



Summary of Feedback and Outcomes

Request for Information No.

W7714-19DRDC

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– List of Participating Organizations

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 16 S&T Challenges for which innovative solutions are sought:

Stream A: Public Safety and Security: Smart Communities and Systems

DRDC is looking for novel ideas and innovative solutions to resolve public safety and security S&T challenges under the following 3 themes: Mitigating the Safety and Security Impact of Climate Change, National Security Risks, and Protecting and Connecting Safety and Security Professionals. Stream A is primarily in support of Canada's resilience through Canadian Safety and Security Program (CSSP) S&T investments. The CSSP mission is to strengthen Canada's ability to anticipate, prevent, mitigate, prepare for, respond to and recover from natural disasters, serious accidents, and crime and terrorism through the convergence of S&T with policy, operations, and intelligence.

Stream B: Support to Canada's Defence Policy "Strong, Secure, Engaged"

One of the initiatives of Canada's Defence Policy "Strong, Secure, Engaged" is to acquire space capabilities to improve situational awareness and targeting, including the replacement of the current RADARSAT systems to improve the identification and tracking of threats and improve situational awareness of routine traffic in and through Canadian territory, as well as in other areas of interest around the world.

Assistant Deputy Minister (ADM) S&T within the Department of National Defence (DND) has a program focused on conducting cutting-edge research and development (R&D) on space-based earth observation technologies in collaboration with allies, industry, and academia to maintain, enhance, and replace situational awareness capabilities for the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF). This program provides advice and recommendations to DND stakeholders concerning viable and cost-effective solutions that are available, or will be available in the near future, and that could be considered in upcoming options analysis phases of space-based intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) projects.

3. Stakeholder Engagement Process

Stakeholder Engagement Period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posting of RFI: 2019/04/16. • Responses to RFI requested: 2019/05/15.
Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to Annex B, List of Participating Organizations. • Overall, 60 organizations participated in the RFI. • 32 organizations participated in one-on-one alignment meetings. • 17 organizations received a written alignment opinion. • 11 organizations provided general feedback only.

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 questions and feedback received during the Stakeholder Engagement Process and the outcomes on the draft CFP.

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

The following represents questions posed during the RFI process and the resulting responses provided in written format and in one-on-one meetings. General administrative questions, on the CFP or submission process, are not included.

Requirement					
5.1	Are the S&T Challenges and Project Types clear?				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #d3d3d3;"><i>Questions and Feedback</i></th> <th style="background-color: #d3d3d3;"><i>Answers and Outcomes</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Stream B: Theme 2 Page 46 says that one of the initiatives is “including the replacement of the current RADARSAT system to improve the identification and tracking of threats”. But the only Challenge listed is “15. Hyper-Spectral Imaging Satellites”. There is no Challenge</td> <td>The statement is to provide high-level context to where the challenges originated. The challenges fall under the scope of Canada’s Defence Policy “Strong, Secure, Engaged”.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>Questions and Feedback</i>	<i>Answers and Outcomes</i>	Stream B: Theme 2 Page 46 says that one of the initiatives is “including the replacement of the current RADARSAT system to improve the identification and tracking of threats”. But the only Challenge listed is “15. Hyper-Spectral Imaging Satellites”. There is no Challenge	The statement is to provide high-level context to where the challenges originated. The challenges fall under the scope of Canada’s Defence Policy “Strong, Secure, Engaged”.
<i>Questions and Feedback</i>	<i>Answers and Outcomes</i>				
Stream B: Theme 2 Page 46 says that one of the initiatives is “including the replacement of the current RADARSAT system to improve the identification and tracking of threats”. But the only Challenge listed is “15. Hyper-Spectral Imaging Satellites”. There is no Challenge	The statement is to provide high-level context to where the challenges originated. The challenges fall under the scope of Canada’s Defence Policy “Strong, Secure, Engaged”.				

	<p>identifying R&D for the next generation of SAR satellites.</p>	
	<p>Stream B: For S&T Challenge #16, the title is “Demonstration of a multi-purpose SSA microsatellite” yet the challenge description does not refer to microsatellites or any other satellite class specifically, nor does it give its own definition of a microsatellite. It is therefore not clear if a solution based on nanosatellites or small satellites is acceptable, or one based on hosted payloads on larger spacecraft.</p>	<p>The type of space craft was purposely left unspecified initially to allow the study to have the freedom to look at various concepts and propose a solution. These comments have been taken into consideration and a revised definition of Challenge 16 will appear in the final CFP.</p>
	<p>The project type descriptions could be made much clearer. In particular, the distinction between a “study” and a “concept” needs to be clarified, e.g. by providing specific examples for each. If a conceptual design for a spacecraft (bus and instrument) is proposed for S&T Challenges 15 or 16, is this considered a study or a concept? In traditional parlance this type of activity is often referred to as a “concept study” or “Phase 0 study”. The SRL for “studies” also runs the full range from 1 to 9, leaving it highly open to interpretation.</p>	<p>The project descriptions are intentionally general to allow for flexibility in proposal submissions. It is not mandatory for proposals to fall fully within one specific project type description; however, each proposal must ensure it is aligned to the S&T Challenge and addresses the evaluation criteria.</p> <p>The revised challenge statement is for a Phase 0 study examining the feasibility, timeline and cost estimate of a new R&D SSA microsatellite capability. Refer to the above statement concerning the class of satellite.</p>
	<p>Stream B: As a replacement spacecraft for NEOSSat will be a major procurement, we would like to discuss what DRDC would like to see done under this initiative</p>	<p>No, this is not a NEOSSat replacement. The revised Challenge statements will provide more clarity.</p>
	<p>Stream B: Depending upon the timeframe, would it be planned that this next SSA asset will be a replacement of NEOSSat or planned to operate in conjunction with NEOSSat</p>	<p>No, this is not a NEOSSat replacement; however, as the design life of NEOSSat is approaching its end, whether this new satellite operates in conjunction with NEOSSat or not is not known.</p>
	<p>They are not clear because space-based capabilities could be used for both stream A and stream b. With all these challenges their descriptions tend to be very short and brief.</p> <p>For example for stream A, satellite imagery could be used to assist in response to a natural disaster in real time or have early detection of natural disasters. Certain threats could be prevented using satellite data e.g. using ship detection machine learning algorithms for detecting high risk ships using satellite data in a certain geography. For stream A and B these areas are very broad and could require very different</p>	<p>Unless otherwise stipulated in the challenge, Bidders have the freedom to propose any technology or solution that will address the Challenge. For Stream A, the challenges are written broadly to accommodate many different solutions and government departments.</p> <p>It is best to have a Lead Government Department (LGD) selected prior to developing your proposal. The LGD that you are partnering with will assist by providing specific details, e.g. data sets.</p>

	<p>solutions, it would be ideal to have a much more broken-down stream with sub challenges for each stream with a lot more detail and access to subject matter experts who can explain the problem. You can develop machine learning models using data but majority of the times that data exists in some sort of unstructured or structured format. Currently the Canadian government is doing work on open government data, with these challenges it is critical that they also provide datasets for relevant problems. We spent nearly all the proposal preparation time reaching out to companies / departments looking for relevant datasets for using machine learning to solve that problem for another Canadian government challenges. Ideally a user would be writing their needs and not just a high level vision because the proposal is expected to respond to a specific problem that will solve a pressing need for a user.</p>	
	<p>We believe that Stream A (Public Safety and Security: Smart Communities and Systems), Theme 2 (Mitigating National Security Risks), Challenge #6 (Understanding the Threat from Disruptive Technology) could be revised to include post quantum cryptography as a Disruptive Technology. More specifically to modify the wording of the S&T challenge as follows: “Innovative S&T solutions or analytical approaches that further our understanding of the risk associated with disruptive technologies such as AI, quantum computing, increased digital connectivity, networked sensors, advanced robotics, and advanced manufacturing.”</p>	<p>These comments have been taken into consideration and a revised definition of Challenge 6 will appear in the final CFP.</p>
	<p>It is not clear how the Stream description for Stream A influences the challenges. Are the projects for the Stream A challenges required to incorporate smart technology specifically? It is unclear as the Theme 1 challenges are not described in this way.</p>	<p>The Stream description provides high level context. The challenges are written broadly to accommodate many different solutions and government departments. Unless otherwise stipulated in the challenge, Bidders have the freedom to propose any technology or solution that will address a Stream A Challenge.</p>
	<p>In my experience as a Refugee and an Intelligence operative, I have noticed a pressing need for « studies » and « concepts » which will further and accelerate the development of methodologies to build systematically bridges between adjacent areas structured by different mental schemas.</p> <p>For example, the bridges between law/cognition/communication/intelligence analysis: new methodologies have been developed since 2011</p>	<p>These comments have been taken into consideration and a revised definition of a Study will appear in the final CFP.</p>

<p>in Intelligence analysis, with the creation of Structured Analytical Techniques (SATs). But those methodologies are not yet integrated into Law and Law enforcement, with the result that Intelligence Analysts are not understood by untrained judges who decide the legality of Intel operations such as surveillance or arrests in cases involving risks of terrorism. A succession of cases involving terrorism before the Federal Court, where the judges substituted their uninformed judgments to those of experienced analysts, has left CSIS and the RCMP reeling and profoundly hampered in their capacity to act preventatively.</p> <p>Thus, the definitions of « studies » and « concepts » could be slightly amended to encourage research in those fields and methodologies which allow to bridge the gaps between domains which coexist in Intelligence but have been founded on very different scientific or methodological assumptions.</p>	
<p>We would be interested in proposing a technology demonstration under the S&T Challenge to develop tools for solutions for risk reduction and mitigation. This S&T challenge is clear, but we would like to clarify if expansion of a previously funded project, to add functionality to meet this S&T challenge is eligible? We would like to expand the application to have a broader focus, specifically to act as a primary tool for Emergency Operations Centre for both risk planning and risk mitigation, and event management, and would like to know if that type of project would be eligible.</p>	<p>Yes, this type of project is eligible. Refer to Section 3.4.2 and Annex A, Project Parameters.</p>
<p>Is Solution Readiness Level (SRL) the same as Technology Readiness Level (TRL) in CFP 2016? If so, if it was determined that the project was at TRL level 8 at the conclusion of that project, and if it is felt that expanding the project under a technology demonstration (which is SRL 5-7) would be the best way to advance the maturity of the project (although it was at TRL 8), would this be possible (or could the technology demonstration be expanded to SRL 5-8). A technology pilot in comparison does not specifically allow for further development of software tools.</p>	<p>Refer to Annex H for additional details on the language used for each SRL level. It is up to the bidder to decide where the project falls within the SRL range.</p> <p>Proposals must be in accordance with Annex A.</p>

<p>Data protection, data sovereignty, and data rights should be part of the evaluation criteria. These issues are the defining questions of the AI, machine learning, and the Internet of Things era. To receive funding from the DRDC, applicants should provide the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How will be data protected? ● How will data and derivative data sovereignty will be ensured? ● Who will own any data and the derivative data that is generated or captured during the course of the project? <p>We noted, for example, in Stream A (Public Safety and Security - Smart Communities and Systems) that preserving the privacy of individuals is a criteria. However, when it comes to data, privacy is not the same thing as protection. Data protection is about securing data and derivative data against unauthorized access and/or use whereas data privacy is about authorized access — who has it and who defines the access level; data protection is essentially a technical issue, whereas data privacy is a legal one. Without adequate data protection, there is the very real risk of 3rd-party cloud providers, real-time data collectors, and IoT manufacturers harvesting data or derivative data from DRDC funded projects. Furthermore, if only data sovereignty requirements are met, that data must reside in Canada, there is no guarantee that rights and/or ownership of the data and data derivative will be a Canadian person or organization. For example, who owns the data generated by an IoT sensor: the purchaser? the manufacturer? the people or organization using the IoT sensor? If this question is left unasked, it usually means the manufacturing or cloud provider is claiming the data rights and ownership. In terms of sovereignty, even if the data from an IoT sensor isn't leaving Canada, there is the possibility that a foreign multinational is creating derivative data sets and sending them across the border, or running an AI algorithm on the data and sending the analytic output overseas. Either way, Canada is not benefiting from data that was paid for by a Government program. Perhaps more troublesome is the fact that a foreign entity can access and use data from a DRDC funded project if the data is not adequately protected.</p>	<p>Currently, we do not have any challenges that directly relate to data protection, sovereignty and rights. From a resulting contract award perspective, depending on the type of project / work being negotiated, the following SACC contracting clauses could be utilized with respect to data protection and IP ownership:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protection and Security of Data Stored in Databases (2008-05-12) A9122C 2. Personal Information (2008-12-12) 4008 3. Contractor to Own Intellectual Property Rights in Foreground Information (2010-08-16) 4006 4. Handling of Personal Information (2014-11-27) A9113C <p>Refer to the SACC Manual Clause hyperlink within Part 7 of the CFP.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>No. As exemplified by the Company A’s one-on-one meeting with CSS on the fit of our proposal with Challenges 1 and 15, it was stated (by CSS) that, in particular for Challenge Area 15, there was ambiguity even among the government attendees as to how the Challenge areas should be interpreted. Overall, Company A came out of the meeting more confused than going in.</p> <p>In both Challenges 1 and 15, Company A and our proposed champion, felt that an evaluation of Company A’s proposed hyperspectral sensor constellation against stated GoC requirements would fit. In Challenge 1, we felt that the upcoming Company A constellation would provide underlying data and information products to support “... scalable tools, methodologies, and novel S&T solutions for risk reduction and mitigation at national level, which consider disasters of all types and include geographical, economic, cultural, and social factors, and which aim to inform disaster risk reduction initiatives...” However, we were told that the emphasis was on the risk models and approaches, not on supporting information products. We are not sure that that aspect comes out clearly in the wording.</p> <p>For Challenge 15, the objective states... “DND and CAF require a better understanding of how HSI technology deployed from space could provide novel and significant solutions to ISR problems such as...” Again, we were told there was no fit. The problem was that the accompanying S&T challenge is confusingly specific. For example, why care about the size of the satellite? The emphasis is on the sensors. According to the scientific experts at the meeting, the challenge had to be very narrowly interpreted as what existing sensor properties are best for exploiting the various wavelengths, alone or in combination to support various DND/CAF applications. This interpretation effectively shuts out Canadian commercial entities that do not meet the very specific S&T challenge requirements, despite the fact that the sensor properties associated with these commercial entities may very well be able to provide huge value against the very same GoC requirements. To us, it appeared as if the challenge criteria were being interpreted as a way to mine Canadian expertise for information that DND can use to pre-determine what its requirements for hyperspectral space-based sensing should be. We can clearly see how this is of benefit to DND, but how</p>	<p>These comments have been taken into consideration and a revised definition of Challenge 1 and Challenge 15 will appear in the final CFP.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>does this approach advance the state of existing commercial capability?</p> <p>We would respectfully ask that Challenge Area 1 be expanded in meaning to include the use of information sources that can greatly improve community risk mitigation and resilience (such as timely and accurate space-based data), and that Challenge Area 15 be broadened to include evaluation of proposed and up-coming commercial hyperspectral imaging sensors and systems to meet Defence capability requirements.</p>	
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Requirement		
5.2	Is it clear how Canada proposes to evaluate the proposals? Provide any suggestions that, in your opinion, could improve the evaluation criteria.	
	Questions and feedback	Answers and Outcomes
	<p>In our experience, and on challenges requiring a lead government department, it is first necessary to “sell” the LGD on the benefit of partnering and on benefit what they will receive from that. In our experience the LGD partner is seeking an “operational innovation” that will allow them to address a challenge or improve their performance in the short term. This “operational innovation”, while it may be a significant step forward for an LGD, seems to pale against or be at odds with the DRDC need to see a “scientific innovation”. In our experience the LGD is rarely interested in a scientific innovation that cannot address their operational needs quickly. We suggest that projects proposing a solution at a higher SRL be assessed more on the immediate operational impact they can provide to an LGD rather on whether or not the solution is a “scientific innovation”.</p>	<p>This is an S&T program / innovation program. Canada is not soliciting for final operational solutions. Canada’s intent is to discover new methods to solve S&T challenges and has created evaluation criteria to address the impact of a proposed solution. Refer to PR-6 in the CFP.</p>
	<p>PR-1 Project Feasibility:</p> <p>a. The text description is reasonably clear that this criterion measures the feasibility that the applicant can accomplish the proposed project. It does not relate to the scientific plausibility of the study. b. For instance, the applicant may wish to study whether or not pigs can fly and could propose a very feasible approach to addressing the question, but the scientific feasibility or scientific merit may be nil even with a very detailed work plan. c. PR1- on page 67 is</p>	<p>Scientific Feasibility of the proposal is addressed in PR-3 of the CFP.</p>

	entitled “Scientific Feasibility” Suggest that it should be re-labelled “Project Feasibility”	
	<p>PR-2 Project Applicability in Canada</p> <p>a. What is more important – that the proposed project is very important to one level of government or one department (ie DND) or that it is of moderate importance to multiple levels of government. The “Required Information” in Column 3 implies the former. The points description the latter.</p> <p>b. To get maximum points, an applicant would show how the results of the project would benefit as many levels of government as possible regardless of the import of the benefit. A project to study better grass seed for instance would benefit all levels of government but may not be as significant to Canada as a breakthrough technology for autonomous, self-targeting artillery shells with primarily benefits only the Canadian military.</p> <p>c. As scientific merit is addressed in PR-3, suggest PR-2 be clarified to state that the only criteria is benefit to more levels of government is better, regardless of the technical benefit – if that is what is intended.</p> <p>d. Having said this I would question why the DND would have this as a criterion to evaluate what it should fund. A hallmark of spending on the military in Canada is that it is frequently not popular with a demonstrable, easily recognized, benefit to taxpayers and if given the choice they would not spend on it.</p> <p>e. Nonetheless, Canada must spend money on defence or we will cease to be a sovereign nation. We are not here to do what Canadians want us to do, we are here to do what they need us to do.</p>	<p>PR-2 addresses the number of different levels of government the proposed project is applicable to.</p> <p>PR-6 addresses the degree of impact the project is going to have on the end user.</p> <p>In addition to the defence community, this call is relevant to public safety and security end users.</p>
	<p>PR 3 Scientific and/or Technical Merit of the Proposal</p> <p>a. The “Information Required” and “Maximum Points” description do not match the title</p> <p>b. The Technical Merit should be a measure of the scientific import of the results of the project, if successful. For example, a new technology for converting sunlight to electricity in space yielding 50% rather than the typical 28% efficiency would have huge ramifications not just for satellites but for solar powered electricity generation everywhere.</p> <p>c. But at an initial R&D stage, there may be few concepts or technical evidence that it is possible or</p>	<p>a. The 0 points description will be corrected to "The scientific concepts and/or technical evidence of the project are not provided".</p> <p>b. This is addressed in PR-6 project impact.</p> <p>c. Scientific concepts can also be known as scientific logic.</p> <p>d. 10 points is a pass, 15 points is exceeded expectations.</p> <p>e. Answered within the previous questions above.</p> <p>f. PR-4 and PR-5 are to prevent a banal and an easily achievable incremental technology improvement. Canada does not comment on other countries' funding models.</p>

<p>feasible – and would score very low in points as written here</p> <p>d. To get maximum points, the applicant would pick a subject that increments the known technology only slightly, but can be backed up with lengthy “scientific concepts and/or technical evidence support the project and suggests a high probability of success”</p> <p>e. In other words, the description encourages potentially insignificant technology gains that can easily be achieved rather than hard ones that are risky</p> <p>f. The word descriptions do not measure “Technical Merit” they encourage only banal but easily describable and easily achievable incremental technology improvement</p> <p>g. Is this the intent of DND R&D-? What about a DARPA approach – we only fund cutting edge, high risk, but high payoff R+D rather than the low risk, best chance of success, maximum benefits to everybody approach.</p>	
<p>PR 4 - Novel and Innovative</p> <p>The only observation comes in the Maximum Points. The text reads “or technologies exploited can be considered advanced thinking or breakthroughs with little or no previous application”</p> <p>As written this would rule out the novel or innovative use of existing technology in a new application. As written, only new ideas count.</p> <p>This is OK, if that is what is wanted however novel or innovative adaptation of existing technology in a new application is important also - for instance the use of crazy glue for sutures less surgery in the field or the invention and widespread use of Velcro well beyond its inventors initial intention</p>	<p>Within the definition of Innovative, existing technologies are taken into consideration.</p>
<p>PR 5 - New Knowledge/Technology and/or Enhancements</p> <p>The only observation is that the text under Maximum Points is contrary to the category. Under “6 points” and the proposal clearly demonstrates how the solution will be achieved in the project. – if the solution approach was already known then it would have been done already.</p> <p>The only thing that you can ask for here is that the basic “Scientific Process” will be followed – the results or known solution to achieve it almost by definition</p>	<p>Given the scientific merit of the project, the bidder should be able to explain with some hypothetical scientific-based certainty what the proposed solution is and how it will be achieved.</p>

	cannot be known a prior or it would not be New Technology.	
	<p>PR 6 - Project Impact</p> <p>a. Same final words under Maximum 12 Points - and the proposal clearly demonstrates how the solution will be achieved in the project</p> <p>b. If we knew the solution, it would already have been done</p>	<p>This will be corrected in the final CFP. It should read "The proposed enhancements to end user capabilities would be a true 'game changer', and the proposal clearly explains how implementation of the project will improve the end user capabilities to this effect."</p>
	<p>PR9 - Work Plan – Risks and Mitigation</p> <p>a. Under Maximum 10 Points. All known major technical and programmatic risks are included, risks and resulting mitigation plans are fully and realistically described</p> <p>b. Known to whom?</p> <p>c. If an applicant lists the risks as they see them, the only way they should not get 10 points is if the reviewer knew that the applicant knew of a risk but didn't list it</p> <p>d. Is this the interpretation to give this?</p> <p>e. If the reviewer knew of other risks that the applicant didn't but should have in the opinion of the reviewer, do they lose marks for this?</p> <p>f. The problem that is frequently encountered in writing a requirement like this is that there is no way to verify whether or not it is met</p> <p>g. There is a huge tendency to prefer sweeping requirements like this using "All" because the wording appears to cover of all potentialities and are less risky for the writer – but in the end are not verifiable</p> <p>h. If a risk does arise that was unforeseen, in the past the "All" clause has been used as an excuse not to pay the contractor</p> <p>i. Most experienced contractors won't accept clauses written that way, it just leads to trouble</p> <p>j. Suggest using the list of risks noted under the description section and require the applicant to state whether it is a risk or not and what the mitigation may be (if any)</p> <p>k. The applicant and the department are then sharing the risk that there may be a "gotcha" that only arises later</p>	<p>This will be corrected as follows "All reasonable major technical and programmatic risks are included, risks and resulting mitigation plans are fully and realistically described". Also, the weight of points provided in this section is an indication of the variety of different responses.</p>

	<p>I. This is R&D, the department has to accept that sometimes R&D is a failure through no one's bad performance. If there is no chance of failure, then it is not R&D</p>	
	<p>PR - Work Plan – Cost Estimate</p> <p>a. A lot of information for what could be a FFP contract.</p> <p>b. You should give the option to the Contractor to list only milestones with objective success criteria and milestone payments if they elect FFP – no cost detail is provided along the way.</p> <p>c. If the applicant wants Limitation of Expenditure, then they should have to detail the expected costs and report on them and under what criteria they will stop work – (i.e. when they reach the limit) – but they are not held to do more work than their costs to receive payment - fair enough.</p> <p>d. As written, Ceiling Price is LOE but lowered to actuals if the applicant finishes under budget but capped if they exceed budget. It is not clear why any Applicant would select this option.</p>	<p>For bid submission, only high-level costing information is required (Refer to Annex E). If the proposal is selected for funding, a comprehensive costing breakdown will be required before contract award (Refer to Annex M). Most of the resulting contracts will be fixed firm price milestones for budgeting and forecasting purposes, however, for Stream B, the TA may request that the resulting contract(s) be actual costs to a limitation of expenditure.</p>
	<p>PR-11- Project Management (PM) Plan Project Team</p> <p>a. This criterion definitely favours larger companies that have all of these experienced personnel available and can put them in place.</p> <p>b. If the selection and approval process takes one year, this means that any identified overhead (PM, PA, Fin) and technical resources must still be available in a year from now This will rule out many small companies that don't have the capacity to potentially let these people sit around for a year.</p> <p>c. This would not favour (or may scare off) start-ups or smaller companies that may have "Novel or Innovative" ideas but don't have the over-head staff.</p> <p>d. For what could be a \$100K project of a few months, this also is a lot of overhead.</p>	<p>There are provisions regarding the replacement of key resources. Refer to Section 5.2.8, Status and Availability of Resources.</p> <p>Bidders have the option to replace named resources on the bid if they are no longer available at time of contract award. Also, the individuals named on the proposal do not have to be on your payroll.</p>
	<p>It is very time consuming and lengthy to prepare these proposals given a large list of evaluation criteria. The evaluation process should be needs based not innovation based because innovation is the result of the process not the process itself. The main criteria that should matter to the evaluating committee is whether this meets their requirements and needs and not whether it is innovative because</p>	<p>Canada has reduced the number of criteria from the previous CFP. Given the additional information and clarity included in the document this year, it is Canada's intent to provide the bidders with adequate information to provide a clear and concise response to each criterion with the purpose of allowing each bidder to make a sound business decision to submit a proposal.</p>

<p>that is a moving target. Please shorten the requirements, start-ups and small businesses don't have the seed capital / investor backing or additional access to highly technical employees to justify spending months and thousands of dollars in uncertain bidding process to respond to RFP.</p>	
<p>It is clear but checking the project leader/manager background and CV specially the related previous industrial and academia works (Finished project and published articles) can be also a good item in review.</p>	<p>The criteria gives the bidders the flexibility to highlight the experience that is most applicable.</p>
<p>Under PR-2, please clarify that government organization at municipal level applies to a regional (county) government.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 3.1 Who May Apply.</p>
<p>Company ownership, not number of employees be used to define "Canadian" - Canadian company eligibility criteria needs to focus on company ownership in defining SMEs, not just number of employees (<499) to receive funding from the Government of Canada.</p> <p>Traditional metrics such as the number of employees for assessing the commercial benefit to Canada have limited value in the world of AI and digital marketplace practices, where data and IP can easily flow across borders with the monetization of assets - revenues and profits - occurring outside of Canada. For example, a large multinational like IBM can buy a small AI company with 10 employees in Newfoundland and use that organization to apply to this program, and they would qualify. At the end of the day though, any new IP would belong to IBM.</p> <p>The current criteria of "less than 500 employees" masks significant foreign ownership of AI-digital companies located in Canada, with IP and profit leaking out of the country. For these reasons, we recommend revising the Canadian company "eligibility criteria" to include the following:</p> <p>Criteria</p> <p>Fund Access Eligibility (SME)</p> <p>Company Structure</p> <p>Greater than 70 percent Canadian ownership</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no Canadian ownership requirement / certification in this CFP (Refer to Part 5 - Certifications and Additional Information). 2. Depending on the size of your company, some certification(s) are applicable. 3. The CFP requires 50% Canadian content, as per Section 5.1.2.1 Canadian Content Certification.

<p>Intellectual Property Registration in Canada</p> <p>Resultant IP is registered with Canadian patent office first</p> <p>Monetization of Products in Canada</p> <p>All data and access to knowledge that is provided by the government through the program, and all derivative data/products, occur as revenue within the jurisdictional boundaries of Canada</p> <p>Track Record</p> <p>Successful Canadian entrepreneurs as part of the team</p>	
<p>Relevant digital peer review, not academic peer review processes used is required - In the software innovation and commercialization space, DRDC/GC should employ standard software integration review processes, including product integration, interface compatibility, and product verification. The traditional academic peer review approach used by the Government of Canada is not suitable for Federal contracting of commercial software products, services and R&D. A fundamental question in any “peer review” process is: who are the peers? Bias towards “scientific merit” of algorithms and practitioners over operational practicality and software integration has already seen Canada’s progress in the AI marketplace slip and a focus on academic providers.</p> <p>Commercial and public sector applications of digital technologies should be evaluated in the same manner as other IT infrastructure. As such, our company recommends (for a typical application of software in the public sector):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● External review teams - should focus on enterprise integration standards review process ● Internal quality control - should focus on software verification of models being put into production; ● Test scripts, data and scenario development - should be lead by procurement department/s, following guidelines established; ● Documentation and code review - documentation on methods should be provided by vendors, with code review limited to foreground intellectual property received by the procuring department; 	<p>The criterion gives the bidders the flexibility to highlight and demonstrate the required proof to meet the criteria. If relevant digital peer review is a part of the "scientific merit", then please include this information in the proposal.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Publication and findings - should be determined by procurement departments at the time of contract/funding authority. Ownership of the output of models should rest with the government. Background IP, inputs and unique technology features of models and ecosystems developed will be the property of the vendors. The academic community might have interest in publishing background IP, but Canadian commercial bodies will not. <p>For the reasons detailed above, data sovereignty and protection should be part of the evaluation criteria.</p>	

Requirement		
5.3	Does the Basis of Selection seem fair and reasonable?	
	Questions and feedback	Answers and Outcomes
	Are the total bid price or the project durations considered as factors in the committee prioritizations? If two bids score equally in terms of mandatory and point-rated criteria, will the lower-priced one be more likely to be selected? Or the shorter-duration one?	The Proposal Selection Committee (PSC) as described in Section 4.4, uses the eleven strategic considerations in the selection of proposals to be considered for funding.
	Where Para 4.4 indicates “Canada will communicate the results of this process” does this mean that bidders will be able to view their prioritization relative to other bidders, or will they simply be informed “yes” or “no” as to whether their bid was selected by the committees for funding?	The Contracting Authority (PWGSC) will email the individual evaluation results to the Bidder named in the proposal. Email results will fall into one of the following three categories: 1) Yes, your proposal will be considered for funding; 2) Your proposal may be considered for funding should additional funds become available and 3) No, your proposal will not be considered for funding.
	Will the reasons for the committee prioritizations be made public, or at least made known to the bidders?	The Contracting Authority (PWGSC) will email the individual evaluation results to the Bidder named in the proposal.
	The draft CFP alludes in several places to cash and/or in-kind contributions. Our interpretation is that these contributions are not mandatory but that they may increase the likelihood of selection. If so, we recommend that the final CFP make this statement clearly.	Refer to Section 4.4 Proposal Selection. As an example, if two similar proposals are received under the same challenge, the amount of co-investment may be taken into consideration as it is one of the eleven strategic considerations used in the proposal selection process.
	The stage 1 basis of selection seems fair and reasonable for acceptance into the qualified pool of proposals. However, the stage 2 selection process for final selection and contracting is unclear and not reasonable, given the effort required to submit a proposal. For example, it is strongly suggested that	Given the different types of proposals received, and the evolving S&T landscape, Section 4.4 Proposal Selection, describes eleven strategic considerations for the PSC. At the end of the proposal selection process, the Contracting Authority (PWGSC) will provide feedback to the bidder

	scoring and evaluation criteria are clearly stated for final proposal selection in the formal CFP.	explaining the rationale for selecting or not selecting the proposal for funding.
	The basis of selection does not seem fair because existing companies have decades of experience with the current challenges, with limited descriptions of the challenge and very little feedback and input from the users / different departments it is extremely challenging to develop a proposal to solve the challenge that is cost effective and technically superior. The current process favours large incumbents and actually hurts innovation in the long run. Existing companies can easily hire people with domain knowledge with the relevant challenges, for start-ups and small businesses this is next to impossible with limited budgets.	In order to receive proposals for a wide range of Challenges with various solutions, Canada has made a significant effort to clarify the process and evaluation criteria through the RFI process so that bidders can make an informed decision regarding their probability of success.
	It is extremely restrictive for a new start-up, an alternative could be the government provides a challenge but with a lot more information such as “relevant data to the problem (e.g. existing open data sets / ways to access to the data), access to resources that educates the respondents on the challenge in a lot more detail, access to subject matter experts to clarify and verify the specific pain points. Someone cannot solve a problem if they don’t have all the variables and important details at a very micro level because the execution of these contracts happens at a milestone basis. Details are critical to contract success. Timeline is also not very clear, that is really important because if a start-up needs to raise investor funding, apply for security clearances for future employees and hire employees to develop a proposal it is extremely prohibitive to not know the timeline.	For proposals submitted under Stream A, the LGD will assist with structuring your project in alignment with the S&T Challenge. As per the Detailed Budget Table in Annex E, the CFP asks Bidders to assume a project start date of April 1, 2020.
	<p>For the above-mentioned theme, since there is emphasis on meeting the four priorities for action of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk reduction, we recommend that the evaluation consider the efficacy of the proposal to meet these priorities.</p> <p>Therefore, we recommend that MC-1 and MC-4 Stream A include a more granular evaluation regarding the Sendai Framework under that S&T challenge.</p> <p>For PR7 GBA+, we feel the weighting of the points is too high as meeting the S&T challenge for risk reduction as it relates to disaster management, for example, is gender neutral (a flood, tornado etc., affects all members of the population equally).</p>	The efficacy of the proposal is addressed in PR 3, Scientific and/or Technical Merit of the Proposal. If GBA+ is not applicable to your proposal, explain why. The point schema accounts for this.

<p>In our experience, the weight of selection by the Government of Canada around various innovation programs (namely IDEaS and ISC) has been towards the academic community, who are several steps away from the innovation marketplace, and do not necessarily have the skills or track record for raising capital, taking goods to market (commercialization), etc.</p> <p>Our participation in the ISC program illustrate (as described above) an overly academic and incremental approach to defining scientific advancement and a lack of understanding of the enormity of R&D involved in software integration and the training of algorithms for new applications in pursuit of development of new products and tools. AI tool development for example often requires significant engineering costs and experimentation with data to meet prediction accuracy requirements of clients or sector.</p> <p>Our company would like to work with GC/DRDC to establish a clear understanding of digital R&D, and ensure that integration and the training of math within a platform is well understood during the evaluation process.</p>	<p>Specific questions can be submitted in writing to the PWGSC Contracting Authority as specified in the Call for Proposals document. Each year, the CFP process allows the Bidder an opportunity to meet with DRDC for a proposal alignment meeting.</p>
<p>On the surface, the basis of selection seems fair and reasonable. However, there is no clarity on the selection criteria and prioritization associated with how proposals that make the cut are actually selected for funding. For example, there are examples out there of companies scoring 100% on their evaluations, and still not being selected for funding. As companies put huge resources against these sorts of calls at their own expense, not providing companies with all the facts concerning how government chooses to fund one project over another is not well perceived and tend to decrease companies interest in such a program. All parts of the process should be transparent.</p>	<p>The Proposal Selection Committee as described in Section 4.4, uses the eleven strategic considerations in the selection of proposals to be considered for funding. PWGSC will email the individual evaluation results to the Bidder named in the proposal.</p> <p>Email results will fall into one of the following three categories: 1) Yes, your proposal will be considered for funding; 2) Your proposal may be considered for funding should additional funds become available; 3) No, your proposal will not be considered for funding.</p> <p>Extensive effort was spent to clarify the process and selection criteria / challenges so that bidders can make an informed decision regarding their probability of success.</p>

Requirement															
5.4	Is the current draft CFP unduly restrictive (e.g. bidding process, project types, funding limits, evaluation criteria)? Please explain why and suggest alternatives.														
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Questions and feedback</th> <th>Answers and Outcomes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>The development of satellites to meet either the Challenge 15 or 16 or the MSCI/MDA SAR will be more than identified funding levels</td> <td>These comments have been taken into consideration and the project parameters are being revised for the final CFP.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Is a capital program identified also to follow on beyond this R&D?</td> <td>No. All resulting contracts are one-off single requirements with no possibility of follow-on contracts.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S&T Challenges 15 and 16 are both restricted to three project types (study, concept, and R&D), presumably because technology demonstration and pilot projects involving standalone space systems are typically beyond the funding levels and schedules proscribed in this draft CFP. There are some circumstances where on-orbit demonstration of a technology could be performed in a more timely and economical manner without investing in a standalone mission, however. It is recommended that the final CFP clarify if technology demonstrations and pilot projects can be considered, either separately or under the category of “study”, if the project can realistically meet the funding levels and schedules as outlined. It is noted that the SRL range of “study” includes SRL 7, 8, and 9 which would imply that some real-world demonstrations may be eligible in this category.</td> <td>These comments have been taken into consideration and the project parameters are being revised for the final CFP.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bids that enter the pool of eligible proposals may remain there for up to 1 year, according to Para 2.1 (b). Pricing will need to account for this extended timeframe of validity.</td> <td>Yes, this is expected and one of the reasons the bid validity period is disclosed. These comments have been taken into consideration and Section 2.1b is being revised for the final CFP.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The overall budget and project duration limits in Table A are reasonable, however, it is strongly suggested that Table A be equally extended to include all challenges, and replace Table B. Challenges 15 and 16 are particularly challenging, and require sufficient budget to adequately address critical implementation issues.</td> <td>The parameters around Challenge 15 and Challenge 16 speak to the desired outcomes of the end user. It also speaks to the current level of available funding for those challenges. These comments have been taken into consideration and the project parameters are being revised for the final CFP.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>For Theme 1, area 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could risks to transportation corridors be considered within this theme? • Are projects limited to those related to risks imposed by climate change, extreme weather events and natural disasters? For example, could general </td> <td>We have revised Challenge 1 to include developing “enhanced information resources”, and also clarified that we are looking for solutions that “directly support risk reduction and mitigation”, because this is the intent of the challenge.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Questions and feedback	Answers and Outcomes	The development of satellites to meet either the Challenge 15 or 16 or the MSCI/MDA SAR will be more than identified funding levels	These comments have been taken into consideration and the project parameters are being revised for the final CFP.	Is a capital program identified also to follow on beyond this R&D?	No. All resulting contracts are one-off single requirements with no possibility of follow-on contracts.	S&T Challenges 15 and 16 are both restricted to three project types (study, concept, and R&D), presumably because technology demonstration and pilot projects involving standalone space systems are typically beyond the funding levels and schedules proscribed in this draft CFP. There are some circumstances where on-orbit demonstration of a technology could be performed in a more timely and economical manner without investing in a standalone mission, however. It is recommended that the final CFP clarify if technology demonstrations and pilot projects can be considered, either separately or under the category of “study”, if the project can realistically meet the funding levels and schedules as outlined. It is noted that the SRL range of “study” includes SRL 7, 8, and 9 which would imply that some real-world demonstrations may be eligible in this category.	These comments have been taken into consideration and the project parameters are being revised for the final CFP.	Bids that enter the pool of eligible proposals may remain there for up to 1 year, according to Para 2.1 (b). Pricing will need to account for this extended timeframe of validity.	Yes, this is expected and one of the reasons the bid validity period is disclosed. These comments have been taken into consideration and Section 2.1b is being revised for the final CFP.	The overall budget and project duration limits in Table A are reasonable, however, it is strongly suggested that Table A be equally extended to include all challenges, and replace Table B. Challenges 15 and 16 are particularly challenging, and require sufficient budget to adequately address critical implementation issues.	The parameters around Challenge 15 and Challenge 16 speak to the desired outcomes of the end user. It also speaks to the current level of available funding for those challenges. These comments have been taken into consideration and the project parameters are being revised for the final CFP.	For Theme 1, area 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could risks to transportation corridors be considered within this theme? • Are projects limited to those related to risks imposed by climate change, extreme weather events and natural disasters? For example, could general 	We have revised Challenge 1 to include developing “enhanced information resources”, and also clarified that we are looking for solutions that “directly support risk reduction and mitigation”, because this is the intent of the challenge.
Questions and feedback	Answers and Outcomes														
The development of satellites to meet either the Challenge 15 or 16 or the MSCI/MDA SAR will be more than identified funding levels	These comments have been taken into consideration and the project parameters are being revised for the final CFP.														
Is a capital program identified also to follow on beyond this R&D?	No. All resulting contracts are one-off single requirements with no possibility of follow-on contracts.														
S&T Challenges 15 and 16 are both restricted to three project types (study, concept, and R&D), presumably because technology demonstration and pilot projects involving standalone space systems are typically beyond the funding levels and schedules proscribed in this draft CFP. There are some circumstances where on-orbit demonstration of a technology could be performed in a more timely and economical manner without investing in a standalone mission, however. It is recommended that the final CFP clarify if technology demonstrations and pilot projects can be considered, either separately or under the category of “study”, if the project can realistically meet the funding levels and schedules as outlined. It is noted that the SRL range of “study” includes SRL 7, 8, and 9 which would imply that some real-world demonstrations may be eligible in this category.	These comments have been taken into consideration and the project parameters are being revised for the final CFP.														
Bids that enter the pool of eligible proposals may remain there for up to 1 year, according to Para 2.1 (b). Pricing will need to account for this extended timeframe of validity.	Yes, this is expected and one of the reasons the bid validity period is disclosed. These comments have been taken into consideration and Section 2.1b is being revised for the final CFP.														
The overall budget and project duration limits in Table A are reasonable, however, it is strongly suggested that Table A be equally extended to include all challenges, and replace Table B. Challenges 15 and 16 are particularly challenging, and require sufficient budget to adequately address critical implementation issues.	The parameters around Challenge 15 and Challenge 16 speak to the desired outcomes of the end user. It also speaks to the current level of available funding for those challenges. These comments have been taken into consideration and the project parameters are being revised for the final CFP.														
For Theme 1, area 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could risks to transportation corridors be considered within this theme? • Are projects limited to those related to risks imposed by climate change, extreme weather events and natural disasters? For example, could general 	We have revised Challenge 1 to include developing “enhanced information resources”, and also clarified that we are looking for solutions that “directly support risk reduction and mitigation”, because this is the intent of the challenge.														

	safety risks such as those related to the transportation of dangerous goods be included?	
	For Theme 2, area 8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could cyber security of an entire supply chain be considered for this theme? Rather than just focusing on the border. The corridor concept is stated in the problem statement, but can it be considered for the S&T challenge? 	These comments have been taken into consideration and Challenge 8 is being revised for the final CFP.
	The only restrictive part we found was that the technology demonstration should allow projects that are above SRL 7.	The project descriptions are recommended considerations. Projects that do not fall 100 % within the descriptions will still be considered compliant.
	The project types and funding limits associated with Challenges 1 and 15 are unreasonably restrictive. There is commercial capability out there in these areas that are beyond concepts and studies. The rationale behind these restrictions is unclear and relaxing the scope of the challenges is recommended.	This is an S&T innovation program. We are interested in solutions within these parameters.

Requirement		
5.5	Are any other aspects of the draft CFP unclear?	
	Questions and feedback	
	Answers and Outcomes	
	The draft CFP makes no mention of or links to other DND initiatives, specifically the IDEaS program and (in the case of S&T Challenge #16) the Surveillance of Space 2 (SofS-2) program. It is highly beneficial to understand the context in which this particular initiative co-exists with these other programs, and the co-ordination between them.	These are distinct S&T Challenges outside of these programs. Projects receiving funding from another program must self-identify in the proposal submission form as Canada will not pay for the same proposal twice.
	Are projects that have been previously completed under IDEaS eligible for consideration for advancement under DRDC Innovation?	Only if they are operationally distinguishable with different purposes and deliverables.
	Are projects proposed for DRDC funding also eligible to be proposed under IDEaS or other Government of Canada programs (e.g. CSA STDP)?	This is a distinct S&T Innovation call for proposals. A bidder may decide to submit a different proposal for one or more innovation programs, provided that the proposal meets the requirements of the appropriate CFP
	Is the proposal template annex C?	No, the proposal submission form will be available online once the CFP is launched.
	Can a Federal Government entity such as the National Research Council be the bidder that carries out certain element of the proposed project?	Yes, the bidder can be a government department. Refer to Section 3.1 Who May Apply.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can eligible expenses include the cost of equipment, such as tracking sensors, and data analysis and acquisition equipment? (For federal government entities?) 	<p>Yes, these items can be considered eligible expenses. Refer to Section 3.5.4 - Eligible Costs, Annex I – Co-Investment Information and Table I – 1: In Kind Contributions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial support declaration, is it for the financial support known to date? What to do if other sources of funding becomes available? 	<p>Yes, for all financial support known at time of bid submission. Yes, if additional funding from the bidder / partners/ LGD becomes available after the bid is submitted, it can be added to the project later.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex E and Annex M are both milestone cost breakdown, are they the same? Do they have to be completed for the proposal? 	<p>Annex E is the "Detailed Budget Table" summary of all costs. It must be submitted as part of the proposal submission process. Annex M is an example of the cost breakdown showing the level of detail required at time of contract negotiation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the RFI, page 8, 'Except for information that Canada agrees is Proprietary, the information gathered from the one-on-one meetings will be summarized and provided to all stakeholders', will the project information and discussions from proposal alignment be provided to all stakeholders? 	<p>All non-proprietary information directly related to clarifications on specific sections of the CFP document and process in general, including all written questions, will be provided in this 'Summary of Feedback' document.</p>
<p>Section 10 of SOW talks about the location of work (company site vs DRDC). What is the importance of this information. In other words, does this prevent my staff from remote commuting?</p>	<p>The SOW is only required during the contract negotiation stage. The location of work helps to provide insight into the work. It also gives justification to the level of effort and costing. For example, for universities, where the work is taking place (on or off campus) dictates what the applicable overhead rate will be. You are in complete control in the location of the work. This should not have any effect on your staff remote commuting.</p>
<p>Following the RFI, Do I have to work with one of the "List of interested bidders"</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>Clarification is required on the Lead Government Department LGD? Would Ministry of Government Relations, Saskatchewan be OK?</p>	<p>Refer to Section 3.1 Who May Apply.</p>
<p>What is a Canadian Content certification? How do we obtain it?</p>	<p>Refer to Part 5 - Certifications and Additional Information, Section 5.1.2.2. All Certifications must be signed within the electronic online bid submission form.</p>
<p>Do we apply for the phased project at the same competition or do we finish phase 1 and apply for phase 2 later?</p>	<p>Submit proposals for both project phases at the same time.</p>
<p>I wanted to inquire regarding Table A of the RFI process. Specially relating to the length of funding and maximum allowable funds outlined in this table.</p> <p>I believe we fall under Technology Pilot which outlines 36 months and less than 2.0 million dollars, does that mean that our proposal cannot exceed those</p>	<p>As per the Project Parameter Tables shown in Annex A, the project duration cannot be exceeded and proposals should not exceed the funding parameters identified.</p>

	<p>limitations? If so, we will adjust our proposal accordingly.</p>	
	<p>Who are the « partners »? Is it necessary for a « Partner » to be a departments (federal or provincial) or another public service institution, or can it be a university? In such a case, can it be an American university?</p>	<p>Partners are other organizations that are named on the proposal to help with the work and add value to your project. They do not necessarily have to be government. For Stream A, a proposal submission must have a partnership that includes a Canadian Lead Government Department (LGD) (federal, provincial, territorial, municipal) and a public or private sector partner organization that is different than the LGD. Refer to Section 3.1 Who May Apply and Annex K which describes the roles and responsibilities of a partner.</p>
	<p>We are unclear how DRDC is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ensuring that data from funded projects is protected; 2. ensuring IP remains in Canada, and how benefit to Canada is defined (without understanding company ownership, IP and data can easily exit Canada in the digital world); and 3. the qualifications of the reviewers, and whether they have technical and commercial experience in software R&D. Software R&D is different from traditional R&D of incremental invention. In software you can have two TRL9 products when integrated to develop a new product start R&D at TRL 2 or 3. 	<p>Resulting contracts/ MOAs will contain procurement clauses to ensure data is protected, according to the type of project.</p> <p>For information on IP, refer to Section 4.7 of the solicitation document.</p> <p>All reviewers are highly educated and have working experience in their field of expertise that directly relates to each S&T Challenge.</p>
	<p>Are there any funding requirements for Cash Contributions and/or In-Kind contributions as a part of either the criteria for submission or evaluation process?</p>	<p>The Proposal Selection Committee as described in Section 4.4, uses the eleven strategic considerations in the selection of proposals to be considered for funding.</p>
	<p>The wording in almost all of the Challenge Areas was unclear, and ambiguous. This is not a problem as long as the evaluators take the approach that ambiguity allows proposals to be considered, whether or not they fit with their narrow definition of what a Challenge Area allows. However, the experience with the scientific experts at our meeting was very concerning in that although it was clear there was difference of opinion around the government attendees, a company runs the risk of having a proposal thrown out based on the opinion of the particular evaluators chosen. What recourse is there to prevent such a scenario from happening?</p>	<p>Some Challenges have been amended to provide more clarity. It is at the Bidder's discretion to ensure the proposal is aligned to the Challenge and meets the other evaluation criteria. The Challenges are written in a broad context to allow for a wide range of innovative solutions. The proposed project must address the items in the challenge.</p>

<p>Section 3.1.1.3 of the above mentioned CFP draft</p> <p>Typical Lead Government Departments (LGD) for an Innovation project proposed would typically be the Directorate Land Command Support Program Management (DLCSPM) for ADM (MAT), Directorate Land Requirements (DLR) for the Army or Directorate Naval Requirement (DNR) for the Royal Canadian Navy.</p> <p>The DG for DLCSPM (to take them as an example) is a Brigadier General, in this case BGen X, soon to be replaced by BGen Y. We assume the BGen to be considered a “L1”, while the actual head of DLCSPM for day-to-day work is a Colonel or “L2”.</p> <p>We note that by requesting the LGD commitment to be made official by the signature of a DG level prior to proposal submission,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed process forces the LGD sponsoring team to prepare a formal brief to their BGen (L1), having to go beyond what seems to be required for example to authorize a similar level of involvement in a BCIP contract. For a BCIP, which may actually require a more intensive level of support from the LGD (ex: field trials), we are told getting the authorization of a full Colonel (L2) is sufficient • Such extra burden at the early proposal stage may discourage initiatives from often overworked officers and professionals within LGDs and will reduce the level of flexibility and agility one normally associates with the very act of Innovation • An unnecessary burden may be created, considering that the support expected from the LGD for this CFP would typically simply consist at helping create the contract, managing and validating its deliverables, claims and invoices, and providing in-kind support by participating in requirement or design review meetings/teleconferences • The obligation to submit a proposal to the BGen and obtain his signature also creates a burden to the private sector partner who may now need to submit its completed proposal 2 weeks in advanced to the actual DRDC due date to the LGD, to allow for the internal discussions, preparations, presentations and approvals to be completed within the LGD organization. This would make the submission of an Innovation proposal to DRDC an heavier, less 	<p>For Stream A, Director General (DG) (i.e., L2) is the level required to commit resources to the project as per the LGD's roles and responsibilities specified in Annex K. This ensures timely contract negotiations and helps support the implementation of the project as defined in the work plan.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>attractive process than the highly successful BCIP one</p> <p>We would therefore suggest that the Annex G signature required from the LGD to show its commitment to the Innovation project be provided by a L2 i.e. full Colonel level rather than from the DG. i.e. BGen (L1).</p>	
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Requirement																					
5.6	General feedback and Concerns																				
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>Questions and feedback</i></th> <th><i>Answers and Outcomes</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Can you confirm that the Canadian Content requirement is 100%?</td> <td>No – it is 50%, refer to section 5.1.2.1 Canadian Content Certification</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Is it necessary to have a governmental partner (federal or provincial) for the proposal?</td> <td>Only for Stream A – refer to section 4.1.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>What is the estimated date or time of year for the release of the CFP?</td> <td>Shortly after the closing date of the Request for Information.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>What is the selection process for the proposal and award of contracts?</td> <td>Refer to PART 4 – EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Is this program linked to the IDEaS program?</td> <td>No, this call for proposals has separate S&T Challenges.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>This innovative proposal has an inherent challenge where some upfront investigation is needed to determine feasibility in accordance to policy and the type of available data sets etc. We are contemplating a two stage approach to this project. Has a two stage approach with a go, no-go decision ever been received by DRDC and how might this work with respect to the submission, funding envelope, etc.? Would there be any negative evaluation placed on such an approach, how this might be perceived? What might CSSP evaluators dislike in this type of approach if any?</td> <td>It is acceptable to have a two-stage approach and Go /No Go points within your proposal. Refer to phased projects in Annex A and PR-8 Workplan – Milestone Breakdown.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>With respect to the proposal, we have subject matter expertise (Company A) we have government expertise / resources from CBSA and we have a technology partner (Company B). Does CSSP see other potential Partners who should be engaged in this project?</td> <td>It is up to the Bidder to determine if any other partners should be added to their proposal. For Stream A, the only requirement is to partner with a Lead Government Department (LGD). For Stream B, there is no partnership or LGD requirement.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I was wondering whether NRC as a Federal Government entity (Schedule 2 department) is able to submit a proposal as the bidder (rather than the lead federal department) for the eventual call for proposal. Everything in the document suggest that it is ok, but I wanted to make sure, since we are in a slightly different category of federal departments and agencies.</td> <td>Yes, refer to Section 3.1 of the solicitation document.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>We were wondering whether we need to collaborate with another entity such as RCMP or the Office of Privacy Commissioner to submit a tender. Our</td> <td> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> For Stream A, yes, a LGD is mandatory. For Stream B, no, there is no partnership requirement. </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>Questions and feedback</i>	<i>Answers and Outcomes</i>	Can you confirm that the Canadian Content requirement is 100%?	No – it is 50%, refer to section 5.1.2.1 Canadian Content Certification	Is it necessary to have a governmental partner (federal or provincial) for the proposal?	Only for Stream A – refer to section 4.1.	What is the estimated date or time of year for the release of the CFP?	Shortly after the closing date of the Request for Information.	What is the selection process for the proposal and award of contracts?	Refer to PART 4 – EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION.	Is this program linked to the IDEaS program?	No, this call for proposals has separate S&T Challenges.	This innovative proposal has an inherent challenge where some upfront investigation is needed to determine feasibility in accordance to policy and the type of available data sets etc. We are contemplating a two stage approach to this project. Has a two stage approach with a go, no-go decision ever been received by DRDC and how might this work with respect to the submission, funding envelope, etc.? Would there be any negative evaluation placed on such an approach, how this might be perceived? What might CSSP evaluators dislike in this type of approach if any?	It is acceptable to have a two-stage approach and Go /No Go points within your proposal. Refer to phased projects in Annex A and PR-8 Workplan – Milestone Breakdown.	With respect to the proposal, we have subject matter expertise (Company A) we have government expertise / resources from CBSA and we have a technology partner (Company B). Does CSSP see other potential Partners who should be engaged in this project?	It is up to the Bidder to determine if any other partners should be added to their proposal. For Stream A, the only requirement is to partner with a Lead Government Department (LGD). For Stream B, there is no partnership or LGD requirement.	I was wondering whether NRC as a Federal Government entity (Schedule 2 department) is able to submit a proposal as the bidder (rather than the lead federal department) for the eventual call for proposal. Everything in the document suggest that it is ok, but I wanted to make sure, since we are in a slightly different category of federal departments and agencies.	Yes, refer to Section 3.1 of the solicitation document.	We were wondering whether we need to collaborate with another entity such as RCMP or the Office of Privacy Commissioner to submit a tender. Our	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> For Stream A, yes, a LGD is mandatory. For Stream B, no, there is no partnership requirement.
<i>Questions and feedback</i>	<i>Answers and Outcomes</i>																				
Can you confirm that the Canadian Content requirement is 100%?	No – it is 50%, refer to section 5.1.2.1 Canadian Content Certification																				
Is it necessary to have a governmental partner (federal or provincial) for the proposal?	Only for Stream A – refer to section 4.1.																				
What is the estimated date or time of year for the release of the CFP?	Shortly after the closing date of the Request for Information.																				
What is the selection process for the proposal and award of contracts?	Refer to PART 4 – EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION.																				
Is this program linked to the IDEaS program?	No, this call for proposals has separate S&T Challenges.																				
This innovative proposal has an inherent challenge where some upfront investigation is needed to determine feasibility in accordance to policy and the type of available data sets etc. We are contemplating a two stage approach to this project. Has a two stage approach with a go, no-go decision ever been received by DRDC and how might this work with respect to the submission, funding envelope, etc.? Would there be any negative evaluation placed on such an approach, how this might be perceived? What might CSSP evaluators dislike in this type of approach if any?	It is acceptable to have a two-stage approach and Go /No Go points within your proposal. Refer to phased projects in Annex A and PR-8 Workplan – Milestone Breakdown.																				
With respect to the proposal, we have subject matter expertise (Company A) we have government expertise / resources from CBSA and we have a technology partner (Company B). Does CSSP see other potential Partners who should be engaged in this project?	It is up to the Bidder to determine if any other partners should be added to their proposal. For Stream A, the only requirement is to partner with a Lead Government Department (LGD). For Stream B, there is no partnership or LGD requirement.																				
I was wondering whether NRC as a Federal Government entity (Schedule 2 department) is able to submit a proposal as the bidder (rather than the lead federal department) for the eventual call for proposal. Everything in the document suggest that it is ok, but I wanted to make sure, since we are in a slightly different category of federal departments and agencies.	Yes, refer to Section 3.1 of the solicitation document.																				
We were wondering whether we need to collaborate with another entity such as RCMP or the Office of Privacy Commissioner to submit a tender. Our	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> For Stream A, yes, a LGD is mandatory. For Stream B, no, there is no partnership requirement. 																				

	<p>understanding is that such collaboration is desirable but not mandatory.</p>	<p>Refer to Sections 3.1 Who May Apply, and 4.2 Evaluation Criteria of the CFP document.</p>
	<p>When might the earliest be that a winning proposal's project could commence? I see that the Annex-E-Detailed Budget Table has columns for Program Funding Requested Summary (FY 2020-2021, FY 2021-2022, and FY 2022-2023). So does that mean that funding is for projects starting in FY 2020-2021?</p>	<p>The dates in the CFP are for planning purposes only; however, they are based on the typical time frame from the end of the call (date of bid submission) to contract award. Contract award may start as early as fall 2019. All dates will be adjusted once the contract start date is known.</p>
	<p>Our contracts people had reviewed the Draft RFP and the General Conditions for Research and Development 2040 (2018-06-21) feel that they are not the ones we generally see from Federal Government departments or from PWSGC.</p> <p>General Conditions for Research and Development 2040 (2018-06-21):</p> <p>1. Section 22- we have to warrant our services/deliverables to be free from all defects in design, material and workmanship. This is not an appropriate standard of care as applicable to engineering and consulting services. We would perform the services in accordance with the generally recognized standards by those performing similar services under similar circumstances.</p> <p>Professional services to develop innovative S&T solutions is inherently risky and such services are not expected to be performed to a degree of perfection. Would DRDC consider using a more appropriate standard of care?</p> <p>2. Section 43- Canada may offset an amount it thinks it is entitled to under this contract or any other contract.</p> <p>This term can be unfair as performance on one project may be totally acceptable while on another project, it may not be. Would DRDC consider removing the language "or any other contract"?</p>	<p>The general conditions are written to cover the most probable outcomes. Some items within the conditions may be more applicable than others; however, Canada does not typically amend them. Often, concerns such as these can be addressed in the Statement of Work, however, this would be reviewed and addressed during the contract negotiation stage.</p>
	<p>The period of proposal validity is 365 days</p> <p>This is unusually long as DRDC requires the guaranteed availability of the named resources and pricing guarantee.</p>	<p>These comments have been taken into consideration and Section 2.1b is being revised for the final CFP. Also, price your proposal accordingly and refer to Section 5.2.8, Status and Availability of Resources.</p>
	<p>There are numerous certifications required with the proposal at RFP stage:</p>	<p>a. General conditions allow for replacement of specific individuals with similar qualifications if some named team members are no longer available.</p>

<p>a) the certification that every individual proposed will be available to perform the work</p> <p>This is problematic given the 365 day proposal validity period.</p> <p>b) there is a certification as to “most favoured customer”. We believe that this is meant to apply to goods and the services which are considered as off the shelf.</p> <p>Can DRDC consider adding to the language “... for like quality and quantity of the goods or services or both under similar times and conditions”.</p> <p>c) We must also certify that our profit does not exceed that normally obtained for services of like quality and quantity and this could also be an element of potential audit.</p> <p>We price fairly but we have not seen this requirement before from the Federal Government that we be required to reveal our profit. Services prices are generally measured against those which are comparable in the industry.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 5.2.8 Status and Availability of Resources.</p> <p>b. It depends. If the proposed labour rates have been charged out in the past, (for similar labour categories), then the most favorable price certification is applicable and the bidder should be able to demonstrate these typical labour rates and categories. If a completely different labour rate and category is proposed, with very specialized skills, and that rate/labour category has never been charged out before, then the declaration of Profit Certification would be applicable.</p> <p>Typically when more than one compliant bid is received, there is no requirement to "justify" the price; however, in this situation, it is impossible to compare one bid to another since each project is unique. This is why Canada requires the certification regarding price. If the bid is selected for contract award, the bidder will need to provide price support, in accordance with the certification selected by the bidder. In most situations, the most favoured customer certification is selected and demonstrated via a public price list OR, previous paid invoice OR recent government contract.</p>
<p>I heard someone saying that a hypothetical DRDC scientist at Shirley’s Bay could be a champion for the DRDC Innovations calls. I don’t think that applies for the current call under the RFI on the street, but perhaps it is true for planned future calls.</p> <p>Is there any scope for Innovations challenges related to radar research in future for any program you know about? For instance future IDEaS or Innovations style calls.</p>	<p>As per the CFP document under Stream A, DRDC can be listed as a partner but can neither be the bidder nor LGD in any proposal for this CFP. For Stream B, DRDC would assume the role of Technical Authority (TA) and the contract would be between DRDC and the bidder.</p> <p>DRDC Innovation calls for proposals are posted on Buyandsell.gc.ca and potential bidders are encouraged to review them as they are posted.</p>
<p>The Oceans Protection Plan (OPP) lays out clear priorities for Canada with respect to environmental effects of pollution, effects of long-term shipping, effects on Arctic coastal communities. We were surprised to see that none of the priorities mentioned in the OPP were to be found in the RFI. This is perhaps because the OPP is a separate funding pot, but there are many areas of intersection with DND and OGDs with safety and security mandates. We think this should be looked at in order to ensure that the RFP is more robust in its Challenge Areas.</p>	<p>These comments have been taken into consideration and may influence future CFP’s.</p>

6. Conclusion

The Stakeholder Engagement Process was a valuable opportunity for Canada to improve the DRDC Innovation Call for Proposals by addressing key areas of concern through the one-on-one proposal alignment meeting process and/or written response. By clarifying and improving information for the final publication of the Innovation Call for Proposals, this increases the probability of receiving quality bid submissions to resolve safety and security challenges for all of Canada.

PWGSC and DRDC would like to thank all stakeholders who participated either by engaging in one-on-one meetings, or providing written responses to the RFI. The dialogue and information that resulted is invaluable in assisting Canada find innovative solutions to the current S&T Challenges and the development of a future CFP.

**Please note that this engagement process is not a pre-qualification to submitting a proposal for the upcoming CFP.*

Annex A List of Participating Organizations

ABB Inc.
Accenture
Anyon Systems Inc.
Aquanty Inc.
Astrocom Associates Inc.
Aurora BioSolutions Inc.
Canadian Nuclear Laboratories
Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
C-Core
Cellula Robotics
City of Ottawa
Communication Security Establishment
Co-operators
Discrete Integration
GlobVision Inc
GSTS
Health Canada
IBM Global Business Services
Independent Individual - 1
ING Robotic Aviation Inc.
INRS
Interdev Technologies Inc.
International Space Consultant
Jacobs
KA Imaging
Kongsberg Geospatial
LS Telcom Limited
Magellan Aerospace
Masood Energy Corp.
MDA Corporation
MedicAlert
Microsat Systems Canada Inc.
National Defence
National Optics Institute
National Research Council Canada
Natural Resources Canada
NavSim Technology Inc.
NorthStar Earth & Space Inc.
Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada
Orenda Software Solutions Inc.
Public Health Agency of Canada
PureSpirIT Solutions Inc.
Risk Sciences International
SageTea Inc.

Saliency Analytics Inc.
SB Technologies
SHIELD Crypto Systems Inc.
Sightline Innovation
Social Research and Demonstration Corporation
SSCL
THALES CANADA INC
The Sky Guys, Ltd.
Transport Canada
Ultra Electronics
University of Guelph
University of New Brunswick
University of Regina
University of Waterloo
URTHECAST
WorldReach Software Corporation