Public Works and Government Services Canada

Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada

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
Gatineau
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

Title - Sujet Future Naval Training System	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W8482-218578/B	**Amendment No. - N° modif.** 004
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W8482-218578	**Date** 2021-05-18

GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG
PW-$NGT-003-39341

File No. - N° de dossier 003ngt.W8482-218578	**CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME**

Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin
at - à 02:00 PM   Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
on - le 2021-05-31   Heure Avancée de l'Est HAE

F.O.B. - F.A.B.
Plant-Usine: ☐   **Destination:** ☐   **Other-Autre:** ☐

Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: McKenny, Harold	**Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur** 003ngt
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (873) 455-5271 ( )	**FAX No. - N° de FAX** ( ) -

Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:
Destination - des biens, services et construction:

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Vendor/Firm Name and Address
Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

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**

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Next Generation Travel Project Division/Division du
Project de voyage prochaine Génération
Terrasses de la Chaudière 4th Fl
Terrasses de la Chaudière 4e étage
10 Wellington Street
10, rue Wellington
Gatineau
Quebec
K1A 0S5

Canada

Request for Information (RFI)
Future Naval Training System (W8482-218578/B)
Amendment #004

This amendment is issued to:

- **A.** Update the date for One-on-One Sessions;
- **B.** Publish a summary of the FNTS Industry Information Session (questions and answers) that was held on April 21, 2021.

Part A: Update the date for One-on-One Sessions

At Article 4.6.2 of the RFI:
DELETE the following:
4.6.2   If One-on-One Sessions are held, they will be held from June 02, 2021 in the NCR (additional days for One-on-One Sessions may be added as required). Each participant will be allotted a maximum of two hours.

INSERT the following in its place:
4.6.2   If One-on-One Sessions are held, they will be held from mid July 2021 in the NCR (additional days for One-on-One Sessions may be added as required). Each participant will be allotted a maximum of two hours.

Part B: Publish a summary of the FNTS Industry Information Session (questions and answers) that was held on April 21, 2021.

Future Naval Training System (W8482-218578/B)

Industry Day Questions & Answers

1. **We would like to request a copy of the attendee list and slide deck.**
The list of suppliers, a copy of the slide deck and also the FNTS videos was shared with industry please refer to [W8482-218578/B Amendment 002](#).

2. **Will you be publishing a list of the industry attendees, or at least the companies that are represented?**
Please refer to Question & Answer 1.

3. **Will you make these slides available following this session?**
Please refer to Question & Answer 1.

4. **This video was great. Will it and the slides be available after the session?**
Please refer to Question & Answer 1.

5. Will the slides and FNTS video be shared?
Please refer to Question & Answer 1.

6. What is the status of creating a single unified command structure for the RCN training capability? If this were not to be achieved, how would it change the way the FNTS moved forward as an opportunity for industry?
The first part of the question is "What is the status of a single unified command structure for the training system?" Right now that is a concept. Anyone who is familiar with the Navy should know that Individual Training and Education (IT&E), as well as a lot of the curriculum and the technologies used in delivering Collective Training (CT) are controlled by Commander of Naval Personnel and Training Group (CNPTG), under the authority of the Admiral on the west coast; and Collective Training, in terms of those teams that go to sea to prove a ship's teams capabilities, as well as those that have those requirements for the team based activities, falls under the authority of Commander Sea Training Group (STG) on the east coast. The level of collaboration and coordination of the activities is quite high. The RCN can't speak to where plans might go in the future, however if the second part of the question is understood well, any concepts that might be provided regarding that issue from industry would be looked at with interest.

7. Is Canada considering a "Performance Based Contracting Framework" for FNTS?
We haven't reached that point in the process yet. The GC is interested in hearing industry's thoughts and are looking for relational contracts in order to deliver outcomes for the Royal Canadian Navy over the long term. If this model is the suggestion from industry, we're more than happy to look at and discuss it. If you have suggestions in this area, please forward them to us.

8. What is the relationship between FNTS and Project STORM? With this TEL (Technology Enabled Learning) strategy, would Project STORM become part of FNTS, under the prime contractor, assuming that there were to be one? Or will STORM remain a separate project?
System of Training and Operational Readiness Modernization (STORM) is a key capability to FNTS. It is a project that the Director of Naval Requirements (DNR) is looking at. The Navy anticipates that particular project will remain separate. As mentioned in the slides, any of the sustainment portions of Future Naval Training System that are developed under the NTST Program will be coordinated, and integrated with whatever sustainment solutions are out there right now, STORM being one of them. At this point, the Navy would like to see the sustainment solution for FNTS be aligned with that of STORM. That is yet to be determined. The requirements for STORM are essentially the requirements emerging out of the Digital Framework subsystem for FNTS. So in that respect, the two are completely coordinated.

9. How will the RCN bound the definition of the Digital Framework? What parts will be government provided vs industry provided?
Right now the Navy doesn't know what that solution is going to look like for the Digital Framework - that remains to be seen.

In terms of the second part: "What will be Government provided versus industry provided?", that is to be determined. That is definitely part of the feedback that the GC is looking forward to receiving. The RCN has the entire concept of everything the Navy is trying to accomplish for this initiative, however, nothing has been decided yet in terms of what might be handled internally by Government versus what would be contracted out to industry.

10. Is there a sequence for implementation of the Digital Framework (DF) relative to the other 5 subsystems of the FNTS, and is there a sequence of which elements of the DF need to be put in place first?

There are going to be certain elements that need to be put in place before the Navy is capable of operating in this kind of digital environment. Some of those things are almost in place right now. The RCN conducts distributive learning. Naval Personnel and Training Group (NPTG) is developing a learning object repository, etc. however there is going to be a stage where those things have to be knit together in the proper way through either Project STORM or other projects. There are other elements or other subsystems that we can tackle at the right time depending on who is providing or depending on what requirements are generated.

An important piece of this is just recognizing where the Navy is at in the process, which is the RFI process. Those specifics are items where the Navy would appreciate feedback because sequencing is very important when it comes to the large scale of this program which is NTST. That is also part of the previous question about the roles and responsibilities between industry and government. This will become an interesting issue because the RCN must abide by and be compatible with the GC services, while leveraging the technologies and the opportunities that industry can provide for Future Naval Training System (FNTS).

11. What are the key challenges and problems that you are hoping that the FNTS will solve? For example, are there challenges with recruitment and retainment of key skills for the RCN? Does the training take too long? Does it fall short in terms of key skills attained and outcomes?

There is definitely a demographic that the RCN is trying to target. It is no secret that the Navy is struggling a bit in terms of personnel, and with the onset of the pandemic, the RCN's ability to recruit and generate sailors has been challenged. There is a backlog to catch up on. Through the process of the RFI and on to the next steps, one of the key things the Navy is going to be doing is some gap analysis to provide an idea of where the current Naval Training System is falling short, and look to bridge that gap into the Future Naval Training System. It is important to understand that the Navy is not meeting the mark as it pertains to expectation of young demographic of officers coming in now. We need to look at the level of technology employed in other learning institutions and understand what is expected from that young demographic. A key driver for FNTS is to meet those expectations. The RCN is in competition with industry and academia for those smart, young folks who are finishing school and looking to start their careers. The RCN and the Canadian Armed Forces want to be a key competitor in that pool to attract those individuals because that is exactly who we want in the Canadian Armed Forces. There is no doubt the FNTS is a key component for the RCN; leveraging the opportunities that will support the Navy in terms of recruitment.

The FNTS CONOPS provides a summary of the challenges the Navy faces, and requirements and concepts of how the FNTS will meet those. Please review that particular document for more information on those deficiencies.

12. Can you talk to your FNTS vision to integrate personal, career, team, platform and task group training?

The question is focussed on what the RCN would call that spectrum of training from individual all the way to task group. Integrating a number of factors into that spectrum so that it is contiguous is important. At the lowest level are the basic tasks, skills and knowledge that an individual sailor has to know in order to perform their function. The related data in that training, from technical data and/or

operational data can be used throughout the spectrum. Perhaps it is a maritime engineering technician learning how to perform some maintenance on a reverse osmosis plant. There's particular data to use with that. As the person progresses to become a member of a team, for example damage control, that same information should be threaded throughout the sailor's career and exploited in other training activities. In an operational sense, this could be as simple as employing a weapon, then using it in the execution of a particular tactic, and then finally using those skills in a task group or joint environment.

The vision isn't simply to use standard practices to develop or design training for each individual person in our system. The vision is to use tools, such as artificial intelligence, common source databases, or data emerging from the Integrated Data Environments (IDE) in real time to make sure that it is up to date and that it is being used for everyone, from an individual all the way through to the task group.

The other aspect of it is simply ensuring the Navy's training devices such as trainers and simulators are able to exchange information, and also to track student behaviours on those technologies and log them and interact with, for example, student record stores. It's not just about high-level architecture and other technical terms but also the integration of things like the Experience Application Programming Interface (xAPI).

13. What aspects of the Royal Navy's Project Selbourne would you want to bring into FNTS?
The RCN can't speak to another Navy's project. There are obvious similarities that motivate vendors and if you look at Selbourne, you will see similarities with the FNTS CONOPS.

The RCN is certainly speaking with our allies, not just the Royal Navy but all our allies, because there is a significant level of recapitalization across many of our allied fleets and obviously the RCN wants to leverage lessons learned from all of them.

14. What will be the relationship between the initial sustainment contracts and the long term ones? Does one naturally lead into another? Is the scope different, or is it an evolution? Will there be two separate competitions for these?
The Navy envisions that an interim, or initial, contract to bridge the gap between what the RCN has now and what the RCN will need in the near future. A long term much more comprehensive contract will follow.

It is likely there will be two competitions. What we have not discussed are decisions on the interim, whether that would be one or multiple RFP's. That is still to be determined.

15. Can you elaborate on the scope of work that will be addressed in the Interim Sustainment contracts and would there be on Prime Contract or several contracts?
That is a requirement that has not been fully determined. To answer the second part of the question: This is really what the RCN wants to talk to industry about. The Navy knows that those participating in the RFI process have some excellent ideas and we welcome their input.

16. Is FNTS in ID or Options Analysis?
Transforming the current RCN Naval Training System (NTS) to the FNTS is being enabled through the NTST Program. This engagement is the initial part of our agile procurement process. This is the first time that the RCN has been able to share what our concept is. The NTST Program staff is developing requirements and looking forward to a series of interactions with industry as the program goes through various levels of approval and investment on the departmental side.

The NTST Program is not a project that will go through specific and defined phases such as Options Analysis, Definition, etc. as would a capital project. It is a system of systems which will generate requirements that will guide projects delivering training capability.

17. Not clear whether the ITB policy will be applied or not, yet many statements made are clearly ITB policy related. Can you please explain why the ITB policy may not be applied?
GC is early on in the procurement phase at this point and this presentation was meant to present an introduction to the ITB policy. ISED is still determining the eligibility of FNTS to have the ITB policy applied. Eligibility will depend on the procurement approach and a number of things that are needed to implement the policy, such as whether or not international trade agreements will be applied. As the procurement process goes forward, ISED will provide a decision as to whether or not the ITB policy will be applied.

Further to this, the information provided in the presentation provides a solid basis in terms of FNTS, and its envisioned goals and the approach in general. As it pertains to economic benefits, ISED believes that this is an area where we want to hear from all suppliers to have a more in depth understanding of opportunities for economic leveraging and where those benefits could be. The message ISED wants to convey is: we want to hear your views. This is the first step, in a number of upcoming dialogues along that question. ISED welcomes all your feedback and your views around economic benefits.

18. FNTS ISS – Cdr White stated they were following a Business Case Analysis process that was robust but not the DND standard SBCA process. Can you please elaborate why it's not the standard SBCA process and what the differences are between the two?
The SBCA process is mandated for procurements over a specific dollar value. Since we are at the initial stages of this endeavor, which is really running as a program, and not a project going through the typical capital acquisition process, it was determined that an SBCA is not required at this stage. Once the NTST Program has determined specific costing figures, the RCN will in all likelihood, have to undergo the applicable processes. The processes the NTST Program is following now closely follows those of the mandated SBCA.

19. How will collaborative opportunities be promoted, beyond proponents signing up on the "interested proponents" list?
Through the collaborative process, the agile procurement process is one of the main mechanisms the GC is looking to leverage, by starting with an RFI process to get industry feedback and to hold one-on-one meetings. The GC plans to do additional RFI's in the future. There is a possibility of an Invitation to Qualify process for one or multiple aspects of the initiative, then that will allow the GC to have more collaborative discussions with industry at the table as a whole and individually. It is also up to industry to somewhat self-collaborate amongst themselves in terms of where strategic relationships might come into play. Those aren't specific items that PSPC will be doing.

ISED would follow the industry engagement processes outlined by PSPC. In terms of ITBs, ISED would be participating in possible one-on-ones or any other collaborative process moving forward.

20. Where will the Digital Platform servers be located?
That is a requirement that has not been fully determined, although there is policy that requires protected data to be stored within Canada.

21. Cdr White mentioned that the facilities would be provided through ADM IE and DCC. He also mentioned that requirements were in definition. Is there a consulting opportunity associated with this, or are you just asking for requirements input in the RFI? Why not consider industry provision of facilities? This could result in quicker delivery.

The decision on who delivers infrastructure has to be made through other departmental decision making processes, including ADM(IE) and Defence Construction Canada (DCC), that is not the Navy's decision. The reason for this engagement is to hear out what proposals and ideas might be coming from all the experts in industry, and the RCN is certainly willing to listen to those.

The GC looks forward to hearing from Industry on Training Facilities and all aspects of the program. If you have innovative ideas on delivering Training Facilities, the GC will want to listen to this. There are other decision making bodies within the government that have to be involved.

22. What is anticipated budget for this program?

At this point in time, no specific budget has been set and there are still requirements to be defined. If industry has cost estimations that might inform the Royal Canadian Navy's requirements, the GC would appreciate that information.

23. Is Canada looking for a single prime contractor for FNTS, or will it be one RFP for many contracts on various elements?

These contracting decisions have not yet been made. The GC is looking for industry input on this topic. This topic will continue to be addressed through future engagement activities however whatever information you wish to share at this time, the GC would very much appreciate hearing about it.

24. Have any existing Training Systems/Technologies been identified as being phased out, not to be included within the FNTS scope?

This question could be interpreted as either existing training technologies we're using today identified for phase out, or technologies being used around the world that are simply being phased out. On the second part, it is too early to tell. On the first part, any decisions we make based on training technology will have to be in accordance with different authorities, such as ADM(Mat). Those schedules still apply. The Navy also has any number of various technologies that are used in the training system today. Items such as, the Navigation and Bridge Simulator (NABS) and any number of technologies have their own schedules for phasing out and renewal and nothing has changed in those plans yet. As the NTST program further refines the requirements for new technologies, then those decisions will have to be made.

Part of the challenge that the RCN faces with the FNTS is training for the Canadian Surface Combatants (CSC). This represents a re-baselining of the Navy's combatant force. That is going to happen over a long period of time, and it will be an evolutionary process. Changes to the Naval Training System (NTS) are going to involve introducing new capabilities to train for the future fleet, whilst maintaining the capability to still train in the current configurations for the Halifax Class Ships (HCS). The Navy is interested in hearing industry perspectives on where the RCN might be able to consolidate elements applicable to multiple systems of classes of ship. If that leads to earlier divestments of old capabilities because we have real estate for the new capability, the capability to train new fleet and current fleet, that is something we would be interested in.

25. Some of the input you are requesting is very detailed and could take more time to prepare than the RFI allows. Can industry make supplemental submissions in between the formal RFI processes, which at this point are basically a year apart?
If industry feels the amount of time we have allocated for you to respond to the questions in the RFI is insufficient, please submit a formal question with how much time you would be looking to add or some of the limiting factors that you don't have enough information at this time to provide a response to a particular question. We will be accepting additional feedback after the closing date as it is an agile process. However, what the Government of Canada is looking at doing is moving through step by step through various engagement aspects. So if we were to receive some information later on that we may have already made decisions upon, that particular feedback may not necessarily be incorporated into our decision making process because we might have already passed that. So please keep that in mind.

Overall if the procurement process is too fast and there is not enough time to do meaningful engagement, please let us know. We are looking to have a collaborative relationship with industry as we go through this engagement so that does mean we need enough time to provide that input.

26. To enable platform specific training in virtual or constructive the FNTS Prime contractor will need access to RCN Ship detailed information and specifications (ie AOPS (Arctic and Offshore Patrol Ship), JSS (Joint Support Ship), HCS(Halifax Class Ships) or CSC (Canadian Surface Combatant)) will the RCN facilitate FNTS contractor access to that ship information to create and produce the relevant platform training?
The RCN agrees with the assertion made in the question that this type of data and information will be essential for this to work properly. Unfortunately the Navy can't speak right now to whatever contractual or legal arrangements that will need to be in place to ensure that happens. There are members of the NTST team who are working very closely with ADM(IE), ADM(Mat), and also with major ship Project Management Offices (PMO), to ensure that as those teams develop their Integrated Data Environments (IDEs) that those IDEs are capable of exchanging this type of information for the purposes of instruction and for the purposes of developing things like 3D models.

It is understood that some of the information that industry might need to deliver training is likely protected. We are not sure exactly what would be released prior to a Request for Proposal or at Contract Award. Those things have not been determined. It is understood that information would be required at some point in time or at various points in time throughout this process.

27. Can you please talk about the relationship/hierarchy of this training contract with all the others such as AJISS, (Arctic and Offshore Patrol Ship and Joint Support Ship In Service Support agreement), AOPS (Arctic and Offshore Patrol Ship), JSS (Joint Support Ship), CSC (Canadian Surface Combatant), others training & sustainment? How will they relate? Thank you!
All of the things that were mentioned are either in place right now or they are contracts aimed at further development or implementation. They are initiatives much more mature than the NTST Program. The aim is to integrate, particularly on the in-service support side, with whatever solutions may be in place. We have also been collaborating with all of these projects to have the FNTS requirements integrate with the Project's requirements. You can expect to see some parallel and complimentary requirements, particularly for CSC.

Regarding the question for the hierarchy where the Navy sees this fitting, in terms of hierarchical amongst other projects, it is difficult to define because they are there to support those projects and the

FNTS is really the key linkage between how the sailors will be linked to those new capabilities. It is not envisioned as a hierarchy in where one is above the other.

28. Any thoughts on the role of Academia in FNTS?
The GC would like to hear from Academia in terms of where they might play a role. Within ITB policy, there is potential to leverage economic benefits for academia.

In our existing Naval Training System, the RCN leverages academia quite extensively. While there are things that only the Navy can teach, there are limits on the Navy's capacity, in terms of throughput, to deliver on. Therefore, the RCN needs help from academia, not only from a throughput perspective, but also expertise. There are certain things the Navy is just not as good at instructing, especially when it comes to the more specialized and technical skills. The RCN already leverages academia and the vision is for that to continue with the Future Naval Training System. As per the Concept of Operations, the Navy wants to stick with RCN personnel doing what only RCN personal can do, and anywhere the Navy can leverage industry and academia is of significant interest to us.

On the ITB policy, there are two areas in which economic offsets could be fulfilled: direct and indirect work. In terms of direct work, there may be an opportunity for academia through the Statement of Work. In terms of indirect work, there is a place for academia in both the Research and Development and the Skills Development and Training pillars in the Value Proposition in which we try to leverage economic benefits from academic partners as well as Small and Medium Businesses (SMBs) looking into Innovation opportunities. In conclusion, there is an opportunity in the direct scope of work for FNTS however, if the ITB Policy is applied, there is also an opportunity in indirect pillars.

29. Have you a high level view/expectation of the FNTS transition Phase from the "as-is" training state to the "to-be" state; or what training/trade/task you want to transition into FNTS first, can it be staggered over a period of time between IOC and FOC?
A high level view of a transition period has been addressed in previous questions. The RCN and the Naval Training System will have to train our existing fleet and our existing sailors for quite some time as we introduce new aspects of the FNTS. So this transition will be a long period not an instantaneous switch. There is not yet a high-level view of what that will look like. We are at the CONOPS stage where the NTST Program is looking for information and ideas, as well as writing requirements that will inform future projects. When that is complete, that question can be answered in much more detail.

Specifically regarding Initial Operation Capability (IOC) and Final Operating Capability (FOC) for FNTS: Given the size and scope of the NTST Program, the Navy doesn't have definitions of what IOC would look like, and in turn FOC would look like. This is going to be an evolutionary process that will be evergreen and will continue to evolve and change over time. So the Navy does not define what IOC and FOC look like.

30. Does the FNTS vision to also include some inter-service capability (ie with RCAF and CA training systems)?
Yes, the NTST Program has written a CONOPS, in close collaboration and with feedback from the other environmental Training Commands in the Forces; the RCAF, Canadian Army, Canadian Special Operations Forces Command (CANSOF) as well as Military Personnel Command and the Canadian Defence Academy (CDA) and Military Personnel Generation (MPG) who are actually the IT&E authorities. Any opportunities for integration will be sought as the intent is to exploit those opportunities as much as possible.

31. On the FNTS Infrastructure, will the RCN engage or seek ADM(IE)/DCC inputs and support during the Engagement process, RFP and Bid Eval? Also once the Infra "in Service" will the buildings and infra fall under ADM(IE) Real Property group oversight?
In accordance with policy the RCN is working with ADM(IE) and DCC, even in these early stages, for infrastructure requirements. Whether or not infrastructure falls under the current Real Property Operations (RPOps) organization or otherwise, that remains to be determined. There are innovative ideas out there and innovative ways to do this that perhaps the CAF haven't even thought of yet.

At this point the Navy is doing nothing different than any other infrastructure project. The only difference is that the level of collaboration between the NTST Program, the RCN, ADM(Mat), and ADM(IE), is more involved and significant compared to other infrastructure projects. The NTST Program's role in the RCN is to help inform the requirements of what the Future Naval Training System needs to look like, and what capabilities it needs to be able to perform. The actual process for the acquisition of the future infrastructure is no different than any other infrastructure projects that the Navy has seen; whereby ADM(IE) is the lead for infrastructure. All the processes will look similar to processes where the program/project will provide requirements and ADM(IE), with the help of other departments, will go through implementing GC approved requirements.

32. Is budget of this program approved? Can the overall budget disclosed?
Please refer to Question & Answer 22.

33. A naval training facility was recently delivered in Halifax (Stadacona). Are additional facilities required in Halifax? In what locations are net new facilities required?
Yes, there was a new facility delivered in Halifax and that is meeting the needs it was designed to meet. The size, space and other requirements needed for FNTS are beyond the capability of that building in terms of size and space.

The RCN is fortunate to have delivered on a capability that will dovetail into the Future Naval Training System infrastructure. The Training Facility delivered in Halifax is one of several infrastructure projects that the Navy will be looking at to support the FNTS. Also, as previously indicated, the bicoastal training concept the RCN aims for is a safe assumption; the Navy will be looking for infrastructure on both coasts.

34. Is there potential within the FNTS concept of operations for industry to participate in training, either in instructional roles or to augment roles in the training audience?
To rephrase the question: "Will there be opportunities or has the RCN envisioned opportunities for industry to participate in roles such as instruction or development?" Yes. The RCN has not defined who we want to be instructors or developers. What has been identified, as per the CONOPS, are certain areas where RCN personnel might be required, and other areas where it could be open to others, either developers, instructors, or managers. In fact, the RCN already makes good use of outside instructional capabilities whether that be contracted university professors, educational institutions, etc. The Navy also has contracts for operating various trainers and simulators and the vision is for the RCN to take good lessons from that, take ideas from industry and expand so that the Navy can ensure that sailors are doing their core jobs and that is doing their jobs at sea and ashore as required.

This is an area where the RCN needs the help of industry to provide ideas on where industry and other partners can participate in the FNTS. Historically, the RCN ran training; the RCN owned it, conducted it,

and developed it all through uniformed people in the Navy. This is no longer a sustainable model. The Navy needs help from academia and industry, and wants to make use of the best skill sets to deliver the best type of training to the sailors of the future. This may not always include uniformed personnel standing in front of the classroom or developing new training content. The RCN requires a training system whereby the best people are employed to the greatest effect.

35. Considering the range of current training assets and their technologies for current fleets; and looking to the future platforms inducted, is there a vision to have a common qualification standards and integration of all current and future training assets in to common configuration?
On the surface, yes. If not a common configuration, then technology that is able to communicate with it or other ones. Additionally, being able to harvest xAPI or student interaction information from student technology is important, as is reconfiguration and multi-use capability. In terms of reconfiguration and multiuse of technology, you are driving down knowledge trained at a lower level, and throughout a career, followed by more specific training programs for specific platforms. In the Navy case, that would mean specialized courses for applying those skills on AOPS or CSC or JSS or otherwise. If the question about common configuration refers to common core training versus specialized training, then the answer is again yes. The Navy does envision having a training system that makes the most use of common core training and specializations.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.