this procurement is for the acquisition of goods which could reasonably be considered as military equipment, and where the possibility for the creation of intellectual property is feasible and expected, we respectfully request an amendment to the resulting contract clauses and that the SACC Manual item N0000C be added as a new Article of Agreement in order to take precedence and replace Section 26 (Liability) of the General Conditions 2030, and Section 24 (Liability) of the General Conditions 2035 which is included by reference in the resulting contract clauses of the RFP.</p>	<p>For the liability clause, As per PSPC's policy, There are basically two situations where it may be necessary to limit a contractor's liability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• in sole source contracts, if potential suppliers are unwilling to accept the Crown's standard terms and conditions.• in competitive requirements if it is felt that the standard terms and conditions may result in lack of competition or bidding. <p>At this point, there is not enough justification to change the standard Liability clause.</p>
---	--	--

9	<p>The requirement is stated as follows: "The TACS should not fail the vulnerabilities and compliance check on the system performed by the NESSUS Scanner which is configured to use all applicable Vulnerabilities and Compliance Scanner Templates." The requirement is not bounded as the NESSUS tool can evolve before the time the requirement verification will be performed. It could include additional templates and demand additional checks. Please bound this requirement to a specific scope (templates, version, etc.).</p>	<p>The latest version of NESSUS Scanner released at the moment of TACS RFP closure, v8.12.0.</p>
10	<p>Decision Taken List There is no clear definition of this term/function "Decision Taken List." Please clarify.</p>	<p>See Amendment 006, question 1.</p>
11	<p>Must the TDC2I support all the symbols and all their modifiers/amplifiers in both the standards listed in requirement</p>	<p>Yes. In both listed standards</p>
12	<p>The requirement is stated as follows: "The TDC2I must provide the operator a real-time 3D interactive mode of tracks, ACM, geographic area/zone, mission data..." Please clarify which mission data the operator must be able to interact with.</p>	<p>Any strategic data related to the current mission/operation, including but not limited to Intel, Orders, airspace clearance, engagement etc. that are received on TACS interfaces.</p>
13	<p>Paragraph 5.4 (Software Options) states the following: "...The Option pricing must be valid for duration of first 5 years from the Contract Award..." - Question a. Does the Option pricing start from the ISS Contract Award or from the date of the Acquisition Contract Award? - Question b. Given that Article 8.4.1 (Period of Contract) states that option pricing can be exercised at any time, then the optional ISS pricing should be valid for 8 years from the date of the ISS Contract Award. If not, then industry can reject Canada's request to exercise an option if the request is submitted after the ISS pricing validity period has expired. We request that Canada align ISS price validity with the number of years that Canada requires for optional ISS pricing.</p>	<p>The option pricing in the ISSC begins on the day that the ISSC kicks off. ISSC is currently planned to begin no later than six months after acceptance of P2 requirements delivery.</p>

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.