



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Réception des soumissions - TPSGC / Bid Receiving -
PWGSC

1550, Avenue d'Estimauville

1550, D'Estimauville Avenue

Québec

Québec

G1J 0C7

**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

TPSGC/PWGSC

601-1550, Avenue d'Estimauville

Québec

Québec

G1J 0C7

Title - Sujet C2I S&T développement de capacité	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W7701-196887/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 004
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W7701-196887	Date 2018-12-28
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$QCL-025-17529	
File No. - N° de dossier QCL-8-41072 (025)	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2019-01-23	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Heure Normale du l'Est HNE
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Lemay, Hélène	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur qcl025
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (418) 649-2974 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (418) 648-2209
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée
Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)	
Signature	Date

N° de l'invitation - Sollicitation No.

W7701-196887/A

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

004

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

QCL025

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

W7701-19-6887

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME – FMS

Amendment 004
Command, Control and Information S&T Capability Development

The purpose of this amendment is :

- 1) To provide Questions and Answers 19 to 37
 - 2) To amend the Request for Proposal
-

1) Questions et answers :

Question 19 :

In section 7.3 – Security Requirements, it states that before award of a contract, personnel requiring access to classified and protected information must hold a valid personnel security screening at the level of SECRET or RELIABILITY STATUS, as required. There is a similar clause for NATO SECRET. Given the time required to obtain those security screening, we would like to start the process immediately such that the security screening are obtained by the time of contract award. Would it be possible to explicit which resource will require which screening level?

Answer 19:

The core team resources must hold a NATO SECRET level clearance. The security requirements required to perform the work will be specified in each task authorizations issued.

Question 20:

In the mandatory technical criteria section of attachment 2, point 1.3 states: "The Bidder must propose resources who meet the matching experience and expertise as described in Annex A – Statement of Work, Appendix 2 – Category of Resources." Is this in reference to the points 1.1 and 1.2 above (i.e., does it apply only to core resources)? In other words, do we need to propose resources explicitly for the resources in group 2 and 3?

- a. If so, do we have to provide resumes?
- b. If so, must we provide only one resource per category?
- c. If so, will it be possible to exchange a proposed resource (for group 2 and 3) during the contract by an equivalent resource? Given that we do not know in advance when they will be required, we cannot keep them unassigned for the duration of the contract. If they are assigned to another project and cannot be provided when requested, we would like to be able to propose a different person with expertise that matches the requirements for that resource type.
- d. If so, it is stated that the same person cannot be proposed for more than a category. Can the same person be proposed for different levels of the same category? (e.g., software architect level 2 and level 3)

Answer 20:

No. Bidders do not have to propose resources in groups 2 and 3 at the bid proposals. The contractor will be required to submit resources with the experience and expertise described in resource categories of groups 2 and/or 3 according to the requirements of each subsequent task authorisation.

The sub-questions asked so do not apply.

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.	N° de la modif - Amd. No.	Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID
W7701-196887/A	004	QCL025
N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.	File No. - N° du dossier	N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME – FMS
W7701-19-6887		

Question 21 :

Would it be possible to relax the constraint that the same person cannot be proposed for more than a category? We have some people with high expertise in multiple fields, it seems like a waste to confine them to a single field.

Answer 21:

The answer to this question is given in question 7 previously published.

Question 22:

For point rated criteria 2.a, does DRDC count as a research organization?

Answer 22:

No

Question 23 :

For point rated criteria 2.c, if some of the qualified servers were located at a subcontractor, can we count them?

Answer 23:

Yes, if the proposal is made in consortium. Otherwise, the bidder must dismantle in his proposal that he will have access to this equipment, without constraints, for the duration of the contract. This contract has also security needs.

Question 24:

Can you clarify the scoring of criteria 2.c? It says that the total number will be normalized to 10, but the criterion is worth 3 points.

Answer 24:

The answer to this question is given in question 4 previously published.

Question 25 :

In Appendix 2, section 3.9, it is stated: "This category is for work required to perform comprehensive analysis in Cognitive Engineering, **as described in Appendix 3**". However, Appendix 3 does not contain a section for Cognitive Engineering.

Answer 25:

The answer to this question concerns only the French version of the Request For Proposal. A revision of page 88 of the French version giving the part of the missing text is provided.

N° de l'invitation - Sollicitation No.	N° de la modif - Amd. No.	Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID
W7701-196887/A	004	QCL025
N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.	File No. - N° du dossier	N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME – FMS
W7701-19-6887		

Question 26:

Several of the resource types requested in “Annex B – Basis of Payment” are missing from “Appendix 2 – Category of Resources” of the RFP. Among others, S.8 – HCI and Visualisation Analyst is completely missing (section 3.7 covers S.7 and section 3.8 covers S.9). E.1 and E.2 level 1 are requested as part of Group 3, but the description for E.1 and E.2 do not include the experience required for a Level 1. Similarly, S.1 level 2 is requested as part of Group 3, but the description for S.1 does not include the experience required for a Level 2.

Answer 26:

The basis of payment has been corrected and the document is attached with the replies.

Question 27:

The required experience for S.4 level 3 described in “Appendix 2 – Category of Resources”, section 3.4 doesn't make sense. It asks for 12 years of experience as an IKM specialist with a relevant Masters diploma, or 10 years of experience, or 5+ years of experience with a Ph.D. Why would someone with a relevant Masters diploma require more experience than someone with neither a Masters or a Ph.D.?

Answer 27:

This question only refers to the English version of the Request for Proposal.

Please refer to section 2 of this amendment, Amendment to request for proposal, article 1. Annex A.

Question 28:

The required experience for S.7 level 3 described in “Appendix 2 – Category of Resources”, section 3.7 does not match the experience required for other scientific specialists (such as S.1, S.4, and S.10). All the others ask for 10 years **or** 5+ years and a Ph.D., but S.7 requires 10 years **and** a Ph.D. Is this intentional?

Answer 28:

Yes, it's intentional.

Question 29:

There are some significant differences between the French and the English RFP.

a. For criterion 3a: **In the English version** of the RFP, to score 10 points, the project manager needs 3 or more projects of similar **domain**, size and complexity. For 8 points, the project manager needs 3 or more projects of similar size and complexity. Note that similar domain is no longer required. Similarly, for 6 points, similar domain is also not present. **In the French version**, the same criterion has “domaine similaire” for 10 **as well as** 8 and 6 points. In other words, a project manager with 3 projects of similar size and complexity, but in domains outside C2 or Intelligence would score 8 points in the English RFP, but 0 points in the French RFP. We hope that the correct version is the English proposal, as that would greatly impact ability of companies to bid on this.

N° de l'invitation - Sollicitation No.	N° de la modif - Amd. No.	Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID
W7701-196887/A	004	QCL025
N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.	File No. - N° du dossier	N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME – FMS
W7701-19-6887		

b. The description of S.7 – HCI and Visualisation specialist in “Appendix 2 – Category of Resources” for the French version is significantly less detailed than the description of the same resource in the English version (less than a page in the former, almost 3 pages in the latter). The same is true for other resources such as S.4, S.10 and S.13. Given that three of those are core resources and therefore point rated, it seems like giving more information on them in the English RFP puts companies that are primarily Francophone at an unfair disadvantage.

c. We have not gone through the whole proposal comparing the two languages, those two differences were stumbled upon by accident, but in case there are other differences, especially in the wording of mandatory or point rated criteria, which version takes precedence?

Answer 29:

a. In the English version the word “domain” was missing in the evaluation method for scores of 8 and 6 points. The revised formulation is:

8 – Very Good. The Project Manager proposed meets the minimum experience required for Level 2, has successfully led three (3) or more projects of similar *domain*, size and complexity, and has a total of at least six (6) or more years of experience as Project Manager.

6 – Good. The Project Manager proposed meets the minimum experience required for Level 2 and has successfully led two (2) or more projects of similar *domain*, size and complexity.

b. The French version of S.13 corresponds to the English one. An amendment of the French version is however published below.

As the description of the English version of resource categories S.4, S.7, S.10 is complete, only the French version of these resource categories has been amended below.

c. There is no preference between the English version and the French version. We aim to make both versions equivalent.

Question 30 :

REQUIREMENTS “C” SRCL, PART B, 10.a)

Special comments:

Commentaires spéciaux : Top Secret work will always be performed on-site

With regard to the reference to ‘on-site’ in the above sentence, please confirm if the Top Secret work must/will be performed on-site at DND facilities in Ottawa and/or at DND facilities in Quebec City.

Answer 30:

The location and the security requirements of the work will be specified in each task authorization issued.

Question 31:

REQUIREMENTS “C” SRCL, PART B, 10.a)

Request that the Contractor's liability for damages is limited to the value of the Contract.

That is, we request that Standard Acquisition Clauses and Conditions (SACC) Manual clause 2040 26 (2008-05-12), Liability, is deleted and replaced with SACC N0001C (2008-05-12), Limitation of Contractor's Liability for Damages to Canada, or similar.

N° de l'invitation - Sollicitation No.	N° de la modif - Amd. No.	Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID
W7701-196887/A	004	QCL025
N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.	File No. - N° du dossier	N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME – FMS
W7701-19-6887		

Answer 31:

There is no change to the current clauses.

Question 32:

There are references in Annex B - Basis of Payment, to resource category **S.8** as follows: "S.8 – HCI and Visualisation Analyst, Level 2" and "S.8 – HCI and Visualisation Analyst, Level 3". However, there is not a corresponding paragraph in APPENDIX 2 of Annex A, CATEGORY OF RESOURCES for S.8. Request that Canada insert a description of the role for "S.8 – HCI and Visualisation Analyst" into APPENDIX 2 of Annex A or, alternately, delete this category from the Annex B - Basis of Payment table.

Answer 32:

The resource category S.8 has been removed. The Basis of Payment has been revised and the publication of a new Annex B is attached to this amendment.

Question 33 :

Could you allow the experience of subcontractors to count towards the point rated criteria for corporate experience? Otherwise, the requirement currently in the RFP gives undue advantage to incumbent companies. The RFP covers a wide spectrum of areas at DRDC. There exist small businesses, like ours, that have delivered praised services to DRDC in one or two of the identified areas, but not all of them. This requirement excludes them. This not only limit options for Canada to access the best services, but it also goes against the idea that DRDC projects like this one would contribute to the development of Canadian small and medium companies.

Answer 33 :

Please see part 2- amendment to Request for Proposal

Question 34 :

Despite the new Annex B, there are still missing categories in the financial statement (which are present in the description of SOW categories):

- S.4 - IKM Specialist, Level 1
- S.4 - IKM Specialist, Level 2
- S.7 - HCI and Visualisation Specialist, Level 1
- S.7 - HCI and Visualisation Specialist, Level 2
- S.14 - Command and Control Specialist, Level 1
- S.15 - Experimentation Manager, Level 1
- S.16 - Data Scientist, Level 1

Answer 34 :

All resource categories described in Appendix 2 of the Statement of Work have been added to the Basis of Payment.

The Basis of Payment has been revised and the publication of a new Annex B is attached to this amendment.

N° de l'invitation - Sollicitation No.	N° de la modif - Amd. No.	Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID
W7701-196887/A	004	QCL025
N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.	File No. - N° du dossier	N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME – FMS
W7701-19-6887		

Question 35 :

Regarding the answer provided in Question 4 in the amendment, suggests that the question was not correctly interpreted / understood. We reiterate the question, with more clarification.

- The majority of the evaluation criteria are scored on 10 points and then the score is reduced to the number of technical points available for the question, as indicated in the note on page 2 (Attachment 2) «In the following Table 2, each criterion is evaluated on a scale of zero (0) to ten (10). The result will then be pro-rated according to the "Technical Points Available" (third column) using the "Rule of Three".

However, this calculation method does not seem to apply for criterion 2.c. This criterion is not noted on 10 points but on 24 points. And the technical points for this criterion seems to be 3. However, for this specific criterion, a specific score is also placed in the evaluation of the criterion, which indicates: "The total number of such points is available for this criterion is 24. This total number will be normalized on a ten (10) scale. Can you confirm that for this specific criterion, the standardization will be done on a scale of 24 (and not on a scale of 10, as stated in the RFP), before pro-rating the technical points on 3?

Answer 35 :

Yes, because the desired result will be equivalent in value (numerically). The measurement scale of the technical evaluation method for each rated criterion has been normalized to a maximum value of ten (10).

Suppose that the evaluation of the technological infrastructure gives a score of 12 on an available score of 24. By bringing back this result to the standard scale of ten (10) applied in the evaluation method, this gives us a score of five (5) out of ten (10). The number of technical points available for this criterion being of three (3) points, the score obtained for this criterion will therefore be 1.50 points out of the maximum total of three (3) points.

What is actually equivalent to doing the following calculation directly:
 $(12/24) \times 3 \text{ points} = 1.5 \text{ points}.$

Question 36 :

As far as I understand this, we have to provide actual named resources/people and their CVs for the "Core group" of 8 positions, which are evaluated against the mandatory and rated criteria.

- However, there is no evaluation or listing of personnel against the other positions, for which there is only an evaluation on price. Is this a correct interpretation?
- What supporting evidence do we have to provide against these "non-core" positions?
- How does the Crown intend to ensure when it is evaluating these bids that the contractor actually has the resources it lists prices for?

Answer 36 :

- This is a correct interpretation.
- There is no supporting evidence to provide against these resource categories ("non-core" positions).
- There is no evidence to provide at bid proposal. During the contract period, the Contractor will have to provide, at proposed prices in his bid, the necessary resources for the task authorization execution.

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

W7701-196887/A

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

004

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

QCL025

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

W7701-19-6887

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME – FMS

Question 37 :

Regarding the point rated criteria, when a criterion requires the identification of "original and peer reviewed scientific research papers published in scientific journals" (criteria 3.d, 3.e, 3.f and 3.g), may a publication, concerning the specific area, in conference proceedings be accepted under these criteria?

Answer 37 :

Original and peer reviewed research papers presented in recurrent and/or recognized conferences will be considered.

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.	N° de la modif - Amd. No.	Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID
W7701-196887/A	004	QCL025
N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.	File No. - N° du dossier	N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME – FMS
W7701-19-6887		

2) **Amendment to the Request for proposal**

1. At **part 4**, paragraph 4.1.1 Technical evaluation, please insert the following paragraph:

4.1.1.1 Bidder Experience

Except where expressly provided otherwise, the experience described in the bid must be the experience of one or more of the following:

1. The Bidder itself (which includes the experience of any companies that formed the Bidder by way of a merger but does not include any experience acquired through a purchase of assets or an assignment of contract); or
2. The Bidder's affiliates (i.e. parent, subsidiary or sister corporations, maximum of one affiliate), provided the Bidder identifies and demonstrates the transfer of know-how, the use of toolsets and the use of key personnel from the affiliate for the applicable criterion; or
3. The Bidder's subcontractors (maximum of 40%), provided the Bidder includes a copy of the teaming agreements and identifies the roles and responsibilities of all parties under the agreement and how their work will be integrated.

The experience of the Bidder's suppliers will not be considered.

2. At **Annex A, Statement of Work** please made de following changes:

- a) Amendment to page 88 of Annex A concerns only the French version of the Request For Proposal. A revision of page 88 of the French version giving the part of the missing text is provided.
- b) On page 58 of ANNEX “A” - STATEMENT OF WORK, the Experience of the IKM Specialist at Level 3 is revised as follow:
 - At least twelve (12) years of experience as a IKM Specialist with a relevant Master diploma, or
 - At least 10+ years of experience as a IKM Specialist with a relevant Ph.D. diploma.

Note that the text of the French version for this resource category has been amended.

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.	N° de la modif - Amd. No.	Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID
W7701-196887/A	004	QCL025
N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.	File No. - N° du dossier	N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME – FMS
W7701-19-6887		

- c) These amendments concern only the English version of the Request for Proposal (RFP)

3.10 S.11 - Operations Research Analyst

At page 65 of Appendix 2 of Annex A - Resources, the RFP specifies a level 1 and 2 instead of level 2 and 3 for the Operations Research Analyst. The amendment is:

Experience Levels

- Level 2: 5- < 10 years of experience
Level 3: 10+ years of experience, or 5+ years of experience with a relevant Ph.D.

3.7 S.7 - Human-Computer Interaction and Visualisation Specialist

At page 61 of Appendix 2 of Annex A - Resources, the mention of the resource category level “**At level 3:**” is missing after the text beginning with: **The required services may include, but are not limited to the following:**

3.13 S.14 - Command and Control Specialist

At page 70 of Appendix 2 of Annex A - Resources, the word *Specialist* is missing in the mention of the resource “**At level 3**” :

- At least twelve (12) years of experience as C2 Specialist with a relevant Master diploma; or
- at least ten (10) years of experience as C2 *Specialist* with a relevant Ph.D. diploma.

- d) This amendment concerns only the French version of the Request for Proposal (RFP)
(See French version)
- e) This amendment concerns only the French version of the Request for Proposal (RFP)
(See French version)

3. Please Delete Annex B Basis of Payment and replace by the following Annex B:

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.

ANNEX "B"

BASIS OF PAYMENT

1. LABOUR:

The Contractor agrees to provide the following resources as and when requested by Canada at the following firm all inclusive rates (in accordance with the Payment terms of the Contract):

Note: The categories of resources are divided according to the following three groups:

- Group 1: Core Resources
- Group 2: Regular Use
- Group 3: Unpredictable use and/or ad hoc

Refer to section 2.4 - Resources - of Annex A - Statement of Work - for a description of each group.

Group 1: Core Resources

Proposed Resources	Firm Hourly Rate				
	FY of the grant as of March 31, 2019	FY April 1, 2019 to March 31, 2020	FY April 1, 2020 to March 31, 2021	FY April 1, 2021 up to 3 years after the grant	Estimated Annual Level of Effort
<i>System Engineering</i>					
A.2 - Enterprise Architect, Level 3 1. _____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.12
A.3 - Systems Architect, Level 3 1. _____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	1.14
<i>Management</i>					
M.1 - Project Manager, Level 2 1. _____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.88
<i>Science & Technology</i>					
S.1 - Sensemaking Specialist, Level 3 1. _____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.41
S.4 - IKM Specialist, Level 3 1. _____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.25
S.7 - HCI and Visualisation Specialist, Level 3 1. _____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.25
S.10 - Cognitive Specialist, Level 3 1. _____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.05
<i>Military Expertise</i>					
E.1 - Intelligence SME, Level 2 1. _____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.19

Group 2: Regular Use

Resource Type	Firm Hourly Rate				
	FY of the grant up to March 31, 2019	FY April 1, 2019 to March 31, 2020	FY April 1, 2020 to March 31, 2021	FY April 1, 2021 up to 3 years after the grant	Estimated Annual Level of Effort
<i>System Engineering</i>					
A.1 - Software Architect, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.34
A.2 - Enterprise Architect, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.23
A.3 - Systems Architect, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.04
A.4 - Data Architect, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.03
A.5 - Software Analyst, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.05
A.5 - Software Analyst, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	1.40
A.6 - Business Analyst, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.03
A.11 - Test Coordinator Analyst, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.12 - Geomatics Analyst, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.06
A.13 - Software Lead Developer, Level 1	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.04
A.13 - Software Lead Developer, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.23
A.14 - Geomatics Lead Developer, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.25
A.15 - Software Programmer, Level 1	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.77
A.15 - Software Programmer, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.91
A.15 - Software Programmer, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	6.69
A.17 - Tester Programmer, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.44
A.18 - System Administration Programmer, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.18 - System Administration Programmer, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.17
<i>Management</i>					
M.1 - Project Manager, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.41
<i>Science & Technology</i>					
S.2 - Sensemaking Analyst, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.3 - Sensemaking Lead Developer, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.03
S.3 - Sensemaking Lead Developer, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.06
S.5- IKM Analyst, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.05
S.6 - IKM Lead Developer, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.05

Resource Type	Firm Hourly Rate				
	FY of the grant up to March 31, 2019	FY April 1, 2019 to March 31, 2020	FY April 1, 2020 to March 31, 2021	FY April 1, 2021 up to 3 years after the grant	Estimated Annual Level of Effort
S.9 - HCI and Visualisation Lead Developer, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.12 - Operations Research Lead Developer, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.13
S.13 - Decision Support Specialist, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.20
S.14 - Command and Control Specialist, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.17
S.15 - Experimentation Manager, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.15
S.16 - Data Scientist, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.35
<i>Military Expertise</i>					
E.2 - C2 SME, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.05

Group 3: Unpredictable use and/or ad hoc use

Resource Type	Firm Hourly Rate				
	FY of the grant up to March 31, 2019	FY April 1, 2019 to March 31, 2020	FY April 1, 2020 to March 31, 2021	FY April 1, 2021 up to 3 years after the grant	Estimated Annual Level of Effort
<i>System Engineering</i>					
A.1 - Software Architect, Level 1	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.1 - Software Architect, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.4 - Data Architect, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.5 - Software Analyst, Level 1	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.6- Business Analyst, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.7- Data Modeling Analyst, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.7- Data Modeling Analyst, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.8 - Data Administration Analyst, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.8 - Data Administration Analyst, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.9 - Security Analyst, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.9 - Security Analyst, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.10 - Network Analyst, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.10 - Network Analyst, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02

A.11 - Test Coordinator Analyst, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.12 - Geomatics Analyst, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.13 - Software Lead Developer, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.14 - Geomatics Lead Developer, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.16 - Database Programmer, Level 1	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.16 - Database Programmer, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.16 - Database Programmer, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.17 - Tester Programmer, Level 1	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.19 - Scenario Developer Specialist, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.19 - Scenario Developer Specialist, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.20 - Training Developer Specialist, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
A.20 - Training Developer Specialist, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
Science & Technology					
S.2 - Sensemaking Analyst, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.4 - IKM Specialist, Level 1	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.4 - IKM Specialist, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.5 - IKM Analyst, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.6 - IKM Lead Developer, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.7 - HCI and Visualisation Specialist, Level 1	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.7 - HCI and Visualisation Specialist, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.9 - HCI and Visualisation Lead Developer, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.11 - Operations Research Analyst, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.11 - Operations Research Analyst, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.12 - Operations Research Lead Developer, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.13 - Decision Support Specialist, Level 1	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.13 - Decision Support Specialist, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.14 - Command and Control Specialist, Level 1	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
W7701-196887/A
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
W7701-19-6887

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
File No. - N° du dossier
QCL-8-41072

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
QCL025
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME

S.14 - Command and Control Specialist, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.15 - Experimentation Manager, Level 1	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.15 - Experimentation Manager, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.16 - Data Scientist, Level 1	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
S.16 - Data Scientist, Level 2	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
<i>Military Expertise</i>					
E.1 - Intelligence SME, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02
E.2 - C2 SME, Level 3	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	\$_____	0.02

2. EQUIPMENT: at laid down cost without markup

3. RENTALS: at actual cost without markup

4. MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES: at laid down cost without markup

5. TRAVEL AND LIVING EXPENSES: in accordance with Section 6.1(iv) of the Contract

6. SUBCONTRACTS: at actual cost without markup

7. OTHER DIRECT CHARGES: at actual cost without markup

Estimated total cost – Limitation of expenditure: \$9,000,000.00 (TPS/TVH extra)