



**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> CORE NETWORK SUSTAINMENT SERVICES LC4ISR CORE NETWORK SUSTAINMENT SERVICES	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> W8486-228517/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 008
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> W8486-228517	<b>Date</b> 2023-02-10
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$RA-059-28901	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 059ra.W8486-228517	<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 2023-02-14</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> Ellingham, Brendan	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 059ra
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (873) 354-2211 ( )	<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>

**DUE TO AN EXTREMELY TIGHT TIMELINE, CANADA CANNOT AFFORD TO PROVIDE PROLONGED CLOSING DATE EXTENSIONS. WE REQUIRE BIDDER'S UTMOST COOPERATION TO SUBMIT THEIR BIDS BY THE SOLICITATION CLOSING DATE.**

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

1. Publish answers to Bidders' questions.

---

**The following questions and answers were published under previous Amendments.**

**Q1: 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 Applications 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.

**A1:** No, any indigenous resources hired will not count towards the 5% target.

**Q2: 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 .

**A2:** No, any skill development training activities will not count towards the 5% target.

**Q3: RFP Reference Annex C – SRCL – Section 10a – PERSONNEL.**

Can Canada please provide the Security Classification Guide?

**A3:** Bidders that are interested in submitting a bid should send a written email request to the Contracting Authority to obtain the SRCL Supplemental Guide.

**Q4: RFP Reference Appendix A4 – CDRL and DID - PMP 100.001 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.

**A4:** 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.

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

Part 3, 1.3.2 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.

**Q6: 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"

**A6:** 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.

**Q7: RFP Reference Annex G – Value Proposition Bidder Instructions - Multiple Sections.**

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 Contract which all bidders can use as a baseline to provide transaction identification against.

**A7:** No change required.

**Q8: RFP Reference Annex F – Compliance Matrix and Technical Bid Evaluation Criteria – Appendix F1 – Mandatory Evaluation Criteria – And Appendix F2 – Rated Evaluation Criteria.**

In reference to Appendix F.1 and F.2, Compliance Matrix and Technical Bid Evaluation Criteria - Mandatory Evaluation Criteria (F.1) & Rated Evaluation Criteria (F.2), 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).

**A8:** 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.

**Q9: 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?

**A9:** 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.

**Q10: RFP Reference Appendix A4 – CDRL and DID – PMP 100.001 – Section 10.13**

Section 10.13 (j) refers to an Audit Closeout Plan.

To which audit is Canada referring?

**A10:** The audit would pertain to all matters and activities subject to this project.

**Q11: 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.

**A11:** 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.

**Q12: RFP Reference Annex F – Compliance Matrix and Technical Bid Evaluation Criteria – Appendix F2 – Rated Evaluation Criteria.**

RT - 1.2 asks the bidder "How their referenced integration experience relates to the APPLICATIONS requirements column titled "Services" when sorted by "Sub-System Integration" listed in the DLCSPM-SBSRM-2001 standard...".

Could Canada provide the **DLCSPM-SBSRB-2021\_Unclassified.pdf** file in native Excel format so that the bidder can sort and filter the spreadsheet on the columns as suggested?

**A12:** Yes, the document will be provided to bidders upon request only.

**Q13: RFP Reference Annex F – Compliance Matrix and Technical Bid Evaluation Criteria – Appendix F2 – Mandatory Evaluation Criteria.**

MT 2.1 states "The SEMP must be based on DLCSPM standard, DLCSPM-SEP-2021 listed in Appendix A2 – Standards and References and must be in accordance with CDRL 200.001 and DID 200.001. Bidders must address all requirements of the DID in their proposed SEMP."

The DID 200.001 states "The SEMP must contain as a minimum the following information aligned with the major headings of Canada's SEP".

Can Canada clarify if it means that the SEMP must have the same major sections as the SEP (i.e. Introduction, Land C4ISR Capability Overview, Engineering Process, Governance, ..., Fielding Process, In-Service Support)? If it is the case:

1. Can Canada confirm that the sub-sections can be different? And
2. Can Canada clarify if the SEMP must also include and consider the sections marked as "To Be Developed" in the SEP (i.e. 10. Fielding Process and 11. In-Service Support)?

**A13:** The SEMP must include the major section outlined in DID 200.001. The content, including sub-sections, is to be based on the DLCSPM-SEP-2021

1. Sub-sections in the SEMP are to be identified by the bidder; and
2. No, however, bidders are encouraged to suggest responses.

**Q14:** RFP Reference Annex F – Compliance Matrix and Technical Bid Evaluation Criteria – Appendix F2 – Rated Evaluation Criteria – RT 2.1c.

The 75% Rating Scale states "Bidder demonstrates an integration process; AND Bidder demonstrates how the integration processes aligns with the SEP; AND Bidder demonstrates how it will manage the minimum product versions."

The 100% Rating Scale states "Bidder demonstrates an integration process; AND Bidder demonstrates how the integration processes aligns with the SEP; AND Bidder demonstrates how it will manage the expected product versions."

Can Canada clarify what is meant by minimum and expected product versions in the context of this requirement?

**A14:** This information can be found in the DLCSPM-SEP-2021.

**Q15:** In APPENDIX F2 - RATED EVALUATION CRITERIA, the Rating Scales of RT-2.4 referred to "principles of life-cycle management". Please could Canada define or clarify what is meant by principle in the context of this requirement? Examples would be appreciated.

**A15:** The Bidder's response is to be based on the "their own experience and best practices", including any industry standards that the Bidder currently uses or proposes to use.

**Q16:** In APPENDIX F2 - RATED EVALUATION CRITERIA, RT 2.4 states, "...the life-cycle management of Products to be developed under the resulting contract." Based on the Full Engineering Process (v2.3) depicted in DLCSPM-SEP-2021, Appendix 2, product life-cycle management extends from "Start" to "Fielding." Can Bidders assume that the LC4ISR Full Engineering Process depicted in Appendix 2 of DLCSPM-SEP-2021 reflects the complete product life-cycle management expected for the contract. If not, please what other elements are missing from the life-cycle management of Products during the contract.

**A16:** No, the life-cycle management process depicted in the SEP does not reflect the full product life-cycle management. As such, Canada is seeking industry expertise, best practices and methods for product life-cycle management.

Bidders are advised that the SEP remains a living document that will be continuously enhanced and evolved with the assistance of the successful bidders via their response and future collaborations. For this reason, Canada is seeking industry expertise, best practices and methods for product life-cycle management.

This said, the Bidder's response should be based on the version released to bidders as part of this RFP process. Bidder are encouraged to include any enhancements and recommendations to be proposed by the Bidder in the System Engineering Management Plan.

As stated in the introduction section of the SEP, the purpose of the SEP “This SEP provides the guidance required for all stakeholders to deliver a cutting edge Land C4ISR capability. This SEP demands all stakeholders work collaboratively under the guidance of Land C4ISR Integrated Product Teams (IPTs).”

**Q17:** DID 100.006 b. iv) states that for each proposed Indigenous business for subcontracting, a copy of the Procurement Strategy for Indigenous Business (PSIB) certification must be included. We understand that PSIB no longer issues certificates. Can Canada please confirm that a snapshot of the Indigenous Business Directory for the proposed Indigenous business will satisfy this requirement?

**A17:** Yes, a snapshot will be accepted. The Contracting Authority will notify Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC) so that certification may be selectively audited for evidence and accuracy.

**Q18: RFP Reference Part 2 - Bidder Instructions – Section 2 - Submission of Bids**

Article 2.3 of Part 2 states that bids must be delivered via CPC Connect only. However, in light of the fact that difficulties can arise with Connect which may prevent bidders from submitting timely bids, it is our view that PSPC should include an alternate method to submit a bid. This is in line with PSPC policy on bid submissions, PN-128R1, dated 2018-05-22, which requires an RFP to include two delivery methods.

**A18:** Canada will accept submission of bids via CPC Connect or Facsimile in accordance with **Section 8** of the 2003 (2022-03-29) Standard Instructions - Goods or Services Competitive Requirements.

**Q19: RFP Reference Part 3 - Bid Preparation instructions - Section 1.3.2**

Part 3, 1.3.2 notes that Prices should only appear in the financial bid. No prices should be indicated in any other section of the bid. Canada is requested to confirm that inclusion of financial information in the Indigenous Participation Plan (IPP) (MT7) is acceptable in order to show the Estimated cost projected for participation of Indigenous Businesses under this contract (DID 100.006 a. iv.).

**A19:** The inclusion of financial information in the IPP is acceptable.

**Q20. RFP Reference 07 - Annex F- Compliance Matrix and Technical Bid Evaluation Criteria**

In RT3.3 Canada is requested to confirm that a CWP resource licensed in a professional discipline will meet the individual certification requirements of RT3.3; where the professionally licensed discipline addresses the application of quality management concepts with significant quality oversight responsibility, and are accountable to and governed by an independent body who regulates practices and establishes professional standards.

**A20:** Bidders will be evaluated on RT3.3 as it is written in Annex F.

**Q21: RFP Reference Annex G – ITB Bidders Instructions, and Annex H – ITB VP – Evaluation Plan.**

Canada is requested to confirm that “Bid Price” in Appendix B is defined as the “Financial Bid’s Weighted Price”, as outlined in Appendix B1: Price Proposal and Financial Bid Evaluation Criteria.

**A21:** Bid Price in Appendix B – Rated Criteria Certificate - of Annex G is the sum of the Total Core Work for Firm Period, the Total Aggregated Labour Rates Proposed for the Firm Period, and the Total Calculated Proposed Mark-Up.

**Q22: RFP Reference Annex G - ITB Bidders Instructions and Annex H - TB VP – Evaluation Plan.**

Canada is requested to confirm that “The bidders Bid Price will be used to calculate the value of the respective VP Commitment Pillar only for the rated criteria related to transaction identification and the percentage of identified transactions is expressed as a percentage of that commitment, not as a percentage of the Bid Price.” As previously answered on a similar solicitation, number W8486-228515/A ISTAR of the LC4ISR as A20.

**A22:** The ITB/VP evaluation requires both the use of Contract Price and Bid Price. Whereas all bidder Commitments are expressed as a percentage of the Contract Price (which can change over time), the evaluation of the Mandatory Requirements uses Bid Price in order to verify that a bidder’s Proposal has identified eligible Transactions that are equal to no less than 30% of Bid Price, measured in Canadian Content Value. For the rated criteria related to transaction identification, the percentage of identified transactions in each VP Commitment Pillar is measured against the Bidder’s Commitment in that respective pillar (e.g. 15% identification of the Research and Development VP Commitment), not as a percentage of Bid Price. The Bidder’s Bid Price will be used to calculate the value of the respective VP Commitment Pillar only for the rated criteria related to transaction identification, and the percentage of identified transactions is expressed as a percentage of that Commitment, not as a percentage of the Bid Price. Bid Price in Annexes G and H is the sum of the Total Core Work for Firm Period, the Total Aggregated Labour Rates Proposed for the Firm Period, and the Total Calculated Proposed Mark-Up.

**The following question and answer is being published under this amendment.**

**Q23: Reference: Annex F – REV1, Requirement RT 2.2**

The requirement is written as follows: “Describe and substantiate, the proposed handover process, specific to the Core Network Functional Grouping, of the Sub-System Design into the System Design.” According to Figure 3 in DLCSPM-SEP-2021, the left side of the V-cycle DLCSPM engineering methodology is the Requirements and Design phase. The right side of the V-cycle is integration, and the Verification and Validation (V&V) phase, which do not include any aspects of the Design phase per se. Based on the engineering methodology phases identified in Figure 3, we believe that it would be more appropriate to write RT 2.2 as follows: “Describe and substantiate, the proposed handover process, specific to the Core Network Functional Grouping, of the Sub-System integration and V&V into the System integration and V&V.” Does this wording reflect the intent of RT 2.2? If so, we ask that RT 2.2 be amended as such. If not, please clarify the intent of RT 2.2.

**A23:** The intent of this criterion is to evaluate the bidder’s response to conduct a handover from the Core Network Functional Grouping back to the SoS E&I Functional Grouping as part of the design process, prior to development.

---

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