



## 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

Land Projects and Communication System Support  
Division/Div des projets terrestres et support de  
systèmes de communication  
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier  
8C2, Place du Portage, Phase III  
Gatineau  
Québec  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> ISTAR of the LC4ISR	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> W8486-228515/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 004
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> W8486-228515	<b>Date</b> 2023-01-17
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$RA-055-28884	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 055ra.W8486-228515	<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 2023-02-06</b> Heure Normale de 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> Abdulkadir, Nadir	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 055ra
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 664-8121 ( )	<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>

**The purpose of this amendment is to:**

1. Modify Annex F – Compliance Matrix and Technical Bid Evaluation Criteria – Appendix F2 – Rated Evaluation Criteria - Sub Section 2.1.c
2. Publish answers to Bidders' questions.

**The following shall form part of this RFP:**

1. In the Annex F – Compliance Matrix and Technical Bid Evaluation Criteria – Appendix F2 – Rated Evaluation Criteria - under Sub Section 2.1.c.

**DELETE:**

Section 2.1.c in its entirety.

**INSERT:**

<b>RT - 2.1 c.</b>	Integration process into the Baseline and release methodology.		Response contains none of the essential elements sought and/or information provided is inadequate which demonstrates that the bidder has very little understanding of the subject matter and/or does not meet the minimum competencies required with respect to the qualification being assessed.	Bidder demonstrates an integration process.	Bidder demonstrates an integration process; <b>AND</b> Demonstrates how the integration process aligns with the SEP.	Bidder demonstrates an integration process; <b>AND</b> Bidder demonstrates how the integration processes aligns with the SEP; <b>AND</b> Bidder demonstrates how it will manage the minimum product versions.	Bidder demonstrates an integration process; <b>AND</b> Bidder demonstrates how the integration processes aligns with the SEP; <b>AND</b> Bidder demonstrates how it will manage the expected product versions.	100	B	
--------------------	--	--	---	---	--	---	--	-----	---	--

**Note: The wording in green font denotes the changes in the RFP.**

**The following questions and answers were published under Amendment 001.**

**Q1: RFP Reference Part 5 – Certifications and Additional Information - Section 1.2 – Proven Experience Certificate**

Bidders are asked to provide "...a certification to demonstrate that cooperation agreement(s) to access Proven Experience are in place with the Team Member at the time of bid submission." Will PSPC provide a certificate with the RFP for bidders to sign?

**A1:** PSPC will not provide a certification with the RFP for Bidders to sign. Bidders, with their bids, must submit references to their Team Members Proven Experience, demonstrating how their Team Member's experience meets and satisfy the evaluation criteria outlined in this bid. Bidders are, further, required to demonstrate a certification that cooperation agreement(s) are in place with the Team Member at the time of bid submission.

To evaluate the Proven Experience required by the RFP, the experience can come from the Bidder or any other members of the Bidder's Team. Bidder's Team includes its subcontractors identified in the technical bid and may also include the parent, subsidiaries or other affiliates of the Bidders. For further details see Certification and Proven Experience in PART 4 – EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION.

**Q2: RFP Reference Part 7A – Resulting Contract Clauses - Section 5.1.2 – Supply Chain Integrity Requirements**

The originally approved versions are included as **Annex TBD** (although portions of Annex TBD that were submitted directly by a subcontractor will be kept confidential by Canada between it and the relevant subcontractor) (To be filled in at contract award, if applicable). In some cases, Canada approved several of each (e.g., several IT Product Lists), because some subcontractors submitted their SCSI directly to Canada. The Parties also acknowledge that security is a critical consideration for Canada with respect to the Work and that on-going assessment of SCSI will be required throughout the Contract Period. This Section governs that process.

Can Canada confirm that Annex TBD is Annex I.

**A2:** Although Annex I is correct, however, its number will be revised at the contract award stage as Annex F to H currently incorporated in the RFP will be removed. Annex I will then become Annex F - Supply Chain Security Information - Submission Form.

**Q3: RFP Reference Note on Page 1**

For Bidders who are already registered with the Contract Security Program (CSP), the submission of the Application for Registration Form (ARF) is a redundant activity. Can Canada remove the requirement for Bidders to submit the ARF, provided that Bidders can demonstrate registration with the CSP (i.e., provide status levels that confirm their active facility security clearance).

**A3:** The CSP has been recently updated and now requires all bidders (even those with current Security Clearances) to submit an Application for Registration Form. This will allow CSP to verify that the bidder's current Security Clearance is valid for the RFP that they are bidding on.

**Q4: RFP Reference Annex F - Compliance Matrix and Technical Bid Evaluation Criteria**

Rated Requirement (RT) 2.4 states: “Describe and substantiate, based on their own experience and best practices, the life-cycle management of Products to be developed under the resulting contract.” The Rating Scale indicates a progressive scale to a 100% score for “Bidder demonstrates a complete life-cycle management process for products and explains eight principles of life-cycle management”.

The DLCSPM SEP (ref. DLCSPM-SEP-2021) however, references only six Product Life-Cycle Management Principles instead of eight. The six Product Life-cycle Management principles described in the DLCSPM-SEP Subsection 2.1.2.1 are as follows:

1. Architectural Development;
2. Systems Engineering;
3. Integration;
4. Fielding;
5. In-Service Support; and
6. Disposal.

Canada is recommended to update the Ratings Scale to be consistent with the process description described in the DLCSPM-SEP, which bidders are required to be compliant with, implementing the following change:

0% (Inadequate):

Bidder does not demonstrate a life-cycle management process for products AND/OR only explains one principle of life-cycle management.

25% (Poor):

Bidder demonstrates a life-cycle management process for products and explains two or three principles of life-cycle management.

50% (Good):

Bidder demonstrates a life-cycle management process for products and explains four principles of life-cycle management.

75% (Excellent):

Bidder demonstrates a life-cycle management process for products and explains five principles of life-cycle management.

100% (Comprehensive):

Bidder demonstrates a life-cycle management process for products and explains six principles of life-cycle management.

**A4:** The DLCSPM-SEP-2021 provides the principles currently being referenced. The Bidder is expected to provide a response that is based on its own experience, which may include more than these six principles.

**Q5: RFP Reference Part 3 – Bid Preparation Instructions**

Part 3, para 3.2 notes that prices should only be contained in Bidder's Financial Bid's. In order to deliver a compliant Section IV - ITB Bid, Bidders must include their Bid price in the Mandatory Requirements Certificate (Mandatory Requirement 4).

Canada is requested to confirm that inclusion of financial information in Section IV - ITB Bid is acceptable?

**A5:** It is acceptable and required to provide the Bid Price as part of Section IV - ITB Value Proposition.

---

**The following questions and answers were published under Amendment 002.**

**Q6: RFP Reference Annex F – Compliance Matrix – Appendix F1 – Mandatory Evaluation Criteria – MT 7 - And Appendix A4 – CDRL and DID**

Can Canada confirm whether or not any internal Indigenous resources that Bidders hire to perform the LC4ISR ISTAR work will count towards the 5% Target for Total Estimated Contract Value for Goods and/or Services to be sourced from Canadian indigenous firms? The Indigenous Participation Plan outlined in Appendix A4 to Annex A, DID 100.006 states that Bidders are required to provide their Human resources strategy on retaining Indigenous peoples for the performance of the Work, however, it is unclear if Indigenous peoples hired as part of these efforts would count towards the 5% Target.

**A6:** No, any indigenous resources hired will not count towards the 5% target.

**Q7: RFP Reference Annex F – Compliance Matrix – Appendix F1 – Mandatory Evaluation Criteria – MT 7 - And Appendix A4 – CDRL and DID**

Can Canada confirm whether Skills Development and Training activities with Indigenous peoples counts towards the 5% Target for Total Estimated Contract Value for Goods and/or Services to be sourced from Canadian indigenous firms?

**A7:** No, any skill development training activities will not count towards the 5% target.

---

**The following questions and answers were published under Amendment 003.**

**Q8: RFP Reference Appendix A4 – CDRL and DID – PMP 100.001 – Section 10.3**

This section states: For each position, the PMP must identify the name...

We assume the requirement is to provide the name of the role and not the name of the individual filling the role. Please confirm.

**A8:** Correct. At bid closing, only name of the role is required unless the individual is known and can be named by the Bidder. However, if successful, the bidder will revise the PMP to also reflect the name of resource.

**Q9: RFP Reference Annex G – Value Proposition Bidder Instructions – Sub Section 5.6.2.5**

Currently, section 5.6.2.5 of Annex G states that “Any proposed Transaction with a company not meeting the Eligible Donor criteria will be rejected.” As written, this could imply that Direct Transactions with an Eligible Donor could be rejected if the supplier did not meet the Eligible Donor criteria.

The following revised language is recommended in place of section 5.6.2.5: “Any proposed Transaction involving ED contributions from a company not meeting the ED criteria will be rejected”.

**R9:** The definition of “Eligible Donor” is provided in Part 7B-ITB Terms and Conditions, Section 1.1.13, and its application is explained in Section 8.1.4. Only those Donors that meet the definition of an Eligible Donor will be accepted as Donors for ITB Transaction purposes. Recipients, as defined in Section 1.1.29, are not required to meet the Eligible Donor definition.

---

**The following questions and answers are being published under this amendment.**

---

**Q10: Reference Amendment 002 - Question 6**

Canada provided clarification noting that "Any indigenous resources hired will not count towards the 5% target". In contrast, the IPP DID (100.006) requires Bidders to indicate:

DID 11.2 a, i) "Human resources strategy on retaining Indigenous peoples for the performance of the Work;" and further requires:

DID 11.2 b, iv), ii) in reference to reporting - "Number of employment or sourcing of Indigenous resources used to perform the Work;"

The DID contents above would indicate that Bidder resources should be counted relative to the fulfilment of the Bidder's commitment to Indigenous Participation. In the spirit of encouraging the Canadian Defence sector to increase the inclusion of Indigenous Peoples within its workforce.

Canada is requested to allow the Bidder's investment in the hiring of Indigenous Resources for the performance of the Work towards its 5% commitment.

**A10:** Please note, although similar, DID 100.006 and the Indigenous Participation Plan (IPP) are two separate mandatory requirements for bidders to submit with their bids, however, bidders who don't wish to respond to the IPP Rated Requirement are not under any obligation to provide any commitment. If bidders choose to not commit to fulfil 1 to 5% target, their bid will not be deemed non-responsive.

Also, please take note that inclusion of Indigenous Peoples in ITB Skills Development and Training Transactions is allowed, subject to the ITB Terms and Conditions, but it would not be part of the IPP Rated Criteria. The objective of the IPP Rated Criteria is to encourage contractors to award contracts to Indigenous Businesses particularly, thus hiring Indigenous resources will not count towards the 5% target.

**Q11: RFP Reference Annex F – Compliance Matrix and Technical Bid Evaluation Criteria – Appendix F1 – Mandatory Evaluation Criteria – And Appendix F2 – Rated Evaluation Criteria**

Canada requests that the Bidders provide their comments in Column L (Bidder's Comments) demonstrating how the bidder will meet the requirements, without cross referencing to other statements in Annex F.

Canada is requested to clarify what information they are seeking for the Bidder's to provide in column L; for instance, is Canada looking to have Bidders confirm that their response to the individual mandatory or rated requirement meets one of the Compliance Methodologies provided (A-D)?

**Q11:** Yes, that's correct, and additionally, in which part of their bid and on what page the bidder has included the Proof of Compliance to meet the requirement.

**Q12: RFP Reference Appendix A2 – Standards and References – Section 1.1 DLCSPM Standards – DLCSPM-SEP-2021 and references to DLCSPM-SEP-2021 throughout the SOW**

The copy of the SEP provided to Bidder is referred to as the System Engineering Plan (reference AMD 1) and is dated December 2022.

Can Canada confirm that all references to "DLCSPM SEP 2021" throughout the full RFP package is in fact the "System Engineering Plan\_ - RFP Release" file, publication date December 2022.

**A12:** Correct. The term "DLCSPM SEP 2021" used throughout the full RFP package is the PDF file titled "System Engineering Plan\_ RFP Release", publication date December 2022.

**Q13: RFP Reference Appendix A2 – Standards and References – Section 1.1 DLCSPM Standards – DLCSPM-SEP-2021 and references to DLCSPM-SEP-2021 throughout the SOW**

The copy of the SEP provided to Bidder is referred to as the System Engineering Plan (reference AMD 1) and is dated December 2022.

Can Canada confirm that all references to "DLCSPM SEP 2021" throughout the full RFP package is in fact the "System Engineering Plan\_ - RFP Release" file, publication date December 2022.

**A13:** Correct. The term "DLCSPM SEP 2021" used throughout the full RFP package is the PDF file titled

**Q14: RFP Reference Appendix A4 – CDRL and DID**

Section 10.13 (j) refers to an Audit Closeout Plan. To which audit is Canada referring?

**A14:** The audit would pertain to all matters and activities subject to this project.

**Q15: RFP Reference Annex F – Compliance Matrix and Technical Bid Evaluation Criteria – Appendix F2 – Rated Evaluation Criteria.**

Can Canada please explain how management and execution of Design Authority applies to RT2.1.c?

**A15:** Canada acknowledges that configuration management is not a component or factor that needs to be considered by the design authority. However, Canada expects the Design Authority to always consider and ensure successful integration processes.

**Q16. RFP Reference Annex G – Value Proposition Bidder Instructions AND Annex H Industrial and Technological Benefits Evaluation Plan**

Referencing Annex G and Annex H (both VP/ITB related), the use of both Bid Price and Contract Price are referenced, in relation to transaction identification. We suggest that since Contract Price is defined in the ITB/VP terms and conditions, and Bid Price is not, that Contract Price be the sole reference for commitment value in both Annex G and Annex H. It is recommended that Contract Price be set at a value that more closely aligns with the anticipated value of the future ISTAR Contract, such as \$120 M CAD, which all bidders can use as a baseline to provide transaction identification against.

**A16.** No Change Required.

---

***All other terms and conditions of the RFP remain unchanged.***