



**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**

Science Procurement Directorate/Direction de  
l'acquisition de travaux scientifiques  
Terrasses de la Chaudière, 4th Flo  
10 Wellington Street  
Gatineau  
Quebec  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Defence Enhanced Surveillance from Defence Enhanced Surveillance from Space Project (DESSP)	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> W6369-210236/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 004
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> W6369-210236	<b>Date</b> 2021-02-05
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$\$ST-004-38741	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 004st.W6369-210236	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> Eastern Standard Time EST <b>on - le 2021-05-31</b> Heure Normale du l'Est HNE	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Byrnes, Ashley	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 004st
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 431-8071 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/</b> <b>de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

#### Amendment 004

This amendment serves to publish questions asked by vendors and answers provided by Canada, and to extend the RFI period to May 31, 2021.

Responses are requested on or before February 10, 2021, via email to the Procurement Authority indicated below; timely responses are requested to support Canada's decision making process.

The RFI period is being extended to allow Canada the opportunity to pursue additional engagement activities as appropriate.

## Defence Enhanced Surveillance from Space Request for Information W6369-210236/A

### Questions and Answers

Q.1	Can you explain in more detail the procurement-related steps that will take place from now through Project Approval (Definition) – June 2023, as indicated in the Request for Information (RFI)?
A.1	Canada is currently seeking feedback from industry to support options analysis, plan project timelines and develop a procurement strategy. Canada intends to generate a business case in 2021, as well as a Preliminary Statement of Requirements for the Defence Enhanced Surveillance from Space Project (DESSP). Canada may pursue additional industry engagement activities; these could include the publication of additional RFIs, or offering industry opportunities to review draft project documents.
Q.2	Please clarify the difference between the acquisition options of managed services vs. long-term leasing of existing or planned commercial systems, as mention in section 8.4 of the RFI?
A.2	In a managed services scenario, Canada would be procuring earth observation data (Synthetic Aperture Radar [SAR] and other) produced by a vendor. In a long-term leasing of existing or planned commercial systems scenario, Canada would be provided full control and tasking of the space system capability, which is not guaranteed in a managed services scenario.
Q.3	Will security regulations permit a top secret capability to be procured via a managed service or leased procurement option?
A.3	It is understood that there are guidelines, restrictions and regulations that could pose challenges with the transfer of TOP SECRET data. While Canada cannot confirm whether this will be a feasible option, feedback on the existence of such services, any lessons learned, and any related challenges that industry may foresee in pursuit of this acquisition option is welcome.
Q.4	Would Canada like feedback on the High Level Mandatory Requirements (HLMRs) as presented in the RFI?
A.4	Canada welcomes feedback with respect to the HLMRs; respondents are requested to provide rationale with such feedback.
Q.5	Is Canada open to a blended delivery model for DESSP, such as a combination of government and contractor owned and managed services?
A.5	Canada welcomes industry's feedback on a variety of acquisition models, including blended delivery models and those proposed in Section 8.4 of the RFI.

Q.6	Is Canada interested in solutions to address the capability gap between the RADARSAT Constellation Mission (RCM) end-of-mission life and the proposed DESSP Initial Operational Capability date of 2033?
A.6	Addressing this capability gap is outside of the project scope of DESSP.
Q.7	Programmatically, how does the provided reference document, <i>RD-1: Department of National Defence Space Based Requirements, version 2.0</i> relate to the DESSP HLMRs?
A.7	The <i>Department of National Defence Space Based Requirements, version 2.0</i> captures all of the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Armed Force's unclassified surveillance requirements, and cannot be construed to be the full scope of DESSP. While DESSP may be able to deliver a subset of these requirements, a separate set of requirements will eventually be developed for DESSP. This document has been offered to industry in conjunction with the RFI as contextual information.
Q.8	Because of the short time frame industry has been given to respond to the RFI, how much depth in the response is Canada seeking?
A.8	Canada would appreciate any information that industry could provide related to the topics addressed in the RFI, including any lessons learned or anticipated challenges; Canada is seeking a broad overview of what industry could provide.
Q.9	How will Canada use the information acquired through this RFI process?
A.9	Feedback from industry may be used to inform the development of a business case and of possible procurement strategies. It may also be used to assist in defining a solution to meet the HLMRs, in drafting performance specifications, to develop or modify business requirements, to conduct analysis, analyze possible procurement approaches, or for budgetary purposes.
Q.10	Will the document containing questions posed by industry during one-on-one meetings and answers provided by Canada be published on <a href="http://buyandsell.gc.ca">buyandsell.gc.ca</a> before the requested RFI response date?
A.10	All questions posed by industry during one-on-one meetings and answers provided by Canada will be published prior to the requested RFI response date.
Q.11	Is it possible for a vendor to have a second one-on-one session with representatives of Canada prior to the requested RFI response date?
A.11	Canada will not be offering a second one-on-one session to any vendor prior to the requested RFI response date. Vendors are welcome to submit questions to Canada in writing via the Procurement Authority identified in the RFI.
Q.12	With respect to security and classifying data within the cloud environment, does Canada envision following a model where the data remains encrypted and classified throughout, vs. a

	model where unclassified information can be transmitted through a classified cloud environment without being encrypted?
A.12	Canada envisions a system where once any data is encrypted, it can be treated as unclassified data and transmitted via radiofrequencies. Once that data is received and brought in to various networks, it remains unclassified until it is unencrypted. Once unencrypted, the data will be required to remain classified at that level in any possible cloud environment.
Q.13	Is Canada interested in vendors conceptually or physically demonstrating technologies, such as cloud computing at classified level, prior to the planned definition phase in 2023?
A.13	Canada is interested in any information industry can provide on its capabilities and abilities to demonstrate technologies; however, Canada has no known plans for any demonstration.
Q.14	Using cloud computing as an example, is Canada interested in a scenario in which capability is split between vendors? For example, one vendor could provide an unclassified and secret cloud computing environment, and a second vendor could provide a top secret cloud computing environment.
A.14	Canada is open to all industry feedback on acquisition models at this time, including information on individual capabilities.
Q.15	Does DESSP plan on having its own funded Research and Development (R&D) program?
A.15	DESSP is not funded to support its own R&D program. Defence Research and Development Canada may have R&D programs.
Q.16	Understanding that DESSP's HLMRs require a SAR payload, is Canada interested in receiving information on optical payloads that could meet other requirements?
A.16	Canada welcomes industry feedback and rationale on proposed synergistic payloads.
Q.17	Would Canada be interested in a compressed schedule, earlier timelines?
A.17	Canada welcomes any feedback that industry could provide.
Q.18	We are reviewing the RFI and noticed that Project Approval (Implementation) is scheduled in June 2027. When would you expect to release a Request for Proposals (RFP) for this program? Are you anticipating to down-select qualified companies via an Invitation to Qualify (ITQ)? If so, when would you expect this to occur?
A.18	Canada is currently seeking feedback from industry to support options analysis, plan project timelines and develop a procurement strategy. Canada may pursue additional industry engagement activities; these could include the publication of additional RFIs, prequalifying companies, or offering industry opportunities to review draft project documents. It is too early in the process to determine if or when these activities may take place.

## Part 2

Q.19	Please advise how industry is to submit RFI responses.
A.19	Responses are requested via email to the Procurement Authority.
Q.20	It is requested that the due date for responses be amended to February 28, 2021.
A.20	Canada will not offer an extension to February 28, 2021. While vendors are requested to submit what they can by February 10, 2021, they are welcome to submit feedback at any time. Canada cannot guarantee that information submitted beyond February 10, 2021 will be considered.
Q.21	Requirements: Based on our analysis the requirements are generally achievable but the 15 year design life will be a major cost driver for a future system. The standard design life for Next Gen radar systems that are being developed today is 10 years with additional consumables. What is driving the 15 year life? Will Canada consider a 10 year design life?
A.21	At this time, Canada is not considering a 10 year mission life; Canada is looking for options to achieve a 15 year mission life. It should be noted the HLMR states it can be achieved by "the development of a satellite system with a design life of a minimum of 15 years, or by the launch of additional satellites to ensure a minimum 15 years of operations." This requirement is driven in part by the lengthy approval and procurement processes faced by large and complex projects; a 15-year mission life may mitigate the risk of a capability gap following the end of DESSP's design life.
Q.22	The current DESSP high-level timeline is very achievable. However, if the goal of DESSP is to ensure uninterrupted radar data after RCM reaches the end of its design life in 2026 the schedule will actually miss an important requirement by about 7 years that will potentially affect Canadian military operations and the Department of National Defences' (DND) access to a sovereign surveillance capability. Is Canada interested in a more ambitious schedule that will result in achieving Initial Operational Capability (IOC) sooner than 2033?
A.22	Though addressing the gap between RCM and DESSP is outside of the scope of DESSP, Canada welcomes suggestions for compressing the proposed DESSP project schedule.
Q.23	What is the relationship between DESSP and the Canadian Space Agency's Earth Observation Service Continuity (EOSC) project? Will they be combined at some point in the future? What is the likelihood of combining the projects?
A.23	DND is leading the DESSP project, which is focussed to deliver as many of the requirements provided in the reference document, <i>RD-1: Department of National Defence Space Based Requirements, version 2.0</i> as possible, and to provide space-based Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities to Canada and its Allies. The CSA is leading the EOSC project independently of DESSP. Canada is unable to comment on the likelihood of combining the projects.

Q.24 Use of a National Security Exemption may reduce competition and innovation, and could increase costs. An NSE could result in a technical solution that is sub-standard with a high price that may not in fact strengthen or benefit Canada's National Security capabilities. What will cause Canada to invoke a NSE? What is the probability that an NSE will be applied on DESSP? At what point in the procurement process is an NSE likely to be declared?

A.24 An NSE may be invoked where Canada considers it necessary to do so in order to protect its national security interests; specific security considerations for DESSP include, but are not limited to, data classifications. As indicated in the RFI, an NSE may be invoked for the DESSP project; an NSE could be invoked at any time, though likely prior to the release of any related solicitation(s).

Q.25 Security Classification: The RFI states – "Certain aspects of the DESSP mission will be classified at either a Secret or Top-Secret level. Therefore, there will be a requirement for Secret and Top Secret level clearances for both facility(ies) and staff." We are operating in an information vacuum regarding a project requirement that is very important to the proposed solution for DESSP.

- What is driving the project towards being a Secret or Top Secret level of classification? When will Canada reveal what these "certain aspects" are?
- Why cannot Canada state today whether the "certain aspects" are either Secret or Top Secret?
- Will NATO and/or other security clearances (Facility & Personnel) be treated as equivalent to Canadian Secret & Top Secret clearances?

A.25 As indicated in section 5.2 of the RFI, certain aspects of the DESSP mission will be classified at either a Secret or Top-Secret level; there will be a requirement for Secret or Top Secret level clearances for both facility(ies) and staff. The project is currently completing its options analysis phase, the outcome of the analysis will help determine the required security levels of the project.

Q.26 The RFI states the following - "DESSP may require the production of, or access to, controlled goods that are subject to the International Traffic In Arms Regulations (ITAR) provisions of the United States (US) for which Technical Assistance Agreements (TAAs) will be required to be in place in advance of bid evaluation so that ITAR-controlled material may be included in any forthcoming proposed solution. Respondents are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the ITAR provisions and TAA requirements at the earliest opportunity."

- Can Canada identify today what ITAR controlled goods & materials are being considered? At what point in the procurement process will the required US technology be declared to industry?
- Does the statement about ITAR & TAA indicate a preference for US technology in the DESSP solution versus technology from a Canadian or other national source? An ITAR-free solution provides Canada with greater independence and complete autonomy from US control.
- Why does Canada want to consider tying its hands and surrendering national control by incorporating US technology on a strategically important surveillance capability?

A.26	Canada is currently seeking feedback from industry to support options analysis. Reference information on TAAs and ITAR provisions were included in the RFI simply to advise industry of potential requirements; Canada is unable to confirm any specific details at this time.
Q.27	<p>The RFI states the following: <i>“DESSP may require access to US Government Technology through a Third-Party Partnership complying with Country Over Private Entity policies.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can Canada provide some clarifying information about what US Government technology is being considered?</li> <li>• Does the U.S. Technology related to satellites, radar payloads, hosted payloads, Processing, Exploitation and Dissemination (PED) system, or something else?</li> <li>• If U.S. Technology is <i>required</i> will it be provided as Canadian Government Furnished Equipment (GFE)?</li> <li>• If Canada directs that US Government Technology will be used, how will the Industrial and Technological Benefits (ITB) Policy and Value Proposition requirements be applied to this part of the DESSP solution?</li> </ul>
A.27	Canada is currently seeking feedback from industry to support options analysis. Reference information on the Country Over Private Entity Assurance Program and Third-Party Partnerships were included in the RFI simply to advise industry of potential requirements; Canada is unable to confirm any specific details at this time. In a scenario where Canada directs that US Government Technology be used, the ITB Policy would apply to the full value of the contract, including any equipment that may be sourced from foreign sources that the Contractor is tasked to deliver. The contractor is not responsible for the value of equipment that is provided GFE.
Q.28	<p>The RFI makes frequent reference to US sourced technology. This implies that technology from other allied nations is of lesser interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is DND only interested in US technology?</li> <li>• Is DND interested in technology from other Allied nations that are leaders in space based radar systems?</li> <li>• Is DND willing to consider collaborative arrangement with Allied nations other than the US?</li> <li>• Can DND confirm that the DESSP project will be based on a level, open and fair procurement process that does not favour US sources of supply?</li> <li>• Is there any point in a non-US company bidding on DESSP?</li> </ul>
A.28	Canada is currently seeking feedback from industry to support options analysis. Any references made to US-sourced technology were included in the RFI simply to advise industry of potential requirements, Canada is unable to confirm any specific details at this time.
Q.29	The RFI refers to the space segment including Automatic Identification System (AIS) capabilities. Given the wide availability of AIS data services, why does Canada want to include AIS capabilities in the satellite versus procuring the capability as a service?
A.29	Canada welcomes any feedback, comments and/or recommendations on all procurement methods for the provision of AIS data.
Q.30	What is Canada looking for in the HLMR# 2, passive surveillance requirements?



A.30	Canada is looking to detect and geo-locate common maritime transmissions in the Radio Frequency (RF) spectrum. This could be accomplished through various means; Canada welcomes any feedback, comments and/or recommendations on this requirement.
Q.31	Is Canada prioritizing on-board processing capabilities or downlink bandwidth capabilities for reducing latency?
A.31	Canada is not prioritizing any specific technical solution, the goal is to reduce latency. Canada welcomes any feedback, comments and/or recommendations on this requirement.
Q.32	Will there be Canadian economic requirements? What are the priorities or weightings for the Value Proposition?
A.32	As stated in the RFI, the ITB Policy, including the Value Proposition, may apply to this procurement (see section 6, Economic Benefits). As part of this RFI, Canada is seeking feedback on the potential for economic benefits from this procurement. Canada is seeking industry feedback as part of the options analysis phase, which will assist us in developing a draft approach (see section 8.7 of this RFI). As a result, the specific requirements including weightings for the Value Proposition have not been determined. For more information about the ITB Policy, please visit <a href="http://www.canada.ca/itb">www.canada.ca/itb</a> . For general questions about the ITB Policy, visit <a href="https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/086.nsf/eng/h_00140.html">https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/086.nsf/eng/h_00140.html</a> . Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada will not address questions about DESSP; enquiries related to DESSP are to be made by e-mail to the Public Services and Procurement Canada Procurement Authority identified in the RFI.
Q.33	What is the best way, in the RFI response, to clearly present the capabilities that Canada has access to under existing contracts?
A.33	Industry is welcome to provide summaries of relevant capabilities and contracts in existence including the technical authority point of contact within their RFI response.
Q.34	With regards to the project gathering information for this RFI, and with regards to providing information relating to existing contracted capabilities, is it in the scope of this project's phase to test those capabilities under existing Government of Canada contract terms?
A.34	Testing environments is not currently within the scope of DESSP; however, Canada welcomes industry feedback on the importance of such activities.
Q.35	Is there a project timeline available?
A.35	Please refer to section 7 of the RFI for a high-level project schedule.
Q.36	Regarding economic benefits for Canada, will there be regional distribution of work requirements?
A.36	There are no regional requirements under the ITB Policy. Generally speaking, Prime Contractors would need to present regional plans as part of any bid submission. Regional plans are

important as they ensure that ITB investment opportunities associated with defence and Canadian Coast Guard procurements are available for firms, post-secondary institutions and charitable/not-for-profit organizations across all regions of Canada. Regional commitments made by Prime Contractors at the time of bid become contractually binding in the event of a contract award. Regional Development Agencies work closely with Canadian industry to understand their capabilities and link them to potential bidders on each procurement. This helps ensure that each region of Canada benefits from defence and Canadian Coast Guard procurements. Regional Development Agencies are also well positioned and available to work with Prime Contractors to ensure they are able to deliver on regional commitments. To find out more about Regional Development Agencies, visit:  
[http://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/icgc.nsf/eng/h\\_07662.html](http://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/icgc.nsf/eng/h_07662.html)