



Summary of Feedback and Outcomes

Request for Information No.

W7714-16DRDC/A

Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) Innovation Call For Proposals (CFP)



Table of Contents

1. Introduction
2. Requirement
3. Stakeholder Engagement Process
4. General Overview of the Stakeholder Engagement Process Feedback
5. Summary of Feedback and Outcomes
6. Conclusion

Annex A – Questions and Answers

Annex B – List of Participating Organizations

Annex C – ADSA Underwater Surveillance - Underwater Environment in Northern Canada

1. Introduction

This document provides the feedback and outcomes from the Stakeholder Engagement Process, including one-on-one meetings, related to the Request for Information (RFI) for the Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) Innovation Call for Proposals (CFP).

The Stakeholder Engagement Process solicited feedback on the upcoming Call for Proposals (CFP), which is an open invitation to government, industry and academia to submit proposals for projects that offer innovative solutions to address identified Science and Technology (S&T) Challenges.

2. Requirement

The RFI identified S&T Challenges (see Annex B of the DRDC Innovation CFP) that relate to the following DRDC programs and for which innovative solutions are sought:

- All Domain Situational Awareness (ADSA) S&T Program — a five-year initiative to conduct research and analysis to support the development of options for enhanced domain awareness of air, surface and sub-surface approaches to Canada, and in particular those in the Arctic. The ADSA Program focuses on the following areas:
 - Strategic surveillance of airborne traffic and aerospace warning;
 - Awareness of maritime traffic in Canadian approaches and Arctic littoral regions;
 - Awareness of sub-surface activity approaching or in Canada's North; and
 - Analysis of sensor mixes and information integration and sharing for all domain awareness to enable detection of modern threats beyond the threshold of the current systems.

- Canadian Safety and Security Program (CSSP) — a whole-of-government initiative that enhances Canada's security and public safety through S&T investments. The CSSP strengthens Canada's ability to anticipate, prevent, mitigate, prepare for, respond to and recover from natural disasters, serious accidents, crime and terrorism through the convergence of S&T with policy, operations and intelligence. More information about the CSSP is available at www.science.gc.ca/cssp.

3. Stakeholder Engagement Process

Stakeholder Engagement Period	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Posting of RFI: October 6, 2016.• Responses to RFI requested: October 28, 2016.
Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Please refer to Annex B, List of Participating Organizations.• Thirty-three organizations provided written responses to the RFI.• Twenty-one organizations participated in one-on-one meetings.

4. General Overview of the Stakeholder Engagement Process Feedback

The consultative process provided participating stakeholders with an opportunity to contribute to the procurement process by providing comments, questions and recommendations for improvement of the draft CFP as well as seeking clarification on technical issues.

Overall, most stakeholders indicated that the draft CFP was clear and not restrictive and there was consistency in the comments received. There were some clarifications requested and some suggestions for improvement.

This document details the feedback received during the Stakeholder Engagement Process and the outcomes on the draft CFP. In Article 5 (below), Canada has provided thematic responses to the feedback received from stakeholders to the extent possible. Questions received that were not responded to thematically are provided in Annex A, Questions and Answers.

5. Summary of Feedback and Outcomes on the DRDC Innovation CFP RFI

The following represents questions posed in the RFI and the resulting responses from stakeholders provided in written format and in one-on-one meetings. Administrative questions are not included.

Requirement	
5.1	Are the S&T Challenges and Project Types clear?
Respondents	<p>Generally, stakeholders indicated they were able to meet the requirements. Some stakeholders requested feedback on the elements detailed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarification is requested on whether individual responses are required for each phase or will one overall response suffice? 2. Information on the results of the funding if a multi-stage (sequential) proposal is cancelled after the first phase is requested. 3. Clarification was requested on the contracting format of a sequential project.
Outcome	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A sequential proposal addresses a single S&T Challenge and includes multiple proposals that span more than one project type and demonstrate progression of technological maturity. Sequential project requires multiple proposals meeting all mandatory criteria. Each project type under a sequential project will be evaluated separately. 2. If a multi-stage proposal is approved but the off ramp is actioned due to “inconclusive” results in the first stage it is possible another Call for Proposals will be issued. This will depend on the proposals submitted for this CFP, the funding allocated, and the options exercised. 3. One contract will be issued for the entire project, including each project type of the project; there will be a go/no-go point in between the stages.

5.2	Is it clear how Canada proposes to evaluate the proposals? Provide any suggestions that, in your opinion, could improve the evaluation criteria.
Respondents	<p>Generally stakeholders felt it was clear how Canada would evaluate proposals. Some stakeholders requested feedback on the elements detailed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarification was requested on the inclusion of Gender Based Analysis in the Evaluation criteria. 2. Information about evaluators was requested. 3. Concerns over evaluation criteria biased towards Technology Demonstrations and Pilots, may result in lower score for studies, concepts and R&D proposals, a clarification was requested if indeed these classes of proposals are disadvantaged in the selection process or if the evaluation are conducted within independent classes?
Outcome	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A) The Government of Canada is committed to supporting the full implementation of Gender-based analysis + (GBA+) across federal departments and agencies. http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/hgw-cgf/oversight-surveillance/tbs-pct/gba-oacs-eng.asp#gba3. B) This CFP introduces consideration to GBA+ aspects. The quality of the approach to address an S&T Challenge will be evaluated, including on the consideration of GBA+. The following website offers examples of GBA+ considerations: http://www.swc-cfc.gc.ca/gba-acs/index-en.html. 2. The evaluators are Subject Matter Experts from Public Sector organizations. There is no set percentage of evaluators from members of industry. An evaluation team composed of representatives of Canada will evaluate the proposals. If required, Canada may use external subject matter experts (SMEs) to evaluate any proposal. External Subject Matter Experts will be required to confirm they are not in a conflict of interest, and sign a non-disclosure agreement. 3. There is no preference for Technology Demonstrations and Pilots. All proposals that pass minimum requirements will be placed in the Pool of Pre-Qualified Proposals. Canada encourages bidders to be innovative and propose new concepts and ideas, and point rated criteria 1c evaluates a proposal for its originality and innovation. Selection of proposals will be based on the Proposal Selection Committee and Steering Committee criteria, with emphasis on the most innovative solutions to the knowledge gaps.
5.3	Does the Basis of Selection seem fair and reasonable?
	<p>Generally, stakeholders felt that the basis of selection was fair and reasonable; however, clarification was requested on elements as detailed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Distribution of investments across all S&T Challenges: Stakeholders requested clarification on the number of contracts that would be awarded under each S&T

	<p>Challenge.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Proposal Selection Committee (PSC) and Steering Committee (SC): Stakeholders requested clarification regarding the considerations of the PSC and SC when selecting proposals in the Pool of Pre-Qualified proposals for funding. 3. If proposals meet the requirements for multiple challenges they should be considered for funding in a secondary or tertiary challenge if they meet the requirements.
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Distribution of investments across all S&T Challenges: There is no pre-defined limit to the number of contracts that may be awarded under each S&T Challenge. <p>Canada aims to ensure there is a prioritized distribution of investments across all S&T Challenges; however, the number of proposals selected across the S&T Challenges will depend upon the responsive proposals received, the types of projects proposed, the funding requested, and the other factors considered by the PSC. For example, 1) if no responsive proposals are received in one S&T Challenge, no proposals will be selected for that S&T Challenge; and 2) if only one responsive proposal is received in a specific S&T Challenge, it does not by default receive a high prioritization or any prioritization for funding.</p> 2. Proposal Selection Committee (PSC) and Steering Committee (SC): <p>The proposed solution to the S&T Challenge is the most important factor and the main driver in the selection of proposals for funding; however, other criteria will be considered and will be identified in the CFP.</p> <p>Though the point-rated evaluation score could be a consideration, proposals will not be selected in a top down manner based on their scores. As the S&T Challenges are high-level and broad, proposals will be both qualitatively and quantitatively different. The intent is to distribute the funding for the joint CFP according to the criteria detailed therein. A high score does not guarantee selection from pool.</p> <p>In the rare instance where Canada receives identical proposals, the PSC may differentiate between them based on the other criteria that will be identified in the CFP. Also, Canada may at its discretion approach the Bidders of similar proposals and recommend that they combine resources and efforts.</p> <p>A summary of discussions is not released; however the reasons for selection or non selection are released to the Bidder in question.</p> 3. It is the responsibility of the Bidder to indicate which is the primary challenge covered by the proposal. If a proposal meets the requirements for many challenges this may be taken into account during the Selection stage.
5.4	<i>Is the current draft CFP unduly restrictive?</i>

<p>Respondents</p>	<p>There were two re-occurring themes in stakeholders' comments regarding the restrictiveness of the CFP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The current evaluation criteria seem unduly restrictive to Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) as there is no emphasis on proposals that leverage talent within Canadian SMEs. Can the CFP assign an evaluation criterion for the use of Small and Medium Enterprises within a proposal? 2. Canadian Content: We note that the Canadian Content Policy is to be conditionally applied and that the 80% threshold has been reduced to 50%. By allowing a lower threshold you increase the likelihood of allowing proposals with more foreign content to be considered. This runs counter to the Government's objective of increasing innovation in Canada. What are the reasons for deviating from the Government's stated intent?
<p>Outcome</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluation criteria are based on innovative solutions to S&T challenges, the technical merit, quality and experience of the team, and reasonable costs. SMEs have successfully bid in past CFP and are invited to continue to do so. Submission of proposals can be lengthy and costly, to minimize these costs, the CFP process has been reduced to one phase in 2016. 2. There are several challenges in applying the standard Canadian Content Policy to R&D, particularly with respect to Technology Demonstration Projects. These are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Technical requirements are exigent, which tends to constrain the number of suppliers who meet the requirement; b) Limited interest by Bidders to bid on R&D is influenced by a perceived fit.

5.5	Are any other aspects of the draft CFP unclear?
Respondents	<p>Generally, stakeholders felt that the CFP was clear; however, clarification was requested on elements as detailed below.</p> <p>1. What is the extent to which financial criteria will be used to evaluate the proposals: The only two price-related criteria defined in the draft CFP are: that the total project cost be below the thresholds defined in the Project Parameters' table of the draft CFP that the cost estimate is substantiated and realistic.</p>
Outcome	<p>1. Financial criteria used to evaluate the proposals as follows: cost estimate provided in the financial budget chart should be commensurate with the level of effort in relation to the project type and deliverables. The Projects Parameters Table describes the threshold of funding for each project type and that the cost estimate provided in the financial budget chart be commensurate with the level of effort in relation to the project type and deliverables.</p> <p>2.</p>

5.6	Please identify any other issues, concerns, recommendations not addressed above.
Respondents	<p>Stakeholders identified the following additional questions for consideration:</p> <p>1. What is the preference or intent as to how many proposals you hope to accept (i.e. a preference for many small ones vs. a few large ones, etc), and your plan for starting them all at once or in a staggered fashion. Also, given where we are in the five-year program, what is the plan should the money not be spent by the end of the five-year period?</p> <p>2. For the purposes of cost estimating, could the Government please provide an assumed start date for the Period of Performance in the final CFP?</p> <p>3. A stakeholder asked if there was flexibility to negotiate the contract terms and conditions.</p>
Outcome	<p>1. The number of proposals receiving funding will depend on the number of proposals received and their quality. There is no set amount of funding per challenge or per project type; it all depends on the proposals. DRDC is looking for the most innovative solutions to its knowledge gaps and will select the proposals best aligned to answer the knowledge gaps.</p> <p>2. We anticipate beginning contract negotiations in April 2017 and all contracts selected for funding are expected to be awarded in June 2017. The maximum</p>

	<p>length of time for any project is three years. There is no expectation to stagger contract awards.</p> <p>3. We anticipate beginning the contract negotiations start as early as April 2017 and aim that both Stream A and Stream B contracts be awarded no later than June 2017.</p>

6. Conclusion

The Stakeholder Engagement Process was a valuable contribution to Canada in informing of potential areas of concern, and clarifying and improving information provided for a future CFP. The procurement process will be improved by implementing some changes in the final CFP that will address the key concerns.

PSPC and DRDC would like to thank all stakeholders who participated either by attending Stakeholder Day, engaging in one-on-one meetings, or providing written responses to the RFI. The dialogue and information that resulted is invaluable in assisting Canada to develop a future CFP.

ANNEX A QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

TIMELINES

1. The RFI is closing December 1st. When will the final CFP be launched? Before or after the Christmas break?
 - a) We hope to post the CFP shortly after closing the RFI in early December 2016.
2. For the purposes of cost estimating, could the Government please provide an assumed start date for the Period of Performance in the final CFP?
 - a) We anticipate contracts to begin contract negotiations in April 2017 and all contracts selected for funding are expected to be awarded in June 2017.
3. The duration of the funding for the Public Safety and Security S&T Challenges (Stream B) is only for 12 months and 125,000.00; will any consideration be given to extending this time frame? If this cannot be extended, will a pilot study based only on the examination of files be considered acceptable?
 - a) The timelines for each project type are from the initiation of the project to the close out. Exceptions can be given, but are rare and not guaranteed.
 - b) Studies can vary considerably in scale and complexity but the scope of the analysis is managed so as to be attainable with limited time-frames and resources (including funding).

S&T CHALLENGES

4. Annex B – Challenges ii.) States that consideration of land, space and cyber threats should be excluded from Stream Challenges. Yet, in Stream a 3) and 6) it mentions cyber attacks? Should the exclusions i) and ii) refer to Stream B? If the CFP text is correct, exclusion of cyber threats from consideration in Stream A makes it extremely difficult to assess and mitigate system vulnerabilities.
 - a) Cyber threats should be a consideration of system vulnerability. Cyber threat as a generic area of work is excluded if it is not in the context of assessing a specific proposed concept or system vulnerability.
5. “S&T projects that enhance domain awareness in the air, land and maritime environments in border regions by better understanding innovative public safety and security solutions to the surveillance of remote areas, including Arctic regions.” This statement is a little confusing. Do you mean to say, “S&T projects that enhance domain awareness in the air, land and maritime environments in border regions by providing innovative public safety and security solutions for the surveillance of remote areas, including Arctic regions?” In any event, can you clarify the intention of this challenge?
 - a) This will be clarified in the final CFP.
6. The explicit exclusion of: “data fusion, integration and higher level manipulation” appears to be inconsistent with many of the challenges. In particular, with the Sensor and Information Mix challenge. It is our belief that the exclusion should be reversed/modified.
 - a) The Stream A S&T Challenges will be clarified in the final CFP. The purpose of this CFP is to generate knowledge that will inform Canada of future procurements for security of all continental surveillance systems. Data fusion as an area of research without consideration of a particular sensor or mix of sensor(s) in a proposed concept or solution is not within the scope of the knowledge gaps DRDC is looking to fill.
7. The RFI Section 3, Item 1, bullet point 4: “Analysis of sensor mixes and information integration and sharing for all domain awareness to enable detection of modern threats beyond the threshold of

- the current systems.” The Draft CFP does not seem to contain a challenge in Stream A (air, surface and sub-surface S&T challenges) that corresponds to this RFI category. Could the crown please confirm that proposals may be submitted which address this area?
- a) An S&T Challenge to this effect was added to the draft CFP in the first RFI amendment.
8. Where can I find more specifics regarding projects funded by Stream B?
 - a) Please see <http://science.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=F05ACC38-1>
 9. Where can I find more information regarding Stream A challenges?
 - a) Please see <http://www.drdc-rddc.gc.ca/en/partnerships-partenariats/all-domain-situational-awareness-connaissance-situation-domaines.page>
 - b) Please also see <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/23667/a-threat-to-americas-global-vigilance-reach-and-power-high-speed-maneuvering-weapons>
 - c) And Annex C
 10. What kind of projects is DRDC hoping for in Stream A?
 - a) DRDC is interested in R&D proposals that are bold and ambitious, that present some scientific or technical uncertainty. It is not expected that all projects will succeed as planned. If a proposed approach does not perform as expected due to scientific or technical risk, this program is the time to find out, not during an eventual acquisition program. We do not expect to have a ready, functioning system at the end of the contract.
 - b) The information resulting from these contracts could eventually inform a procurement of a capital project for a continental surveillance system. It is possible that a future procurement may be co-funded with the US government; therefore, deliverables from resulting contracts may be shared with the US government in order to analyze the options available.

SEQUENTIAL PROJECTS

11. Page 31 of the draft CFP discusses “Sequential Projects”. If an organization has a project that is currently funded by CSSP, can a proposal be submitted for a sequential project to that currently-funded project? If so, should the Bidder identify the proposal as a sequential project and reference the current CSSP project number?
 - a) A sequential proposal addresses a single S&T Challenge and includes multiple proposals that span more than one project type. These proposals must demonstrate progression of technological maturity.
 - b) A single proposal addressing an S&T Challenge is not a sequential project as defined for this CFP.
 - c) A follow-on project to closed or active CSSP projects can be proposed but this will not represent a sequential project.
12. Is it the intention that an individual response is required for each challenge in each phase (Studies, Concepts R&D, Tech Demo and Tech Pilot), so potentially could be 110 (22 S&T challenges multiplied by 5 phases). Or are respondents able to submit an all-encompassing response to the S&T challenges spanning all 5 phases (or as appropriate)?

- a) Canada only requires a response to one phase in each challenge. If you would like to respond to multiple phases it would be a sequential project.
 - b) Sequential project requires multiple proposals fully completed and meeting all mandatory criteria. Each project type under a sequential project will be evaluated separately.
13. If a multi-stage proposal is approved but the off ramp is actioned, what will happen to the funds allocated to the later stages of the project?
- a) It is possible another CFP will be issued. This will depend on the proposals submitted for this CFP, the funding allocated, and the options exercised.
14. If a bidder submits proposals for more than 1 project type, will 1 contract be issued for all proposals or separate contracts for each proposals?
- a) One contract will be awarded for all proposals. There will be off-ramps in between each phase of the projects.
15. Who will own the IP?
- a) In most cases the Contractor will own the IP, and Canada will have a license to the IP. The license can be found in the General Terms and Conditions 2040 in the SACC Manual at the following link: <https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/standard-acquisition-clauses-and-conditions-manual/3/2040/17>.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

16. It is not clear that the evaluation criteria are uniformly applicable to all possible program types. They appear to be biased towards Technology Demonstrations and Technology Pilots. Thus Studies, Concepts and R&D proposals will naturally score lower. Will this put these classes of proposals at a disadvantage in the selection process? Or is the evaluation conducted within independent classes?
- a) The Evaluation of proposals follows a fair and rigorous process. Proposals meeting the minimum scoring requirements will then follow the selection process that aims to ensure there is a distribution of investments across all S&T challenges; however, the number of proposals selected across the S&T challenges will depend upon the responsive proposals received and the factors considered by the PSC and the SC. For example, 1) if no responsive proposals are received in one S&T Challenge, no proposals will be selected for that S&T challenge; and 2) if only one responsive proposal is received in a specific S&T challenge, it does not by default receive a high prioritization for funding.
17. Why is the GBA+ criteria part of the Scientific and/or Technical Value evaluation and not in standalone criteria?
- a) GBA+ is an important consideration in the scientific and technical value of the proposal, given that GBA+ factors can influence the outcome of a project. In instances where a project proposal does not include relevant aspect of GBA+, the Bidder needs to explain why.
 - b) The Government recently renewed its commitment to GBA+ and is working to strengthen its implementation across all federal departments. Treasury Board of Canada: <https://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/hgw-cgf/oversight-surveillance/tbs-pct/gba-oacs-eng.asp>. GBA+ is an aspect that must be considered in the project approach.
18. Would Canada consider creating a corporate responsibility criteria category which would include GBA, environmental/ social responsibility, and economic benefit to Canada?

- a) The Government of Canada is committed to supporting the full implementation of Gender-based analysis (GBA+) across federal departments and agencies. <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/hgw-cgf/oversight-surveillance/tbs-pct/gba-oacs-eng.asp#gba3>
 - b) This CFP introduces consideration to GBA+ aspects. The quality of the approach to address an S&T Challenge will be evaluated, including on the consideration of GBA+. The following website offers examples of GBA+ considerations: <http://www.swc-cfc.gc.ca/gba-acis/index-en.html>.
19. Would Canada consider modifying the “Impact” rated criteria to award more points to solutions that address more than one S&T Challenge?
- a) No. The Bidder must demonstrate how the proposal aligns with one primary selected S&T Challenge and the Impact will be evaluated accordingly. Bidders can identify additional S&T Challenges their proposals address. If a proposal meets the requirements for many challenges this may be taken into account during the Selection stage
20. Will points be awarded for partnerships?
- a) There are no points awarded for partnerships.
 - b) Partnership is a mandatory criterion for proposals responding to Public Safety and Security S&T Challenges (numbers nine through twenty five only. For a proposal to be considered for one of these S&T challenges, bidders must have two partners and submit a completed Partner Signature Form in accordance with the minimum requirements described at Annex C - Evaluation Criteria of the DRDC Innovation Call for Proposals Solicitation Document.
21. The current evaluation criteria seem unduly restrictive to Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) as there is no emphasis on proposals that leverage talent within Canadian SMEs. Can the CFP assign an evaluation criterion for the use of Small and Medium Enterprises within a proposal?
- a) Evaluation criteria are based on innovative solutions to S&T Challenges, the technical merit, quality and experience of the team, and reasonable costs. SMEs have successfully bid in past CFP and are invited to continue to do so. Submission of proposals can be lengthy and costly; to minimize these costs the CFP process has been reduced to one phase in 2016.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

22. The evaluation process by the Proposal Selection Committee is vague, can you elaborate?
- a) The selection is done via a Distribution of investments across all S&T Challenges: Canada aims to ensure there is a distribution of investments across all S&T challenges; however, the number of proposals selected across the S&T challenges will depend upon the responsive proposals received and the factors considered by the PSC. For example, 1) if no responsive proposals are received in one S&T Challenge, no proposals will be selected for that S&T challenge; and 2) if only one responsive proposal is received in a specific S&T challenge, it does not by default receive a high prioritization for funding.
23. If proposals meet the requirements for multiple challenges can they be considered for funding in a secondary or tertiary challenge if they meet the requirements?
- a) It is the responsibility of the Bidder to indicate which is the primary challenge covered by the proposal. If a proposal meets the requirements for many challenges this may be taken into account during the Selection stage.
24. If “other governments” are successful bidders, will the Crown, through DRDC or PSPC, monitor follow-on contracting to ensure that that contracting is consistent with DRDC’s intentions? For

example, if Govt. of Canada Dept XX wins an award, will that department be obliged to follow the same “Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection” criteria when it contracts with industry? For example: Canadian content, IP etc.

- a) Other governments are bound to the same contracting rules as DRDC and PSPC. However, if another government department is awarded a contract through the CFP and they have a requirement for another contract, they are not required to follow the same selection or evaluation process as this CFP. It is a separate process.

25. Is the same steering committee being used for both Stream A and Stream B proposals?

- a) The process is the same, and the Steering Committee for both Streams will be chaired by ADM(S&T), DND; however, there will be different individuals on the committees for Stream A and for Stream B.

26. What percentage of members from Industry is on the evaluation team?

- a) There is no set percentage of evaluators from members of industry. An evaluation team composed of representatives of Canada will evaluate the proposals. If required, Canada may use external subject matter experts (SMEs) to evaluate any proposal. External Subject Matter Experts will be required to confirm they are not in a conflict of interest, and sign a non-disclosure agreement.

SELECTION PROCESS

27. Can you clarify the selection process by the Proposal Selection Committee (PSC)?

- a) The selection is done via a Distribution of investments across all S&T Challenges: Canada aims to ensure there is a distribution of investments across all S&T Challenges; however, the number of proposals selected across the S&T Challenges will depend upon the responsive proposals received and the factors considered by the PSC. For example, 1) if no responsive proposals are received in one S&T Challenge, no proposals will be selected for that S&T Challenge; and 2) if only one responsive proposal is received in a specific S&T Challenge, it does not by default receive a high prioritization for funding.

Proposal Selection Committee (PSC):

The PSC membership is made up of DRDC personnel, Subject Matter Experts, advisors, as well as, senior representatives from DRDC. A representative of PSPC will attend in an observational capacity. The number of members is not defined in advance.

The criteria for prioritization of proposals by the PSC are provided in the draft CFP.

The proposed solution to the S&T Challenge is the most important factor and the main driver in the selection of proposals for CSSP funding; however, the PSC will also consider the other criteria identified in the draft CFP. To this end, the point rated evaluation score does not carry the same weight at the PSC. Though the point rated evaluation score could be a consideration, proposals will not necessarily be selected in a top down manner based on their scores. As the challenges are high-level and broad, proposals will be both qualitatively and quantitatively different. It should be clearly understood that a high score does not guarantee selection from pool.

In the rare instances where Canada receives identical proposals, the PSC may differentiate them based on the other criteria found in the draft CFP which differ in each proposal (and may include, for example, the

co-investment contributions). Also, Canada may approach the Bidders of similar proposals and recommend that they combine resources and efforts.

Steering Committee (SC):

The SC is chaired by the Assistant Deputy Minister responsible for S&T at the Department of National Defence. The SC endorses the recommendations of the PSC using the same criteria. This adds an additional level of assurance that Canada has performed its due diligence in the CFP process.

Given the broadness of the S&T Challenges and the constant evolution of this field, these criteria are difficult to define more precisely in advance. Canada will revisit this section to see if and how this process can be better refined.

28. Will a summary of the discussions undertaken by the PSC be released since they form part of the selection process?
 - a) A summary of discussions is not released; however the reasons for selection or non selection are released to the bidder in question.
29. Within section 4.2.3, the minimum pass criteria are not defined.
 - a) They will be identified in the final CFP.
30. The CSSP program required bids to include a lead government department or agency, and that this is still the case for Public Safety and Security bids. I'm wondering if there is any preference or bias for including or excluding government agencies from the non-Public Safety and Security proposals.
 - a) No, there is no preference or bias. Partnership is not a criteria that will be looked at in the Stream A challenges.

LETTERS OF SUPPORT

31. How many letters of support are required and are they submitted with the request?
 - a) Letters of support are not required.
 - b) Support letters from stakeholders, other than named partners, can be submitted with the proposal.

PARTNERS

32. Is there a requirement for the university to partner/collaborate with industry partner in order to submit proposals to this CFP? Can the university submit the proposal by itself?
 - a) If the University is submitting a proposal to challenges 1-8 the University can submit alone. If the University is submitting to challenges 9-25 they must partner with a government partner (federal, provincial, territorial or municipal). Section 3.1 *Who May Apply?* and Annex C- *Evaluation Criteria of the DRDC Innovation Call for Proposals* Document provide more information on bidders and partnerships.
33. In the draft CFP section C.1, criteria 4 states: "For proposals responding to Public Safety and Security S&T Challenges (numbers nine through twenty five only – mandatory requirements are: a) Identification of a partnership that includes: i. a Canadian Government Department*; and ii. a different public organization from 4.a.i, or any other partner". Does the above section 4 a. ii

- constitute our company as the “different organization”, or must the partnership be a minimum of three organizations (ourselves, one government sponsor and one other partner)?
- a) The minimum requirement for the Stream B challenges are: two partners, one being a government organization and one other partner. Your company can be a partner as well as the Bidder. Section 3.1 Who May Apply? And Annex C- Evaluation Criteria of the DRDC Innovation Call for Proposals Solicitation Document provide more information on bidders and partnerships.
34. Can the university submit multiple proposals (e.g. different themes/focus areas)? Is there a limit to the number of proposals a university can submit?
 - a) There is no limit to the number of proposals that can be submitted; however, only a maximum of one contract can be awarded per proposal.
 35. Is the participation of a government department mandatory for Stream A? Page 50 [Annex E – Detailed Budget Table] seems to suggest that “Partner 1 or Lead Government Department (if Lead Federal Department is not the Bidder)”.
 - a) No, participation of a government department is only mandatory for Stream B.
 36. If government department participation is not mandatory for Stream A, can a government department be a partner? If so, what level of signature is needed?
 - a) Yes, a government department can be a partner on the proposal. There are no signature requirements for Stream A proposals. An operational support letter can also be given.
 37. Is DRDC an eligible government department for participation?
 - a) DRDC can be a partner where Bidders feel that this partnership is required for their bid. DRDC, however, cannot be the Lead Federal Government Department.
 38. What is the expected role and responsibilities related to the involvement of Canadian government departments to proposed projects. Can DRDC confirm if the inclusion of a Canadian government department in the proposed project is mandatory or not?
 - a) The inclusion of government department in the Stream B challenges is mandatory. The expected roles and responsibilities are found in section 3.1 Who May Apply
 - b) A Lead Government Department (at the federal, provincial, territorial, or municipal level) should be prepared act as the Project Champion.

DRDC

39. Are any of DRDC’s assets available for use under a contract?
 - a) A Bidder may propose to use an asset in its proposal; however, this would depend on availability and be subject to negotiation. DRDC will not provide services as part of the Contract and performance of the work is solely the responsibility of the Contractor. It is suggested that Bidders propose an alternative if possible as part of its bid, such as renting equipment, or partnering with another company that can provide the asset. The partner could be a subcontractor.
40. Will DRDC’s Explorer autonomous underwater vehicle (AUV) be available for a Contractor to use to demonstrate its technology?
 - a) It is possible. To note, the Explorer is not a long range vehicle. Of more interest would be longer endurance AUV that could be underwater for months or travel thousands of kilometers, or an AUV with more towing capacity.
41. If a bidder has a proposal that meets the DRDC Innovation Stream A challenges and the needs of another DRDC project such as CAUSE, how do we determine the best way to submit a bid?
 - a) CAUSE and OTHR are projects within DRDC that are part of the ADSA program. Proposals may complement the work of other projects funded by DRDC but Canada is not interested to duplicate the work of these projects.

CANADIAN CONTENT

42. Canadian Content: We note that the Canadian Content Policy is to be conditionally applied and that the 80% threshold has been reduced to 50%.
- a) What are the reasons for deviating from the Government's stated intent?
 - i. There are several challenges in applying the standard Canadian Content Policy to R&D, particularly with respect to Technology Demonstration Projects. These are:
 - 1. Technical requirements are exigent, which tends to constrain the number of Bidders who meet the requirement;
 - 2. Limited interest by Bidders to bid on R&D is influenced by a perceived fit;
 - 3. A solicitation calling for cost sharing by a contractor tends to receive limited response from bidders on certain requirements due to narrow market.
 - b) Why is the "conditionally limited" approach being selected (vs "limited")?
 - i. See the response above.
 - ii. If there are more than 2 proposals received in a challenge that meet the Canadian Content definition only the proposals that meet the definition will be considered.
 - c) Under whose authority are you deviating from the 80% threshold as identified in the Supply Manual.
 - i. In accordance with the National Strategy for Research and Development issued April 2013, the percentage of Canadian Content will be tailored for the CFP, in this case 50%. <https://buyandsell.gc.ca/procurement-data/tender-notice/PW-13-00362569>.
43. It is suggested that 50% Canadian Content be a minimum, but more points be awarded for additional Canadian Content.
- a) This procurement is conditionally limited to Canadian goods and Canadian services and there is no rating point attributed to the Canadian content. However, for each S&T Challenge, if there are two or more bids with a valid Canadian Content certification, the evaluation process will be limited to the bids with the certification; otherwise, all bids will be evaluated. Therefore, Bidders with a minimum of 50% of Canadian content must provide a valid Canadian Content certification with the proposal.
44. The previous RFI for All Domain Situational Awareness (W7714-16ADSA) was considering up to 50% foreign content, but we cannot find any such references in this draft CFP. Could the Crown please specify regulations regarding foreign content?
- a) This procurement is conditionally limited to bidders offering 50% Canadian goods and Canadian services. For each S&T Challenge, the evaluation team will determine first if there are two or more bids with a valid Canadian Content certification. In that event, the evaluation process will be limited to the bids with the certification; otherwise, all bids will be evaluated. Please refer to Part 4, section 4.1 (c), and Part 5, section 5.1.2.1.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

45. In other PWGSC contracting methods they have a process where, if the Bidder does not submit certain documents that are mandatory, PWGSC contacts the Bidder and gives them 48 hours to submit those documents in question. This does not allow the bidder to change the contents of

their bid. However, if signatures are missing or references do not respond or a particular form) is missing, they give the Bidder an opportunity to submit them when PWGSC asks for them. A process such as this one may add some extra work to PWGSC due to the back and forth but it will result in greater value to Canada.

- a) This has been considered in this CFP. The Contracting Authority may request the Bidder to submit any supporting information pursuant to the technical mandatory criterion 1, 2 and 4, or annexes D, E, and H , including after the closing date of the bid solicitation. It is mandatory that the Bidder provide the supporting information within one business days of the written request or within such period as specified or agreed to by the Contracting Authority in the written notice to the Bidder.

46. Within section 4.2.2, would it be possible to increase the timeframe for obtaining additional information to 4 business days, on the basis that this information might need to be obtained from sub-contractors.

- a) No, this information is mandatory with the proposal and should be submitted with the proposal. One business day from the written request or within such period as specified or agreed to by the Contracting Authority in the written notice to the Bidder.

47. Is it possible to amend the CFP to include the requirement for the bidders to complete a ppt presentation with their submission?

- a) No, we are trying to make it as easy as possible for bidders to submit a bid. As the proposal submission process can be time consuming and costly, Canada would like bidders to only submit information needed to evaluate their proposal. Successful bidders will be asked to develop quad charts after the contracts are awarded.

FINANCIAL ASPECTS

48. Can we confirm the extent to which financial criteria will be used to evaluate the proposals: The only two price-related criteria defined in the draft CFP are: that the total project cost be below the thresholds defined in the Project Parameters table on page 31 of the draft CFP that the cost estimate is substantiated and realistic (criterion 2b on page 45 of the draft CFP)

- a) Other than those criteria, it is confirmed that no other criterion (e.g. weighted average of technical score and financial score) will be applied when evaluating the proposals.
- b) Funding requested should be equal or under the limit of a project type. The Projects Parameters Table describes the threshold of funding for each project type.

49. If a proposal includes co-investments, the total project costs can be higher than the funding requested.

- a) Correct, evaluation of the estimated costs will be based on substantiation and realistic costs for the technical approach offered.

50. We recommend clarifying any constraints and requirements related to co-investment by the partners. The draft CFP does not explain if co-investment by the partners (in-kind or in-cash) is mandatory or not. If co-investment is mandatory, to which level? If co-investment is not mandatory, how is co-investment evaluated in the overall evaluation of a proposal? At the moment, there are no point-rated criteria related to the level of co-investment.

- a) Co-investment is not mandatory but will be a parameter that could be considered by the proposal selection committee. However, realistic costs estimates will be evaluated.
 - b) The level of co-investment, particularly cash co-investment, is an indicator of risk sharing on a proposal and is a factor that could be considered by the PSC and the SC for determining the distribution of investments during the selection process. Section 4.4 Selection process offers more information regarding the selection of proposals.
51. Annex J discusses co-investments. Do these co-investments play a role in the proposal evaluation and, if so, could you please clarify specifically how they are incorporated into the proposal evaluation?
- a) The co-investment is used as a selection factor during the Proposal Selection Committee and the Steering Committee.
52. Annex E – Detailed Budget Table mentions partners; does/should this also include subcontractors?
- a) Please include subcontractors in the workplan. It is not necessary to include subcontractors in the Detailed budget table
53. The newer funding limit (which is now increased to 19M) could have been lower; it could have resulted in a greater number of innovative proposals being funded, especially from SMEs.
- a) The funding limit is a maximum. Canada will be awarding multiple projects that cover a vast range of cost, project type and challenge area.
54. Why is a detailed funding proposal required with the bid if no points are awarded for it?
- a) Bidders are evaluated on commensurate costs with the level of effort in relation to the project type and deliverables for the proposal. Detailed cost information is also considered by Proposal Selection Committee and the Steering Committee for the distribution of investment. For Public Safety and Security Challenges (9-25), the Signature form ensures that the bidder and the partners agree to the cost information provided.

IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS

55. With respect to this specific call for proposal, I require clarification with regards to the following sections: 3.4.5, 3.4.6 and 3.4.7. These sections seem to suggest that employee costs from the NRC used in any proposal cannot be submitted as a cost items to be funded by DRDC. Is this what DRDC contemplated in drafting these sections?
- a) Correct. DRDC funds cannot be used to pay for salaries of indeterminate employees at the federal level of government in Canada; however, their salaries (including the EBP amount) can be included as in-kind contribution. Table J-1: In-Kind Contributions of the DRDC Innovation Call for Proposals Document lists valid in-kind contributions.

CONTRACTING

56. What is the preference or intent as to how many proposals you hope to accept (i.e. a preference for many small ones vs. a few large ones, etc), and your plan for starting them all at once or in a staggered fashion. Also, given where we are in the five-year program, what is the plan should the money not be spent by the end of the five-year period?
- a) We anticipate beginning contract negotiations in April 2017 and all contracts selected for funding are expected to be awarded in June 2017. The maximum length of time for any project is three years. There is no expectation to stagger contract awards.

- b) The number of proposals receiving funding will depend on the number of proposals received, and the quality. There is no set amount of funding per challenge or per project type; it all depends on the technical proposals. DRDC is looking for the most innovative solutions to its knowledge gaps and will select the technical proposals best aligned to answer the knowledge gaps.
57. Does DRDC prefer starting contracts all at once or in a staggered fashion?
- a) DRDC would like answers to its knowledge gaps as soon as possible, however, if work for a very interesting solution cannot be started right away, the proposal may still be selected.
58. Can you have different prime contractors for different phases of the work?
- a) No. If there are different prime contractors for different phases of a project then separate contracts will need to be issued for these phases.
59. Can we offer optional work packages?
- a) Yes work packages will allow a stakeholder to show different ways of using its technology, and Canada can choose the options that best meet its objectives.
60. Part 8, Basis of Payment, refers to a number of payment models, e.g. Firm Price, Ceiling Price, etc. Please confirm if it is up to the bidder to determine which payment model will be applied.
- a) This is determined in the contract negotiation stage and is a discussion between the contractor and Canada.
61. For the purposes of cost estimating, could the Government please provide an assumed start date for the Period of Performance in the final CFP?
- a) We anticipate beginning the contract negotiations start as early as April 2017 and aim that both Stream A and Stream B contracts be awarded no later than June 2017.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

62. Part 2, clause 2.2.1 mentions the process for submitting an Unclassified Proposal. Please define what constitutes an Unclassified Proposal?
- a) Proposals are to be deemed classified if they contain information related to the national interest that may qualify for an exemption or exclusion under the [Access to Information Act or Privacy Act](#) and the compromise of which would reasonably be expected to cause injury (the national interest definition from the Supply Manual) in accordance with [the Treasury Board of Canada's Policy on Government Security](#). It is expected that the majority of proposals will not qualify for the exemption or exclusion and they will therefore be submitted as unclassified proposals.
63. I have top secret clearance, do I submit an attestation to that effect with the application;
- a) No, you do not need to attest to that fact.
64. Part 2, clause 2.2.2 mentions the process for submitting a Classified Proposal. Please define what constitutes a Classified Proposal? Will a Classified Submission Form be included within the CFP when finalised and released?
- a) Please see above for a response regarding the definition of a classified proposal. The Classified Submission form will be available from heather.palmer@pwgsc.gc.ca

FEEDBACK PROCESS

65. Can bidders be given the opportunity to review and object to external Subject Matter Experts if bidders feel those Subject Matter Experts may be unduly biased in some way.
- a) Equal access, fairness, and transparency are key principles of this CFP. The evaluation procedures require individual expert reviews to be shared amongst a panel who will then reach consensus as a group to determine the final evaluation and scoring. Looking at the span of proposals across S&T challenges and TRL, as well as the quality of pre-qualified pool of proposals, the selection by committees ensures that the public funds are distributed in the most effective way for both Stream A and Stream B, respectively.
 - b) After communication of the finalized pool of pre-qualified proposals, Bidders may request a debriefing on the results of the CFP process (excluding Stage 2 which will be released after all contracts have been negotiated and awarded). Such a request is to be made to the Contracting Authority within 15 working days of receipt of the results of the CFP process. The debriefing may be in writing, by telephone or in person.

OTHER QUESTIONS

66. Can a Bidder be in contact with DRDC to submit a bid if they are submitting a bid for a different DRDC Request for Proposals?
- a) A Bidder can be in contact with DRDC personnel, however DRDC personnel involved in the preparation of the CFP will not provide information regarding the CFP.
67. What online tool or portal will be used for response submission regarding the CFP when finalised and released?
- a) The online tool will be identified in the final posted CFP.
68. It was very difficult to find this RFI. Can a reference to ADSA and CSSP be made in the title of the document posted on Buy and Sell?
- a) If you search DRDC Innovation, the CFP will quickly come up.
 - b) CSSP and ADSA can be added to the front page.
69. Are there any existing land-based sensors at vessel choke points in the Arctic, or choke point locations with power/communications infrastructure where sensors could be installed with reasonable effort that might possibly be accessed?
- a) The Department of National Defence has a camp located on Devon Island, at Gascoyne Inlet, which has been used primarily as a research camp in the past. This facility may potentially be used for conducting R&D activities under the ADSA Program, and other initiatives as required, based on availability. The Northern Watch Technology Demonstration Project which investigated the potential of navigation radar, underwater arrays, AIS, EO/IR, and radar intercept technologies to conduct choke point surveillance was carried out at this facility.

Currently there is no sensor systems connected at the facility, as they were returned south after the final demonstration, with the exception of the underwater array systems that are currently deployed at the site, although not in operation.

There is an extensive planning process associated with use of the Gascoyne Inlet camp due to the requirement for trained camp staff for managing its operation and safety, its remote location, and adverse weather conditions in the area. Incremental costs associated with the

use of the Gascoyne Inlet camp, such as camp reconstitution, satellite communications, camp staff, etc. would be the responsibility of the bidder.

Bidders should elaborate in their proposals requirements for access to this facility or other DRDC resources in their bids. DRDC's ability to support such requests will be evaluated based on the specific requirements at the time of bid evaluation and contract negotiations.

70. Part 4, clause 4.2.4 is restricted to Canadian customs duties and excise taxes – how will other customs duties and excise taxes that may be payable in the delivery or cross-border movement of tangible goods be considered?
 - a) Bidders can include these costs in Annex E under the line item “Other”.
71. Part 5, clause 5.2.7 proposes that a substitute resource can only be suggested in the event or as a result of death, sickness, parental leave, retirement, resignation, dismissal. This is quite restrictive. Can “for valid business reasons” be added?
 - a) This will be looked at in the final CFP
72. Part 7, clause 9.2 refers to holdbacks. What is the intended value of the holdback and how long will this be held back?
 - a) Holdbacks are normally 10% of progress payments, however, if applicable they will be negotiated prior to contract award. Payments based on milestones usually don't have holdbacks.
73. Can DRDC propose a partnering arrangement?
 - a) A list of stakeholders that participated in the engagement process is included in the Summary of Outcomes and Feedback Report. Stakeholders are encouraged to review this list and contact anyone they think could be a partner for a proposed project. Canada can't suggest a particular stakeholder as there may be multiple stakeholders that do similar work and we want to ensure fairness and equal treatment of all stakeholders.

Annex B
List of Participating Organizations

- Airshare
- Amita
- A.U.G. Signals Ltd.
- Array Systems Computing Inc
- ASL Environmental Sciences Inc.
- Bubble Technology Industries.
- CAE
- C-CORE
- Canadian Food Inspection Agency
- CS Communication & Systems Canada
- Environmental Sciences
- Esri Canada
- Intergraph Canada Ltd.
- International Submarine Engineering Ltd.
- Kepler Communications
- KinetX Aérospatiale International
- Kraken Sonar
- Landsdowne
- Launch Scientific
- Lockheed Martin Canada Inc.
- National Research Council
- Niagara Police Department
- Norstrat Consulting Inc.
- MDA Geospatial Services Inc
- MDA Systems Ltd.
- Microsatellite Science and Technology Center (MSTC) University of Toronto
- MYY INC
- Norstrat Consulting Inc.
- Qinetiq Canada Operations Ltd.
- Raytheon
- Real-Time Engineering & Simulation Inc
- Sierra Systems
- Ultra Electronics Maritime Systems

Annex C

ADSA Underwater Surveillance - Underwater Environment in Northern Canada

Canadian Tracking and Fusion Group (CTFG) Workshop 2016
Ottawa, October 24-25

Dr. Jim S.F. Chan, DRDC CORA

Summary

The Canadian Arctic Archipelago is adjacent to the Arctic Ocean where it is strategically important to many countries. Since the waterways in the Archipelago are generally deep enough for submarines, particularly nuclear powered ones, to navigate around, there could possibly be a need to monitor the underwater activities in the region. However, the physical environment in the Archipelago is unique in terms of its bathymetry and ice condition. Consider Parry Channel as an example: the east side of the 1,400 km-long waterway is as deep as 800m while 70% of water surface area was frozen between April and September, 2016. The waterway is deep and wide enough to be a safe underwater corridor for foreign submarines to exploit the Archipelago.

Although it has been demonstrated that underwater surveillance is possible in a large area of the Archipelago, there are other unresolved issues beyond surveillance. For example, what can the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) do when submarine activity is detected under 2 m-thick sea ice? Are they equipped to tactically detect and classify the submarine for threat confirmation? How do they find naturally occurring water holes on ice to deliver an airborne response into the water? If the CAF cannot act on the surveillance cues for a significant portion of the year, what utility does underwater surveillance in the Arctic provide? In addition, the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act forbids the CAF to degrade water quality in the North in any way, which may limit the CAF's response options in the North. The VICTORIA Class submarines must not discharge black water beyond 60°N; this restricts how far north it can go.