



**RETURN BIDS TO:**

**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -  
TPSGC  
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier  
Place du Portage, Phase III  
Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2  
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5  
Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

**SOLICITATION AMENDMENT  
MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION**

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

**Comments - Commentaires**

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

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**  
Defence Communications Division. (QD)  
11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier  
Place du Portage, Phase III, 8C2  
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> TIC3 Air Deployable Tactical Data L TIC3 Air Deployable Tactical Data Link (TDL) –Ground Entry Station (GES)	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> W8475-235520/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 004
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> W8475-235520	<b>Date</b> 2023-08-01
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$QD-028-29097	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 028qd.W8475-235520	<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 Daylight Saving Time EDT <b>on - le 2023-08-21</b> Heure Avancée de l'Est HAE	
<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> Garate, Oscar	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 028qd
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (873) 355-3354 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b> 6363 NOTRE DAME EST MONTREAL QC H1N 3V9 CANADA	

**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/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>



## REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

W8475-235520

DEPLOYABLE TACTICAL DATA LINK GROUND ENTRY STATION

### AMENDMENT # 4

#### Q&A's # 2

The questions and answers outlined in this amendment supersedes all previous posted answers

#	Document	Question	Answer
1	Appendix A1, 3.1.1	The Network Time Server has environmental requirements for a transportation solution, will the NTS be operational within this solution.	No, these requirements are for transportation of the equipment only.
2	Appendix A1, 3.1.1	Please clarify/provide the Network Time Server transportation solution packaging requirements.	The maximum packaging size (LxWxD) must be less than 33"x23"x21"
3	Appendix A1, 3.1.1	Please confirm whether the GPS device to provide time to the network time server will be provided as GFE	Correct. Please refer to the GFE/GSM list.
4	Appendix A1, 3.1.1	Please confirm the required external interfaces to the Network Time Server e.g. Link 16 Gateway (network time, 1 PPS), Secure Communication Gateway (Network Time), Link 22 Gateway (Network time, 1 PPS)?	All required external interfaces for the NTS are defined in Appendix A1.
5	Appendix A1, 3.1.1	Please clarify what the Network Time Server (NTS) capability requirements for L16GW are (SYSTEM PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS DEPLOYABLE DATA LINK GROUND ENTRY STATION 3.2.1 - 3.)	1-PPS, NTP V2, and NTP V3.
6	Appendix A1, 3.1.2	Please confirm the required external interfaces to the Secure Communication Gateway	The integration of the SCG is Canada's responsibility.
7	Appendix A1, 3.1.3	Please confirm the required external interfaces to the Link 16 Gateway	The integration of the Link 16 GW is Canada's responsibility.
8	Appendix A1, 3.1.4	Please confirm the required external interfaces for the GFE Laptop for the Airspace Management Suite (ASMS) Capability	The integration of the ASMS is Canada's responsibility.
9	Appendix A1, 3.1.5	Please clarify the Link 22 Radio Antenna mast requirements	Delivery of an antenna mast is not required. The GFE list will be updated accordingly.
10	Appendix A1, 3.1.5	Please confirm whether or not the Signal Processing Controller is required to support EPM for the HF radio.	Yes, we require the SPC to support EPM in the HF radio.
11	Appendix A1, 3.1.5	Please advise the power interface/requirement, dimensions and weight for the Link-22 Modernized Link Level COMSEC (LLC 7M)	The exact specifications cannot be released prior to the contract being awarded and an NDA being



			signed. Generic information can be provided via email if required.
12	Appendix A1, 3.1.5	Please confirm the minimum system specification for the SNC software (for example, operating system, processor, RAM, storage) and also any other software dependencies.	The exact specifications cannot be released prior to the contract being awarded and an NDA being signed. Generic information can be provided via email if required.
13	Appendix A1, 3.1.5	Please confirm whether the Time of Day requirement (SYSTEM PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS DEPLOYABLE DATA LINK GROUND ENTRY STATION 3.1.5 - 5.) is a unique network time server within the Link 22 Gateway or whether this is an additional set of requirements for the Network Time Server requirement (SYSTEM PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS DEPLOYABLE DATA LINK GROUND ENTRY STATION 3.1.1) specific for the Link 22 GW	Only one NTS is required which satisfies the Link 22 GW TOD requirements.
14	Appendix A1, 3.1.5	Please clarify/provide the requirements for the Link 22 Ancillaries and Laptop transportation and storage	There is no specific requirements for the transportation of laptops. Link 22 ancillaries can be stored within the Link 22 GW or in a separate container.
15	Appendix A1, 3.1.5	Please confirm the power interface requirements to the Link 22 GW (including quantity).	One power interface per equipment case and each power interface must be compatible with 100-240 VAC, 50-60Hz
16	Appendix A1, 3.1.5	Please confirm the OPTASK Link Message standard. (AAPP-11(D)(1) is assumed.)	APP-11(D)(1) is correct, but it also must be compatible with (C) as well.
17	Appendix A1, 3.1.5	Please confirm whether the operator is required to change the Quality of Service parameters for each of the Link 22 Tactical messages as these parameters are specified by ATDLP.5-22 not an operator.	Yes. Generally the operator doesn't need to change those parameters during the mission, however we want to provide the flexibility to configure them depending on the IER of operation/mission.
18	Appendix A1, 3.2	Please confirm whether or not there are environmental requirements for the Link 22 GW DLP/SNC Laptop	A commercial laptop is acceptable.
19	Appendix A1, 3.2	Please clarify whether appropriate configuration/ICD/user documentation will be provided to allow for integration of the Airspace Management Suite, System Network Controller, Tactical Data Processor (TDP) Command Control (C2) capabilities/software.	The integration of GFE and GSM will remain Canada's responsibility and any required support from the Supplier will be tasked as required.
20	Appendix A1, 3.2	Please confirm the required cable lengths for system integration, interface, power and RF	Network / Interface cable should be at least 10 meters long. The power cable should be at least 5 meters long and the RF cable should be at least 150-foot long



21	Appendix A1, 3.2	In that COTS equipment crates similar to the dimensions identified are in themselves in the region of 20+Kg (not including cabling, connectors, back panel or equipment itself) the stated 60Kg requirement could lead to an unnecessary increase in cost in order to achieve the requirement. (e.g. a bespoke composite equipment crate might be required.) Please confirm if the 60Kg is a fixed requirement for the packaging of the Link 22 Gateway or whether there is any flexibility in this regard.	Updated SWaP requirements will be published in an upcoming amendment which will increase the allowable weight.
22	Annex A - 4.3.2.1	The hyper link provided “ <a href="https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/ntnl-scr/cbr-scr/_fl/tp-strtgse.pdf">https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/ntnl-scr/cbr-scr/_fl/tp-strtgse.pdf</a> ” results in an error when the URL is entered in a web browser with message “We couldn't find that Web page (Error 404)”. A correct link will need to be provided in terms to evaluate what is required.	There is a typo in the link. The correct link is: <a href="https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/ntnl-scr/cbr-scr/_fl/tp-strtgse.pdf">https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/ntnl-scr/cbr-scr/_fl/tp-strtgse.pdf</a>
23	Annex A - 4.3.3	Could you please clarify the expectation for compliance this requirement as there are hundreds of vulnerabilities in the MITRE Common Vulnerabilities and Exposure (CVE) database to many different applications (of which most do not apply to the systems in this TIC3 AIR – LOE4 proposal). Download the csv file results in 210,000+ records. Does the proposal need to include the cost/effort to review and respond to each of these vulnerabilities? Also as some portions of the proposal will include purchasing equipment from vendors and they would not disclose any information on their internal design/document until contract award so it may not be possible to identify and determine cost to address any vulnerabilities found.	The supplier will only be responsible for vulnerabilities relevant in LoE4's context.
24	Annex I - All	Many of the applicable documents (not including public domain standards) are not available for download and required in order to estimate the scope of work to integrate or show compliance to meet the System Performance Specifications (SPS) (as defined in Appendix A1) as these – for example these documents could be 50 pages or 1000 pages which could significantly impact the amount of work to show compliance. If these documents are available for download, please provide the location or how to access. If these documents are not available, please describe the expectation on how to estimate the scope of	Canada is not intending to develop a Link 22 system as part of TIC3 Air – it intends to procure a system which requires minimum adaptation. These standards will be released after contract award and an NDA/TAA has been signed with the supplier.



		<p>work/cost to meet the following requirements from the SPS (Appendix A1):</p> <p>a. Documents Required (as listed in Annex I) :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. [1] SEGMENT SPECIFICATION FOR SIGNAL PROCESSING CONTROLLER (SPC SS)</li><li>ii. [2] INTERFACE REQUIREMENT SPECIFICATION (IRS) FOR THE LINK-22 MODERNIZED LINK LEVEL COMSEC (LLC 7M) SEGMENT OF THE LINK 22 (NILE) SYSTEM (LLC IRS)</li><li>iii. [3] SEGMENT SPECIFICATION FOR THE SYSTEM NETWORK CONTROLLER (SNC SS)</li><li>iv. [4] INTERFACE DESIGN DESCRIPTION FOR THE DATA LINK PROCESSING SEGMENT AND THE SYSTEM NETWORK CONTROLLER (DLP-SNC IDD)</li></ul> <p>b. Applicable SPS requirements which depend on these documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. SPS – 3.1.5.2.a – “ The L22GW must provide and integrate the SPC into the implemented solution. The provided SPC must be compliant with Segment Specification for Signaling Processing Controller (SPC SS) Appendix A and D as well as the Interface Requirement Specification (IRS) for the LINK-22 Modernized Link Level COMSEC (LLC 7M) Segment of the Link 22 (NILE) System (LLC IRS) as applicable. The SPC must be compatible with the provided HF and UHF radios.</li><li>ii. SPS – 3.1.5.2.a – “The L22GW must provide and integrate all power adapters, data communication cables, support equipment and ancillaries that are required to operate the SPC.”</li><li>iii. SPS - 3.1.5.3.a – “The L22GW must integrate the LLC 7M into the implemented solution.”</li><li>iv. SPS – 3.1.5.3.b – “The L22GW must integrate all power adapters, data communication cables, support equipment and ancillaries that are required to operate the LLC 7M.”</li><li>v. SPS - 3.1.5.6.b. – “The DLP must implement all tactical functionalities supporting Link-22 in accordance with, unless otherwise specified, the latest edition of STANAG 5522 / ATDLP-5.22, SNC Segment Specification (SNC SS), SPC SS and LLC IRS as applicable.”</li><li>vi. SPS - 3.1.5.6.g.(iii). – “The DLP must allow the operator to select the LLC/SPC for each network.”</li><li>vii. SPS - 3.1.5.6.g.(iv). – “The DLP must allow the operator to set the frequencies and transmission</li></ul>	
--	--	---	--



		<p>power of SPC/Radio.”</p> <p>viii. SPS – 3.1.5.6.j.(ii) – “The DLP must implement all required logic, messages and functions that enable the LLC configuration.”</p> <p>ix. SPS - 3.1.5.6.k.(ii). – “The DLP must implement all required logic, messages and functions that enable the SPC configuration through the attached LLC.</p> <p>x. SPS - 3.1.5.6.l.(v) – “DLP should allow the operator to initiate the command to zeroize the LLC. The execution result should be displayed.”</p> <p>xi. SPS – 4.1.1.7. – “Integrable with external Link 22 compatible modem (SPC).” – Applies to understanding the HF Radio interface required.</p> <p>xii. SPS – 4.2.1.6. – “Integrable with external Link 22 SPC.” – Applies to understanding the UHF Radio interface required.</p>	
25	Appendix A4 - All	<p>In order to estimate the effort required to integrate the GFE/GDM systems operational capabilities and functionalities to meet the “Deployable TDL GES must integrate the following:” SPS requirements in “Appendix A1 - Section 3.2.1” more information is required on the hardware and hardware/software communication protocol interfaces for the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Airspace Management Suite (GSM)</li> <li>SNC (GSM/GFE)</li> <li>Secure Communication Gateway (SCG)</li> <li>Link 16 Gateway (GFE)</li> </ol>	<p>The integration of GFE/GSM is a joint effort between Canada and the Supplier. The Supplier is only responsible for the integration of the provided systems / subsystems and software with the GFE/GSM based on the interfaces defined in Annex A1 (SPS).</p>
26	Annex B - 1	<p>There are several “Error!” references that need to be corrected. Please indicate which sections should be specified.</p>	<p>This appears to be an issue that has come up with the conversion to PDF. The correct text is:</p> <p>The scope of work required as part of this SOW will include basic maintenance and support (Section 2.1), task based support (Section 2.2), and optional acquisitions (Section 2.3).</p>
27	Appendix A1 - 3.2.1	<p>Could you provide clarification/definition of the level of integration for the requirements listed in Appendix A1 – SPS Section 3.2.1 for the references listed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For example, does ‘integrate’ mean the supplier needs to only physically connect, power on and configure the equipment/software so the</li> </ol>	<p>1. It can be seen in that way. The 'integrate' action in the context of SPS Section 3.2.1 includes all the work required to make the provided systems/subsystems operate with the GFE/GSM via the predefined interfaces defined in the SPS.</p>



		<p>applicable systems/subsystems can communicate with each other?</p> <p>2. Or does “integrate” also include demonstrating other GFE provided equipment functional capabilities where only GFE equipment is involved (such as Link 16 Gateway connection to the Secure Communication Gateway or ASMS communicating with L16GW). If additional GFE functionality demonstration is required, where are the functions defined as the RFP only states the list of GFE equipment provided. The ‘integrate’ clarification is required as the level of effort (cost) will be different depending on the amount of integration to be performed. In the absence of GFE system capabilities to demonstrate (aside from the L22GW ones which are defined in the SPS) the integration effort can only be estimated to be very basic installation and power on to verify connectivity based on vendor documentation (i.e. user manuals).</p>	<p>2. The Supplier is not responsible for the functional capabilities of GFE/GSM. The integration will be done in a joint-effort, where each involved party will be responsible for their systems /subsystems. Canada will join the Supplier on the integration to make sure the communication and interaction between the GFE/GSM and the delivered systems/subsystems is functioning as specified in the SPS.</p>
28	Part 1 - General Information - 1.1	<p>Our company holds a valid Industrial Security Certificate from the MoD of our country (it is a NATO country). Is the Industrial Security Certificate granted to our company considered as a "valid security clearance" for Canada? Please clarify.</p>	<p>Most of NATO member countries have access to the NATO Clearance program and should be able to grant the NATO security clearance certificate to the local industry. In the context of this project, the NATO clearance and not national clearance is required</p>
29	Part 1 - General Information - 1.2	<p>We understand that instead of: 'Ground Entry Point (GEP)', it should be written: 'Ground Entry Station (GES)'. Please confirm.</p>	<p>That is correct</p>
30	Part 1 - General Information - 1.2	<p>Are the two (2) mentioned contracts (Acquisition Contract &amp; In-Service Support Contract) going to be awarded on the same date? Please clarify.</p>	<p>Yes. Would be at the same time.</p>
31	Part 1 - General Information - 1.2.2	<p>It is stated that in terms of the Acquisition contract, initial provisioning of spares will take place. However, no other reference to this provisioning is included in the RFP document. Please clarify whether spares will be provided in terms of the Acquisition contract or not. In case that spares will be provided in terms of the Acquisition contract, please state the types and the quantities of the required spares.</p>	<p>No spares will be acquired as part of the acquisition contract. Spares will be under a separate contract and in support of the ISS. The amount of equipment will be decided after consultation with the winning bidder.</p>
32	Part 1 - General Information - 1.2.3	<p>It is stated that in terms of the ISS contract, optional spares will be provided. However, no other reference to this provisioning is included in</p>	<p>Spares will be under a separate contract and in support of the ISS. The amount of</p>



		the RFP document. Please clarify whether the provision of optional spares is included in the ISS contract or not. In case that the provision of optional spares is included in the ISS contract, please state the types and the quantities of the required spares.	equipment will be decided after consultation with the winning bidder.
33	Part 1 - General Information - 1.3	It is mentioned that as part of the In-Service Support (ISS) contract, Management Services, Engineering and Tech support services will be provided. Should the Acquisition Contract contain such services? Please clarify.	Yes, management, engineering, and tech support services can be included as part of the acquisition contract via its tasking mechanism (DND626).
34	Part 2 - Bidder Instructions - 2.1	We understand that instead of: 'Ground Entry Point (GEP)', it should be written: 'Ground Entry Station (GES)'. Please confirm.	That is correct
35	PART 6 - RESULTING ACQUISITION CONTRACT CLAUSES - 6.1, Clause 5. A)	We understand that instead of: 'Annex J', it should be written: 'Annex M'. Please confirm.	An amendment will be published to correct this
36	Part 6 - Resulting Acquisition Contract Clauses - 6.1.3	The formal way to ensure that the Supplier's personnel working at the identified site(s) is made aware of and comply with the restriction of removing any PROTECTED information or assets from the identified site(s) is not clearly identified and described. Please clarify.	Protected and classified information will be properly marked and the supplier will be advised on what information can be removed from the work site.
37	Part 6 - Resulting Acquisition Contract Clauses - 6.2	Please clarify the statement: 'all Statement of Works'? Is there any other Statement of Work besides the one stated in Annex A of the RFP document?	Annex A and Annex B are the two statements of work for this procurement
38	Part 6 - Resulting Acquisition Contract Clauses - 6.4.1	We understand that the execution of the options of the Acquisition Contract should be performed and completed within thirty-six (36) months from the Contract Award date. Please confirm.	Yes, options will be executed within 36 months.
39	Part 6 - Resulting Acquisition Contract Clauses - 6.4.3	Does the execution of the options of the Acquisition Contract involve, except from the delivery of the additional equipment, the provision of integration and verification services? Please clarify.	Yes. It includes the provision of integration and verification of GFE/GSM services.
40	Part 6 - Resulting Acquisition Contract Clauses - 6.5.1	Reading the statement: 'The Contractor must not perform work in excess of or outside the scope of the Contract based on verbal or written requests or instructions from anybody other than the Contracting Authority' we understand that the	That is correct



		Supplier is allowed to perform whatever additional work is in the scope of the Contract no matters who submits the request. Please confirm.	
41	Part 7 - Resulting In-Service Support Contract Clauses - 7.1, Clause 5. A)	We understand that instead of: 'Annex J', it should be written: 'Annex M'. Please confirm.	An amendment will be published to correct this
42	Part 7 - Resulting In-Service Support Contract Clauses - 7.2.1, 7.4.1	We understand that instead of: 'Ground Entry Point (GEP)', it should be written: 'Ground Entry Station (GES)'. Please confirm.	That is correct
43	Part 7 - Resulting In-Service Support Contract Clauses - 7.2.2	What is the difference between the software updates mentioned in the two Categories of Work of the ISS Contract? Please clarify.	The first update based on the NATO standards change, the second one based on the change of specific systems (Canadian systems)
44	Part 7 - Resulting In-Service Support Contract Clauses - 7.2.3	The statement: 'DND is not bound to issue the Tasks indicated in the Contract and reserves the right to change Task details as well as issue other Tasks' requires clarification, since as stated next: 'the work must be within the general Scope of Work stated in the Contract. May the mentioned tasks in the first statement above be completely different from those indicated in the contract? Please clarify.	Canada will only issue tasks in the scope of the contract issued.
45	Annex A Acquisition – Statement Of Work - 1	The distinction between the Initial Support services included in the Acquisition Contract and the support services of the ISS Contract is not clear. Please clarify.	The initial support services as part of the acquisition contract will not be completed at the same time as the support services as part of the ISS contract. The ISS contract will be deliberately activated by Canada.
46	Annex A Acquisition – Statement Of Work - 2.1.1, 3.1.1	Is a Site Survey by the potential bidders required before bid submission? Is a Site Survey by the Supplier required before an on-site Integration Task? Please clarify.	There is no requirement for a site survey prior to bid submission. This equipment is intended to be deployed with various RCAF units.
47	Annex A Acquisition – Statement Of Work - 2.2.2	Since the SAT is expected to be a joined effort for the Deployable TDL GES, please investigate the possibility of adding a Test Readiness Review in the Project Related Meetings before the execution of the SAT. Could a potential Bidder propose this in its bid? Please clarify.	Yes. TRR and PRM for the SAT are included in the SAT preparation activities.



48	Annex A Acquisition – Statement Of Work - 2.3.4	We understand that the SAT will be conducted after the completion of the FDC Deployable TDL GES Systems delivery. Please confirm.	Correct.
49	Annex A Acquisition – Statement Of Work - 3.1.2	We understand that the Supplier may be tasked to support integration effort not limited to the delivered Link 22 GW but on all the components of the Deployable TDL GES. Please confirm.	That is correct
50	Annex A Acquisition – Statement Of Work - 3.1.2	If the Supplier is tasked to support integration effort not limited to the delivered Link 22 GW but on all the components of the Deployable TDL GES, please confirm that Canada DND shall have resolved through the respective Contract all the Security and Releasability restrictions.	That is correct
51	Annex A Acquisition – Statement Of Work - 3.1.2.3	Is GFE late furnishment included in the mentioned exemptions? Please clarify.	Prior to issuing a task, Canada will ensure any required GFE will be available.
52	Annex A Acquisition – Statement Of Work - 4.1.1	Please provide more information in order to understand the scope of having two (2) deliveries with different contents for each of them so that to be able to support it as much as possible.	It's a risk reduction implementation method that allow Canada to mitigate the risk. Also the first delivery contains the core functionalities that allows Canada to conduct certain familiarization and training. The second delivery will contain the full operational capabilities which allow Canada to conduct national and international missions.
53	Annex A Acquisition – Statement Of Work - 4.1.2	Do you expect the execution of Factory Acceptance Tests for each of the two deliveries (IDC & FDC)? Please clarify.	Correct.
54	Annex A Acquisition – Statement Of Work - 4.1.1.1	Please clarify if any Acceptance Tests should be conducted after the delivery of the IDC Deployable TDL GES Systems.	Only the SAT on the FDC Deployable TDL GES
55	Annex A Acquisition – Statement Of Work - 4.3	Do the provisions of this section refer to Bid stage? Please clarify.	The supplier is expected to provide a plan as part of their bid.
56	Annex A Acquisition – Statement Of Work - 4.3.2	It is stated that the Supplier must provide a Cyber Security Fundamental plan. However, the Cyber Security Fundamental plan is not stated in the respective Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL) Table of APPENDIX A2 - CONTRACT DATA REQUIREMENT LIST. Therefore, please clarify	The cyber security fundamental plan will be in the suppliers format and will address the objectives of the reference identified in section 4.3.2 in Annex A.



		whether a Cyber Security Fundamental plan shall be provided or not and when.	
57	Annex A Acquisition – Statement Of Work - 4.3.2	Please clarify when (at which stage) the Supplier shall provide the Cyber Security Fundamental plan (if it shall be provided).	The supplier is expected to provide a plan as part of their bid. Further details on what controls are needed to receive authority to operate will come after contract award and will be task based.
58	Appendix A1 - System Performance Specifications - 3.1.1.8	It is stated that the Network Time Server (NTS) must be equipped with an internal quartz crystal oscillator. Please note that today most NTS manufacturers do not use quartz crystal oscillators but they apply to their products other types of high-stability oscillators (e.g. Rubidium). Therefore, please indicate and clarify whether equivalent types of high-stability oscillators (e.g. Rubidium) are acceptable or not.	A quartz-equivalent oscillator is acceptable. An amendment will be published to update this requirement.
59	Appendix A1 - System Performance Specifications - 3.1.1.8	It is stated that the Network Time Server (NTS) must be equipped with an internal crystal oscillator which maintains time during loss of external time source within $\pm 0.15\mu\text{s}$ per day. Please note that the internal crystal oscillators of a very limited number of Network Time Servers in the market can achieve this level of time accuracy during loss of external time source. Please also note that the operation of Link-16 and Link-22 data links can be fully supported by internal crystal oscillators of Network Time Servers with inferior levels of time accuracy during loss of external time source than the one mentioned. Therefore, please clarify whether an internal crystal (or equivalent) oscillator which maintains time during loss of external time source within $\pm 1\mu\text{s}$ per day is acceptable or not.	An amendment will be published to update this requirement.
60	Appendix A1 - System Performance Specifications - 3.1.5.3	We understand that the data cables from and to the LLC 7M device are GFE. Please confirm.	Correct.
61	Appendix A1 - System Performance Specifications - 3.1.5.5	If the Supplier is tasked to support integration effort not limited to the delivered Link 22 GW but on all the components of the Deployable TDL GES, please confirm that Canada DND shall have resolved through the respective Contract all the Security and Re	Only L22 GW and support the integration of L16 GW with L22 GW.
62	APPENDIX A1 - SYSTEM	It is mentioned that the DLP must allow the operator to operate on two (2) Link-22 networks	Correct. It would be Link-22 HF and Link-22 UHF-EPM networks



	PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS - 3.1.5.6.1	simultaneously. We understand that the mentioned Link-22 networks refer to Link-22 (NILE) super networks. Please confirm.	
63	Appendix A1 - System Performance Specifications - 3.3	Does this statement refer only to the Link 22 GW components of the Deployable TDL GES? We understand that it is difficult to verify that all components of the TDL GES (even the GFE ones) are proven, integrated and ready to operate as requested, since no relevant information is available. Please clarify.	Only Link-22 GW components.
64	Appendix A2 CdrI - Acq-Se-002	Please confirm that the applicant meeting for the SDS is the SAT and not the CDR.	ACQ-SE-002 is the CDR meeting.
65	Appendix A3 Data Item Description - 1	On most of Blocks Nbr 4 of DIDs, concerning the definition of the CDRL Approval Date, the approval duration time is given but the time when this should be submitted and approved by the Authority is not given. Should the Supplier define the relevant submission dates in the Project Schedule that he/she will provide? Please clarify.	The submission date is specified in the CDRL and the Supplier must incorporate the dates in the Project Schedule for the approval.
66	Appendix A3 Data Item Description - Did Acq-Td-003: Systems Acceptance Test (Sat) Plan	The Approval Date for FAT Plan is set as N/A. Please clarify.	Should be at least 5 working days (since the submission date which is specified in the CDRL)
67	Appendix A3 Data Item Description - Did Acq-Td-003: Systems Acceptance Test (Sat) Plan	At the SAT Plan DID, under the Validation Procedures (4b), we see that the Supplier must provide: 'Details of the procedures that Canada will use to validate the test results'. Please clarify how this should be accomplished.	The particular procedure / method (if there's any) that Canada needs to use to 'interpret' / 'visualize' the submitted test results.
68	Appendix A3 Data Item Description - Did Acq-Td-003: Systems Acceptance Test (Sat) Plan	At the SAT Plan DID, under the Validation Procedures (4c) we see that the Supplier must provide "Details of the briefing that Canada will receive in order to validate the tests". Please provide more information regarding this briefing.	The guideline, including software configuration, systems and communication interface configuration, that Canada will follow to validate the tests
69	Appendix A3 Data Item Description - Did Acq-Td-003:	At the SAT Plan DID it is stated that: 'The System Acceptance Test (SAT) Plan must contain the test cases and test procedures necessary to perform formal qualification testing of each Deployable	Agreed. It's a typo, the terms "each type of" must be removed. The 'relevant integration test' is referencing any relevant test with external systems in



	Systems Acceptance Test (Sat) Plan	TDL GES system type and relevant integration test.'. It is not clear what the term 'each type' refers to, since there is only one type of Deployable TDL GES system. Also, it is not clear to what type of integration the term: 'relevant integration test' refers to. Please clarify.	order to validate specific functionalities and capabilities.
70	Appendix A4 Government Furnished Equipment	We see that the list of the GFI that shall be provided by the CND as part of the delivered Deployable TDL GES solution is missing. In addition, no reference to the TPT process for furnishing the GFE and GFI to the Supplier is made. Please provide the list of the GFI that shall be provided by the CND. Please also provide information regarding the TPT process for furnishing the GFE and GFI to the Supplier.	Appendix A4 is the list of GFE. Canada will provide GFE as per needed to implement the related functionalities / capabilities. All details about provision of GFE/GSM will be discussed during the Contract Award Kick-off meeting.
71	Appendix A4 Government Furnished Equipment	At which point / time frame, during the Acquisition Contract implementation, the furnishing of the GFE/I will take place? Please clarify.	See the answer to question 70.
72	Appendix A4 Government Furnished Equipment	Information regarding the GFE must be provided to the Supplier after contract award. At which point / time frame during the Acquisition Contract implementation, information regarding the GFE is expected to be provided to the Supplier? Please clarify.	See the answer to question 70.
73	Annex B - In-Service Support – Statement Of Work - 1	Please list the CAF bases where the Deployable TDL GESs will be installed.	The GES' are currently intended to go to CAF units located in Comox, BC; Trenton, ON; Greenwood, NS; Cold Lake, AB; and Bagotville, QC. These locations may be subject to change.
74	Annex B - In-Service Support – Statement Of Work - 1	We understand that the scope of the in-service support services includes not only the L22 GW System and its components stated in APPENDIX A1 - SYSTEM PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS, but the complete Deployable TDL GES, including all incorporated GFE. Please confirm.	The scope of work for ISS will include the goods delivered by the supplier as part of the acquisition contract.
75	Annex B - In-Service Support – Statement Of Work - 2.1.2	The Annex B 'In-Service Support - Statement of Work' does not include any software update requirements, other than the update deriving from the incorporation of bug fixes. We understand that any other software update/upgrade should come through a specific task from TA/PA, as described on the ISS Categories of Work on Part 1. Please confirm.	Correct.



76	Annex B - In-Service Support – Statement Of Work - 2.2	Which should be the Supplier's response time and the subsequent approval process duration in terms of the Task Based Support? Please clarify.	Initial response (acknowledgement) within 2 business days. The final response dead-line is depending on the task 'size' and this should be mentioned in the initial response.
77	ANNEX B - IN-SERVICE SUPPORT – STATEMENT OF WORK - 2.2.1.C	Does the mentioned software code refer: 1) to the source code of the software, or 2) the software executables and applications programming interface(s)? Please clarify.	All executable files, static and dynamic libraires, and programming interfaces.
78	Annex B - In-Service Support – Statement Of Work - 2.2.2	Does the scope of the General Engineering and the Maintenance Services to be provided by the Supplier, refer to the complete Deployable TDL GESs and their components, including all incorporated GFE? Please clarify.	Only Link-22 GW components.
79	Annex B - In-Service Support – Statement Of Work - 2.3.1.3	It is stated that the Supplier must update the Operator and Maintenance training packages to maintain currency throughout the lifecycle of the provided systems and subsystems for Deployable TDL GES. Is this a standard (non-tasked) obligation of the Supplier in terms of the In-Service Support Contract? Please clarify.	This is the task based activities.
80	Annex B - In-Service Support – Statement Of Work - 2.4	We understand that the Supplier decides if any GSM, GFE, and GFI are required to support the In-Service Support of the Deployable TDL GES and submit the relevant request. Please confirm.	Correct.
81	Annex B - In-Service Support – Statement Of Work - 2.4.2	We understand that the Training courses of the Acquisition Contract will be conducted no earlier than four (4) weeks after the delivery of the systems for the first <b>FDC</b> Deployable TDL GES. Please confirm.	Correct.
82	Annex B - In-Service Support – Statement Of Work - 2.4.2	Is there any limitation for the last date that the Training courses of the Acquisition Contract should be conducted? Please clarify.	The date will be based on mutual agreement between Canada and Supplier but should not more than 3 months after the delivery.
83	Annex B - In-Service Support – Statement Of Work - 2.5.2.1	It is mentioned that all travel and living expenses are subject to Government Audit before or after the claim is paid. What does this mean? May DND request the return of the paid money? Please clarify.	Expenses paid for travel and living expenses are paid based on exact amounts (hotel / car rental) and using a predetermined table for other costs (meals, etc.)
84	Annex C - Basis Of Payment - 1.1.3	Does the mentioned approval refer to the approval of the bid or to the approval following the successful systems acceptance? Please clarify.	After systems acceptance
85	Annex D - Basis Of Payment - 1.1.1.2	What is the exact meaning of: 'Firm Fixed Extended Price'? Please clarify.	That is a typo and should read' Firm Fixed Price'



86	Annex D - Basis Of Payment - 1.1.1.2	We understand that the mentioned: 'Firm Fixed Extended Prices' refer to the total monthly quoted prices for the provision of Basic Maintenance and Support Services. Please confirm.	Correct.
87	Annex D - Basis Of Payment - 1.1.3	We understand that the two first columns refer to the actual courses to be conducted and the other columns refer to the cost of supporting the preparation and execution of the courses. Please confirm.	Correct.
88	Annex F - Compliance Matrix And Evaluation	Please provide the respective Excel file as indicated.	The excel file will be provided on request via email
89	Annex F - Compliance Matrix And Evaluation	At the Demonstration Scoring Matrix, we understand that instead of: 'Ground Entry Point (GEP)', it should be written: 'Ground Entry Station (GES)'. Please confirm.	That is correct
90	Annex F - Compliance Matrix And Evaluation	At the last row of the System Performance Specification (SPS) Compliance matrix, we understand that instead of: '3.2.1. & 3.2.1.8. & 3.2.1.8.f.', it should be written: '3.2.1. & 3.2.1.7. & 3.2.1.7.f.'. Please confirm.	An amendment will be published to update this requirement.
91	Annex I - Applicable Documents	Please clarify which of the mentioned Applicable Documents will be furnished as GFI.	Most of them and based on the signed NDA/TAA
92	Annex J - Dnd Task Authorization	Please clarify the meaning of the clause "Only services included in the contract shall be supplied against this task" stated in the DND 626 Task Form.	The DND 626 is used for the procurement of services only -- it cannot be used to procure goods.
93	Annex M Security Requirement Check List	Please clarify if the SRCL and/or any other action related to Security Requirements should be executed separately for each of the two (2) Contracts (Acquisition & In-Service Support).	The SRCL will be used for both contracts.
94	ANNEX M Security Requirement Check List - Part B, 10a	We understand that in case that multiple levels of screening are identified, a Security Classification Guide must be provided. How can we have access to this Security Classification Guide? Please clarify.	DND does not intend to release information that has a higher classification than Reliability Status for these contracts. DND will ensure the documents released to the supplier meet this criteria.
95	Part 1 - General Information - 1.1	Our company holds a valid NATO Security Clearance up to the level of NATO SECRET. Please clarify if the relevant Company's security clearance certificate should be provided with our proposal and if yes should we include it in the Certifications section of our proposal?	A NATO security clearance isn't required as part of the bid. It must be provided on request if needed as part of security requirements.



96	Part 1 - General Information - 1.2.2	As per your response to Enquiry Serial No. 31, please define and clarify which are the stated 'Parent' and 'Child' systems for which spare systems / sub-systems shall be provided.	The answer to this question has been clarified.
97	Appendix A1 - System Performance Specifications - 3.1.5.2	In Paragraph 3.1.5.2 of APPENDIX A1 - SYSTEM PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS it is stated among others that the Signal Processing Controller (SPC) must support one Link-22 HF FF/EPM radio. We understand that currently there is no Link-22 HF EPM radio waveform available and as far as we know no SPC vendor can officially declare that Link-22 HF EPM operations are supported by their respective products. Please clarify.	The statement at 3.1.5.2 is a statement for information only. The requirements that must be fulfilled are the two sub-paragraphs.  Canada believes there are STANAG 4444 compliant HF EPM radios available on the market.
98	Appendix A1 - System Performance Specifications - 3.1.5.6	An enquiry by a bidder was raised stating: 'Please confirm the OPTASK Link Message standard. (AAPP-11(D)(1) is assumed.)'. The response to this enquiry (Serial No. 16) was: 'APP-11(D)(1) is correct, but it also must be compatible with (C) as well.' As far as we know APP-11(C) does not provide Link 22 segment in the OPTASK. Please clarify.	This requirement does not apply where the OPTASKLINK omits information in the legacy version of the APP-11.
99	Annex A Acquisition – Statement Of Work - 1	As per your response to Enquiry Serial No. 45: 'The initial support services as part of the acquisition contract will not be completed at the same time as the support services as part of the ISS contract. The ISS contract will be deliberately activated by Canada.' Please state the conditions under which the ISS contract could be deliberately activated by Canada.	Canada intends to activate the ISS contract after delivery of the last GES.
100	Annex A Acquisition – Statement Of Work - 4.3.3	Following to the response to Enquiry Serial No. 23, please clarify which vulnerabilities are relevant to the LoE4s context.	The supplier will perform their own analysis on their proposed system to determine what vulnerabilities are relevant in their implementation.
101	Annex G - Demonstration Plan	Please clarify whether the required licenses, Government Furnished Information (GFI) and related documentation will be available to the selected Bidder before the execution of the demonstration or not. If not, please, clarify how ITAR restrictions could be overridden for the demo purposes.	Canada is not intending to provide full licenses for software and recommends the bidders use their alternate solution where possible. Canada will provide documentation/information where feasible under current security arrangements.
102	Amendment #1, Appendix A4 – Government Furnished	In reference to Amendment #1, please clarify whether the HF Antennas and UHF Antennas to be provided as GFE, include the relevant masts and cables for all Deployable TDL GESs, or not.	Canada will provide the relevant masts and cables for their GFE Link 22 antennas.



	Equipment - 1.1.2		
103	Amendment #1, Appendix A4 – Government Furnished Equipment - 1.1.2	In reference to Amendment #1, please provide more information regarding the HF Antennas and UHF Antennas to be provided as GFE, including equipment models and part numbers, in order to examine their compatibility with the HF & UHF radios to be offered and avoid any incompatibility issues.	Canada has not selected a particular model at this time, however Canada will remain flexible with what the bidder proposes.
104	Annex G - Demonstration Plan - 1.1.2.4	During the Demonstration of the selected capabilities/functionalities in which way the CND Team expects the Supplier to justify and certify the compliance with the respective requirements? Would a Supplier's declaration suffice (e.g. for the 'Under Development' capabilities/functionalities)? Does the Team expect to see anything specific concerning the 'Implemented' capabilities/functionalities? Please clarify.	The bidder must submit how they intend to demonstrate this functionality on their demonstration plan. Usually 'under development' functionality is demonstrated through a roadmap, capability brief, budgetary allocation. Unless not possible due to factors beyond bidder's control (GFI/GFE), 'developed'/'implemented' capabilities must be physically demonstrated.
105	Part 1 - General Info - N/A	In the Tender Notice states a delivery date of 1/1/2025. Is this the expected contract award or the expected delivery of equipment?	An amendment will be published.
106	Annex A1 - SPS - 3.2.1.7.a	Our initial concept is to assemble all equipment in 3 separate ruggedized cases. We believe that using COTS cases, the overall stackable height with this approach would need to be 42 inches (13.375 + 13.375 + 15.25) Is this change something that can be investigated?	An amendment will be published.
107	Annex A1 - SPS - 3.2.1.7.a	We plan to purchase server equipment to install into the ruggedized cases. A lot of inventory that we are considering that meets your technical requirements are 20" deep servers. This would push the external dimensions of the ruggedized cases to 31.5". Is this change something that can be investigated?	An amendment will be published.
108	Part 4 - Eval and BoS	PART 4. EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION; paragraphs 4.1.1.1, 4.2 and 4.2.1 are missing	An amendment will be published.
109	Appendix A1	As written, Requirement 4.1.1.4 suggests that a radio could be compliant without including the MIL-STD 188-110D and EPM waveforms, due to use of "most". As written, non-EPM radios could be compliant. Please consider revising to require these waveforms, for example: Waveforms: Shall include STANAG 4415, STANAG	An amendment will be published.



		4539, STANAG 4285, MILSTD 188-110B App. C/D/F, MIL-STD 188-110D (48 kHz) and STANAG 4444.	
110	Appendix A1	As written, Requirement 4.2.1.4 suggests that EPM waveforms other than HAVE QUICK II and SATURN would be acceptable. To avoid allowing proprietary and non-NATO waveforms, please consider revising to make HQII and SATURN mandatory, for example: Waveforms: Shall include NATO approved FF waveforms (STANAG 4205) and EPM waveforms HAVE QUICK II and SATURN.	An amendment will be published.
111	Appendix A1 – 3.1.5.6.i	Does the system need to support operation on two (2) Supernetworks simultaneously and each Supernetwork need to support two (2) Nile Networks simultaneously (HF and UHF EPM)? Please clarify.	As for now the system only needs to support 1 super-network with HF and UHF EPM simultaneously. However, the system will need to be scalable to support, in the future, more than 1 super-network simultaneously.
112	Amendment #3, PART 6: TERM OF CONTRACT, ANNEX A - ACQUISITION – STATEMENT OF WORK - 6.4.2	In reference to the Amendment #3 modification regarding Paragraph 6.4.2 of PART 6: TERM OF CONTRACT, please clarify if the duration of the Acquisition Contract remains thirty-six (36) months. Considering the aforementioned modification, does the RFP still include the requirement for Initial and Final Delivery? If yes, please clarify whether the stated timelines for the delivery of the IDC and FDC in Paragraph 4.1.1 of ANNEX A - ACQUISITION – STATEMENT OF WORK remain unchanged or not. Does the aforementioned modification imply the submission of a Project Schedule from the Bidder as part of its bid? Please clarify.	The term of contract (period of performance) remains thirty-six (36) months. It should be noted that the term of contracts includes all activities under this contract which includes production, delivery, testing, installation, integration, and final validation. This consequently implies that delivery must be completed in time (24 months) to allow time for installation, integration, and final validation activities. The term of contact doesn't invalidate IDC and FDC as outlined in Annex A. The extended period of performance is to allow for tasked based activities supporting installation and integration and closure of the contract. A project schedule from the bidder is preferred outlining how the bidder intends to meet all the requirements within the period of performance. The scheduled is usually discussed in detail and agreed upon during the kick-off meeting after the contract award.
113	APPENDIX A1 - SYSTEM PERFORMANCE SPECIFICATIONS	Please clarify if the L22GW kit can be used as the transportation solution for the Network Time Server (NTS).	Yes, the Link 22 GW can be used to transport the NTS.



	- 3.1.1.15, 3.2.1.6		
114	ANNEX F - COMPLIANCE MATRIX and EVALUATION - 4.1.2	Since the compliance evidence requested in section 4.1.2 "...a document such as a brochure..." will not be available for much of the service and delivery commitments in Annex A Acquisition - SOW, would Canada accept a narrative description that we can reference in our response to Annex F? For example, Annex A Requirement 2.1.1 "The Supplier must provide the Project Schedule at the Contract Award Meeting" cannot be substantiated by the means requested in 4.1.2 of the RFP	Yes, Canada will accept a narrative description.
115	ANNEX F - COMPLIANCE MATRIX and EVALUATION - 4.2.1	Where minor Non-Recurring Engineering/adaption effort is required to achieve compliance with requirements that are not commercially available, would Canada accept a combination of narrative technical description and evidence described in 4.2.1 of the RFP, for the work required to adapt COTs items for the specified system requirements? It does not appear that there are COTS solutions that meet all of Canada's requirements without the need for NRE. It is likely that Canada will not receive compliant bids without this provision.	Yes, Canada will accept a narrative technical description and evidence as described in the RFP.
116	Appendix A1 - 4.2.2.1	Section 4.2.2.1 – Integrable with external LLC 7M. – The UHF Radio does not directly interface with the LLC 7M. Please clarify how the UHF Radio is to directly interface with the LLC 7M as LLC 7M is GFE and unclear if this is required/possible.	This requirement is no longer needed and can be ignored.
117	Appendix A1 - 4.2.2.2	Section 4.2.2.2 – Remote key and configuration data loading. – Key loading normally implies COMSEC. Please clarify what exactly is required by the UHF Radio for remote key and configuration data loading – what functions does UHF radio need to perform and the interface requirements.	This requirement is not Link 22 specific. The radio must be able to accept configuration files and non-Type 1 keys (e.g. HAVEQUICK II or SINCGARS) remotely.



118	Appendix A1 - 4.2.2.3	Section 4.2.2.3 – Link 22 method compatible. – Please clarify how this is different than 4.2.1.6 “Integrable with external Link 22 SPC” and what is expected to show as compliance to this requirement since the UHF radio is already defined as being a Link 22 Radio in Section 3.1.5.1.b.	This requirement ensures the radio will be compatible with the Link 22 waveform.
119	Appendix A1 - 4.2.2.8	Section 4.2.2.8 - Software-controlled cooling fan. - Please clarify the intent of the requirement (i.e. is it for noise, cooling capacity, etc.). Why does it need to be software controlled if the cooling provided by the unit is adequate and very low noise?	This requirement is no longer needed and can be ignored.
120	DID ACQ-ILS-001 - 10.3.2.i	10.3.2.i in DID ACQ-ILS-001 indicates lesson plans must include: "Translation of Training Material." 2.4.2 (Training Package) indicated "The training and course materials must be in English (and in French if available)." Please confirm that translation is not required for material than exists only in English.	There are no translation requirements for this RFP. English documents are acceptable.
121	Part 1.2 and Amendment 2 -	For ACQ spares, Part 1.2 Amendment 2 response indicates "The spare systems/sub-systems for qty of 1 Child and 1 Parent will be provided under ACQ contract." Seeking clarification on the scope of sparing (child and parent do not appear elsewhere in the solicitation.) Please confirm whether spares need to be included in ACQ pricing and the scope of the sparing (full system, multiple systems, contractor recommended spares for x qty of systems, etc.)	This question has been clarified. Please see the response for question 31.
122	Appendix A1 - 3.1.5.6-f(iii)	3.1.5.6-f(iii) "The DLP must allow for the exchange of Link-22 tactical messages with TDP C2 systems through a SIMPLE link in accordance with STANAG 5602." The STANAG 5602 defines the SIMPLE interface for the connection of test or training rigs to Live TDL systems. To our understanding, it is not normally used as an integration interface to connect	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Canada is intending to use SIMPLE at the message exchange level</li> <li>2. Canada's TDP C2 system does not support DIS</li> <li>3. Canada does not require SNC simulation capability</li> <li>4. Yes</li> </ol>



		<p>operational systems. In Multi-Link Operations the Data Link Processing System can be configured to operate on a Live data link interface or over a SIMPLE interface - but generally not both Live data link and SIMPLE of the same type at the same time. As an example, the operator could configure the system to run with Live Link-22 and Simulated Link-16 over SIMPLE; but both Live and Simulated Link-16 is not configurable due to the different interface routing and packing of messages. This allow the operators to conduct training (or testing) with live or simulated connections and to perform data forwarding between Live and Simulated data sources.</p> <p>This raises the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As per Annex H of ATDLP-6.02, which level of "testing" capability will be implemented in the SIMPLE interface to the TDP C2 systems?</li> <li>2. Will DIS entity and simulation control Packet Data units (PDUs) be implemented?</li> <li>3. As per section E.4.5 of ATDLP-6.02, is the SIMPLE gateway node of the L22GW expected to simulate the SNC behavior towards the TDP C2 System?</li> <li>4. Will only Link-22 PDU's be exchanged in the SIMPLE interface?</li> </ol>	
123	<p>Appendix A1 - 3.1.5-6o(vi)</p>	<p>3.1.5-6o(vi) "The DLP must allow for enabling/disabling the transmission and reception of tactical messages on each individual Link-22 network interface." The default addressing method for all Link-22 messaging is Totalcast - sending to all units on all configured NILE Networks. There is no facility in the DLPSNC interface to direct tactical messages to an individual NILE network. The only way to accomplish this within the constraints of the ICD would be to create a Mission Area Sub-Network address for each NILE Network and to change the default addressing to be to the desired MASN. This reduces the</p>	<p>Canada agrees this is will not be an optimal solution, however Canada wishes to maintain flexibility for this kind of scenario.</p>



		<p>flow of tactical data to all units in the Super Network. It is recommended that this requirement be re-considered</p>	
124	<p>Appendix A1 - 3.1.5-6o(vii)</p>	<p>3.1.5-6o(vii) "The DLP must process and transmit Link-22 tactical messages received from connected TDP C2 systems on Link-22 network." It is understood that the D-GES will be operating in a Multi-Link environment. It is expected that a Multi-Link capable platform will be assigned one common address as defined in ADATP-33. 1. Will the Link-16 Gateway, the TDL C2 system and the Link-22 Gateway operate with a common Address/Source Number? This can appear to the Link22 Gateway that messages received from the TDP C2 system are sourced from the Link-22 Data Link processor (DLP), and could be rejected as evidence of data looping (data link messages being forwarded to the originating link/unit). If the Link-16 Gateway is assigned a different Address/Source TN, and data is received on Link-22 from another Forwarding unit with that Source Number, it will be impossible for the Link-22 Gateway to detect this as Data Looping. 2. Will the Link-22 tactical messages received from the TDP C2 system be fully populated, including assigned Link Track Number? If an assigned Track Number is already in use by a remote track on the Link-22 network the Link-22 could reject the message as a duplicate Track Number situation, or treat it as a reporting responsibility takeover. 3. Which D-GES application will be responsible for Track Number allocation and accountability? 4. How will a new Local system track be indicated to the Link-22 Gateway? Will the TDP C2 system use a special Track Number block for Own Unit local tracks?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Each Link 16 and link 22 GW will have its own distinct track number.</li> <li>2. It is intended a distinct track block will be assigned to each Link 16 and Link 22</li> <li>3. The Link 16 TDP C2 Software will assign TNs</li> <li>4. The Link 22 GW will play a role as a forwarder between Link 16 and Link 22 networks. It is not intended to send local tracks on Link 22.</li> </ol>



125	Appendix A1 - 3.1.5-6o(viii)	<p>3.1.5-6o(viii) "The DLP must process and transmit Link-22 tactical messages received from Link-22 network to connected TDP C2 systems."</p> <p>Conceptually the processing of Link-22 messages over the SIMPLE interface is configuring an "extra" Link-22 Network in addition to the two Live NILE Network connections. This creates an unusual situation where the SIMPLE interface is logically outside of the Super Network, and the Link-22 Gateway is re-transmitting or "Forwarding" the data received over-the-air to the TDP-C2 system.</p> <p>1. Would DND consider a revised version of this requirement where Link-16 tactical messages are exchanged with the TDP C2 System, which would then preserve the concept of data forwarding that is compliant to STANAG 5616, and reduce the impact of creating special re-transmission protocols for the Link22 DLP which adds cost, schedule and risk.</p> <p>2. In the situation where a Link-22 Command, Handover or Text message is received and addressed to Own Unit, how is the Link-22 Gateway expected to respond to the received orders? Will the Link-22 Gateway perform receipt compliance responses and wait for the TDP C2 system to respond with WILCO or CANTCO operator responses, or will the operator perform the compliance responses at the Link-22 Gateway tactical user interface?</p> <p>3. In the situation where Link-22 tracks are received that result in an Environment/Category or Identity Conflict, is the Link-22 Gateway expected to send this immediately to the TDP C2 system, or wait for the R2 Unit to resolve the conflict before sending the confirmed data?</p>	<p>1. Yes, Canada will consider a revised version as long as it meets the original intent and purpose for the Link 22 GW.</p> <p>2. The Link 22 GW will not have any local tracks in its database, so any commands received will be forwarded to the Link 16 GW and will wait for operator acknowledgement (WILCO/CANTCO/CANTPRO/etc) by that system. Reception of text messages is not a mandatory requirement.</p> <p>3. Canada believes this question that will be answered after contract award.</p>
126	Appendix A1 - 3.1.5-6o(xii)	<p>3.1.5-6o(xii) "DLP must allow for the operator to enable/disable the transmission of tracks received from a SIMPLE interface without processing</p>	<p>The Link 22 GW is intended to be a data forwarder for the Link 16 GW and is not responsible for R2 and conflict/ID resolution.</p>



		<p>through the track management, correlation, report responsibility and conflict resolution functions."</p> <p>While STANAG protocols allow the operator to override the need for performing correlation tests on selected Air and Surface tracks prior to transmission, and to override data filters using Force Tell or Emergency track alert status; there is a serious concern that not following reporting responsibility, conflict resolution or track number accountability rules on ALL tracks received from the TDP C2 system over SIMPLE would result in situations where the tactical force picture will become corrupted by dual designations, duplicate track reports, continuous operator conflict alerts and rejection of track reports. The only resolution methods for other units in the network would be voice coordination, text messages or orders for Own unit to leave the network. It is highly recommended that this requirement be reconsidered.</p>	
127	<p>Appendix A1 -          3.1.5-6k(iii)</p>	<p>3.1.5-6k(iii) "The DLP must allow for the automatic update of Operational Start Time (OST) in accordance with the '12 hours' rule when the initialization occurs after the planned OST."</p> <p>The Link-22 Guidebook (Edition 7) Article Para. 2C.1.3 System Initialization, and 2C.1.4 Network Initialization - Page 2-75 dictates that if the OST provided in the OPTASK Link is prior to the current time the network can be started immediately, if the OST is after the current time, the network start is in the future at the scheduled OST.</p> <p>Please clarify the requirement to "allow for the automatic update of OST"? Does this indicate an operator action to change the planned OST? It is recommended that this be examined with OPTASK Link message guidelines.</p>	<p>Canada would like to retain flexibility and allow for operator action to change the planned OST.</p>



128	Appendix A1 - 3.1.5-6i	<p>3.1.5-6i "The DLP must allow the operator to operate on 2 Link-22 networks simultaneously."</p> <p>In Amendment 002 of the RFP, in response to Question 63 which asked if the two Link-22 networks refer to NILE Super Networks, the DND response was that this assumption is correct. Clarification is requested whether this causes a change in the SPS Specification, as STANAG 5522 and the Link-22 NILE documentation clearly state that there is only one Super Network in a Link-22 operation where the Super Network can contain up to Eight NILE Networks (NN), and each NILE unit can participate in up to Four NN (5522 Ed. 4, Chapter I, Article 1.2.1).</p> <p>Does this response indicate a requirement to run multiple instances of the Link22 Gateway to operate in two Super Networks?</p>	<p>Canada clarifies that the network can be under the same super network. There are not two super networks.</p>
129	Annex B - 2.1.2	<p>2.1.2 "1. The Supplier must provide Canada with all minor software bug fixes."</p> <p>In Amendment 002 of the RFP, in response to Question 43 which asked about the difference between the two categories of work indicated in Part 7 of the Resulting ISS Contract Clauses - 7.2.2 - Continuous work, and all other taskings, DND's response indicated that "The first update based on the NATO standards change, the second one based on the change of specific systems (Canadian systems).</p> <p>This response seems to contradict the ISS SOW article 2.1.2 which indicates that under basic maintenance and support (Core work) includes minor software defect resolution.</p> <p>Where a NATO Standard change can include many data link change proposals, some of which can create new functionality or significant message changes, this would clearly not qualify as "minor fixes". Clarification is requested about the scope of software support under the Core technical support.</p>	<p>Future changes to standards, update, upgrades or any work that is considered new and as result of emerging requirements are not covered by "core work" and will be tasked and paid separately.</p> <p>Any work in order to maintain the software as delivered and intended to function is considered core work. Security patches if required will be considered on case by case.</p>



---

130	ANNEX F - COMPLIANCE MATRIX and EVALUATION	Where Canada requires compliance references for the system Performance of GFE items, how should the bidder complete the compliance reference columns?	Canada only requires compliance references for items listed in Annex F. The system performance of GFE items is not the responsibility of the supplier.
-----	--	---	--

**All other Terms and Conditions remain unchanged**