

WEBVTT

00:00:03.000 --> 00:00:08.020

<v SPEAKER\_1>In this episode of Defence Deconstructed, recorded September 9th, 2025, we sit down with Dr.

00:00:08.020 --> 00:00:16.260

<v SPEAKER\_1>Philippe Lagassé, Alex McPhail and Alexander Rudolph to discuss their newly released port, Defence Agile Procurement Insights and Analysis.

00:00:16.260 --> 00:00:25.060

<v SPEAKER\_1>We discuss what Agile Procurement is, the risks to it, and how to approach the model in a way that not only aligns with its goals but sustainably achieves them.

00:00:25.060 --> 00:00:36.960

<v SPEAKER\_1>We also want to remind listeners that if you haven't already, to register for our Digital Transformation Conference on the 16th of September next week, titled Charting Canada's Digital Ambition online at the CGAI website.

00:00:38.320 --> 00:00:41.680

<v SPEAKER\_1>Bill, Alex and Alex, welcome back to Defence Deconstructed.

00:00:41.680 --> 00:00:42.920

<v SPEAKER\_2>Thanks Dave.

00:00:42.920 --> 00:00:45.860

<v SPEAKER\_3>Thanks, it's a pleasure to be here.

00:00:45.920 --> 00:00:58.660

<v SPEAKER\_1>So, I brought you together to talk about some analysis and research, culminating in a final report of the Defence Agile Procurement Insights and Analysis Initiative that the three of you spearheaded.

00:00:58.660 --> 00:01:14.900

<v SPEAKER\_1>Looking at some ways to adapt to Canada's defence acquisition process, introduce some different concepts to expedite some of the aspects of procurement that have been problematic in the past, and you touched on a whole bunch of really interesting insights in this report.

00:01:15.500 --> 00:01:25.460

<v SPEAKER\_1>Alex McPhail, I'm going to ask you to kick things off and just start by outlining what the rationale was for the three of you undertaking this effort and what the purpose of what you were trying to do was.

00:01:25.460 --> 00:01:25.820

<v SPEAKER\_3>Sure.

00:01:25.820 --> 00:01:29.100

<v SPEAKER\_3>Well, thanks, David, for inviting us into this.

00:01:29.660 --> 00:01:33.500

<v SPEAKER\_3>It's an important program and it's one that we hope will go places.

00:01:33.500 --> 00:01:41.960

<v SPEAKER\_3>So agile procurement has been practiced for decades, as Alex's case studies are going to show towards the end of this discussion.

00:01:42.700 --> 00:01:51.000

<v SPEAKER\_3>And our own research in DAPIA showed that many Canadian companies are already using agile procurement among their contractors.

00:01:51.000 --> 00:01:59.740

<v SPEAKER\_3>So it's here, it's happening, it's been used in the DOD in the United States for quite some time.

00:01:59.740 --> 00:02:07.600

<v SPEAKER\_3>And so it's just taking some time to gather some traction inside of the Canadian Department of Defence.

00:02:09.200 --> 00:02:20.020

<v SPEAKER\_3>I, about five years ago, I was working on a program, it wasn't a defence program, it was with the RCMP, and it was the Cybercrime Solution Project.

00:02:20.020 --> 00:02:24.420

<v SPEAKER\_3>And I'm just going to talk about the RFP itself.

00:02:24.420 --> 00:02:32.600

<v SPEAKER\_3>It was described to be an agile procurement RFP, and I thought, at last, here's something coming out with real agile procurement.

00:02:32.600 --> 00:02:39.960

<v SPEAKER\_3>And I got excited about it until I looked at the evaluation process, and it was basically just a standard contract.

00:02:39.960 --> 00:02:49.460

<v SPEAKER\_3>It had a prototype, not a minimum viable product, and I won't go into the details of that, but when you do agile, you go for something called a minimum viable product.

00:02:49.460 --> 00:02:51.820

<v SPEAKER\_3>It didn't have that, it had a prototype.

00:02:51.820 --> 00:02:57.060

<v SPEAKER\_3>And it had an eight-year contract after a two-year contract, so ten years.

00:02:57.060 --> 00:03:03.280

<v SPEAKER\_3>And it had firm fixed pricing over ten years for a cloud-based solution.

00:03:03.600 --> 00:03:08.960

<v SPEAKER\_3>And I don't, your readers might not have an advanced understanding of cloud-based solutions.

00:03:08.960 --> 00:03:13.900

<v SPEAKER\_3>Those are people like Amazon Web Service, Microsoft, Google, Oracle, IBM.

00:03:13.900 --> 00:03:22.600

<v SPEAKER\_3>And the services that they provide and the costs that they charge are highly dependent upon user factors, data storage.

00:03:22.600 --> 00:03:27.820

<v SPEAKER\_3>And so I'm drilling down into a few details here, but I won't stay here long.

00:03:27.820 --> 00:03:35.780

<v SPEAKER\_3>And the point of describing all of this is that they want you to predict for 10 years what all these things are going to cost.

00:03:35.780 --> 00:03:40.100

<v SPEAKER\_3>And that was what an Agile Procurement Program was five years ago.

00:03:40.100 --> 00:03:45.960

<v SPEAKER\_3>So I was a little bit disappointed by how that came out.

00:03:45.960 --> 00:03:49.580

<v SPEAKER\_3>And I wanted to see if there's anything that we could do.

00:03:49.580 --> 00:03:57.360

<v SPEAKER\_3>So I gave Phil a call, and we talked for a while about an opportunity coming out of the MINES program.

00:03:57.360 --> 00:04:02.780

<v SPEAKER\_3>And did we think that we had a chance in putting a program together?

00:04:02.920 --> 00:04:04.160

<v SPEAKER\_3>And we both thought we did.

00:04:04.160 --> 00:04:05.400

<v SPEAKER\_3>It was a competitive program.

00:04:05.400 --> 00:04:06.760

<v SPEAKER\_3>We won that.

00:04:06.760 --> 00:04:09.020

<v SPEAKER\_3>And out of that came DAPIA.

00:04:09.020 --> 00:04:13.340

<v SPEAKER\_3>So that's how we got started.

00:04:13.340 --> 00:04:16.520

<v SPEAKER\_3>That was the rationale behind everything that we're doing.

00:04:16.520 --> 00:04:18.460

<v SPEAKER\_1>So you got into this a little bit.

00:04:18.500 --> 00:04:24.740

<v SPEAKER\_1>But I know Phil, you, amongst others, have done some work in the past on procurement agility.

00:04:24.740 --> 00:04:27.980

<v SPEAKER\_1>And I guess let me start off with a bit of cynicism to begin.

00:04:27.980 --> 00:04:39.060

<v SPEAKER\_1>And I guess in my view, as you were just describing, Alex, the concept of agility is a bit of a be-all term that people can see in it whatever they want to.

00:04:39.060 --> 00:04:54.480

<v SPEAKER\_1>Can you talk about sort of as you lay out in this report as part of the work that you folks did, both kind of what's a wider understanding of agility and then what you folks are proposing to kind of crystallize your understanding or the specific applicability of the concept?

00:04:56.080 --> 00:04:57.160

<v SPEAKER\_3>Sure.

00:04:57.160 --> 00:05:12.900

<v SPEAKER\_3>Well, our real, the basic concept of agile procurement is to, let me back up a moment, is the agile process itself is a cyclical process and they do things in sprints.

00:05:12.900 --> 00:05:14.640

<v SPEAKER\_3>We call them cycles.

00:05:14.640 --> 00:05:21.000

<v SPEAKER\_3>And it's a cyclical management and refinement of the requirements, the budget, the risks, and the contract.

00:05:21.000 --> 00:05:32.040

<v SPEAKER\_3>So you work on the program for a little while, then you stop and you analyze where are you, how much have you done, how much is left to do, and how have the requirements changed?

00:05:32.040 --> 00:05:45.380

<v SPEAKER\_3>And this is an innovative approach to doing procurement because the way DND and PSPC does procurement now is they set out all the requirements at the outset, they're fixed, they're locked in stone.

00:05:45.380 --> 00:05:58.600

<v SPEAKER\_3>The RFPs go out, the proposals come in response to those fixed locked in stone requirements, and then the winner develops the system, whatever that is, in response to those fixed locked in stone requirements.

00:05:58.600 --> 00:06:19.440

<v SPEAKER\_3>Through a cyclical process, you go through a cycle, and at the end of that, you say, you know what, certain technological advances have occurred, or there are obsolescence issues, or we've had a change in operational requirements, and the requirements that we set out at the beginning aren't fine-tuned to what we think we're going to need by the time we finish this.

00:06:19.440 --> 00:06:27.880

<v SPEAKER\_3>So let's change the requirements, and that changes the budget, it changes the outcome, it changes the risks, and it even changes the contract.

00:06:27.880 --> 00:06:29.960

<v SPEAKER\_3>So the contract itself has to be agile.

00:06:30.700 --> 00:06:44.860

<v SPEAKER\_3>So each cycle looks at what the user preference and applicability will be for the program, and that means that you have to get people involved in who will be using this in the end.

00:06:44.860 --> 00:06:55.520

<v SPEAKER\_3>So you get those kinds of stakeholders who are involved in that cyclical analysis, and they're saying, well, this is really nice, we'd like to have this, or we were in a situation where we wish we could have had that.

00:06:55.520 --> 00:07:03.900

<v SPEAKER\_3>And so you start, as they start seeing what the product can do, that develops its own insights into what they might want to have.

00:07:03.900 --> 00:07:08.480

<v SPEAKER\_3>And so those things, those kinds of requirements weren't available at the outset.

00:07:09.980 --> 00:07:18.780

<v SPEAKER\_3>D&D takes up to 16 years to go from concept to contract in its major Defence programs.

00:07:18.780 --> 00:07:22.700

<v SPEAKER\_3>And there's a lot of obsolescence built into that process.

00:07:22.700 --> 00:07:30.720

<v SPEAKER\_3>Just think of IT and how quickly things fall out of modern, when IT changes so quickly.

00:07:30.720 --> 00:07:38.460

<v SPEAKER\_3>So in each one of these cycles that you do, you look at what has become obsolete, what will become obsolete.

00:07:38.460 --> 00:07:43.400

<v SPEAKER\_3>How should we change our requirements or our specifications in order to manage that obsolescence?

00:07:43.400 --> 00:07:45.380

<v SPEAKER\_3>And you do that every time.

00:07:45.380 --> 00:07:48.120

<v SPEAKER\_3>There could have been market developments.

00:07:48.120 --> 00:07:52.420

<v SPEAKER\_3>Think of how AI has come on to the market in the past five years.

00:07:52.420 --> 00:08:07.040

<v SPEAKER\_3>And if you had developed something 10 years ago in terms of its specifications, how would AI five years later after you wrote that firm fixed specification have made the entire concept obsolete?

00:08:07.040 --> 00:08:20.000

<v SPEAKER\_3>So there are market factors, there are technological advancements that will play a role in how you redefine those requirements which drive budget risks and contract as you go along.

00:08:20.000 --> 00:08:23.140

<v SPEAKER\_3>The other thing that you look at is what's next.

00:08:23.140 --> 00:08:25.940

<v SPEAKER\_3>What is it that you're doing and that you could be doing?

00:08:26.540 --> 00:08:35.140

<v SPEAKER\_3>You see those insights that the user community are bringing in and you come up with new innovative ways of doing things that you didn't realize the last cycle.

00:08:35.140 --> 00:08:40.460

<v SPEAKER\_3>And so there's an opportunity to develop that innovation as you go along.

00:08:40.460 --> 00:08:45.080

<v SPEAKER\_3>So that's one of the most basic elements of Agile Procurement.

00:08:45.080 --> 00:08:49.860

<v SPEAKER\_3>And the upcoming goals are flexibility and adaptability.

00:08:49.860 --> 00:08:55.580

<v SPEAKER\_3>So as the process goes along, you're flexible, you adapt to things as they happen.

00:08:56.860 --> 00:09:07.240

<v SPEAKER\_3>Speed and efficiency, there's a bit of a misunderstanding in that Agile Procurement doesn't necessarily reduce timeline cycles.

00:09:07.240 --> 00:09:07.900

<v SPEAKER\_3>It might.

00:09:07.900 --> 00:09:10.340

<v SPEAKER\_3>You hope that it does, but it's not a guarantee to do it.

00:09:10.340 --> 00:09:16.760

<v SPEAKER\_3>But what it does is by the time you actually deliver the product, the product is up to date.

00:09:16.760 --> 00:09:22.760

<v SPEAKER\_3>It meets the user, the real user's requirements, because it's gone through all of those iterative developments along the way.

00:09:24.160 --> 00:09:34.080

<v SPEAKER\_3>There is a collaborative, transparent integration approach, and that really changes the relationship between the buyer and the seller.

00:09:34.080 --> 00:09:36.920

<v SPEAKER\_3>There is no longer this hard wall between them.

00:09:36.920 --> 00:10:01.340

<v SPEAKER\_3>It's a much stronger collaborative approach, where the buyer and the seller have open, honest discussions about what will work, what won't, and how should you improve this so that the contractor can make recommendations to the government about maybe this would work better for your armed services, and they work with that collaboratively.

00:10:01.340 --> 00:10:08.660

<v SPEAKER\_3>The last thing that you do is you manage risk very effectively, you hope very effectively, throughout the process.

00:10:08.660 --> 00:10:21.060

<v SPEAKER\_3>So at every cycle, you stop and you analyze what are the risks, what are the obsolescence risks, what are the technological risks, what are the management risks, and let's understand those risks and address them in the upcoming cycle.

00:10:21.760 --> 00:10:29.100

<v SPEAKER\_3>So when you finish the entire product after many cycles, you have driven the risk out of the system.

00:10:29.100 --> 00:10:42.940

<v SPEAKER\_3>It's not risk free, nothing is, but you've driven the risk out of the system so that you have the lowest risk, highest flexibility driven product at the end of the procurement process.

00:10:42.940 --> 00:10:46.540

<v SPEAKER\_1>So a couple of aspects of that that I want to just tease out a little bit more.

00:10:46.540 --> 00:11:03.060

<v SPEAKER\_1>I guess as you outline that, my high level, very simplistic reflection would be, it's moving away from a process that creates one static snapshot in time under the existing model, from which virtually everything else flows from.

00:11:03.060 --> 00:11:13.080

<v SPEAKER\_1>Then the other piece is you've made a couple of references to defence, and that's an understanding to be driven off of the need to have iteration on requirements.

00:11:13.080 --> 00:11:32.920

<v SPEAKER\_1>But in our system, and as you talk about in the report with a whole bunch of dispersed actors involved in a wide stakeholder map, the current way that we approach that is you basically take that one static initial snapshot, and then all the other government considerations flow off of that financial, technical, contracting approach, etc.

00:11:32.920 --> 00:11:47.980

<v SPEAKER\_1>I guess, could you elaborate a little bit about some of the other implications of having to have all the other considerations involved in procurement, and adapt to an iterative and on-going process, rather than being built off one early snapshot that's static?

00:11:47.980 --> 00:11:49.340

<v SPEAKER\_3>Sure.

00:11:49.340 --> 00:11:55.980

<v SPEAKER\_3>Outside of D&D and Defence, you have PSPC, which is dealing with two fundamental things.

00:11:55.980 --> 00:11:58.020

<v SPEAKER\_3>They're dealing with the budget.

00:11:58.140 --> 00:12:06.480

<v SPEAKER\_3>It's a defence budget, but PSPC is managing the budget under contract, and they're dealing with the contract itself.

00:12:08.260 --> 00:12:19.220

<v SPEAKER\_3>I guess one of the principles in Agile Procurement is that there's no distinct boundary between the requirements definition and the product development.

00:12:19.220 --> 00:12:21.320

<v SPEAKER\_3>So right now there is.

00:12:22.680 --> 00:12:37.840

<v SPEAKER\_3>The government, whatever department it is, defines the requirements, puts them into an RFP, fires the RFP out, and then there are proposals, and then there is product development with the winning bidder.

00:12:37.840 --> 00:12:52.480

<v SPEAKER\_3>In an Agile approach, all of the stakeholders are involved to some extent in the original requirements definition and in the product development.

00:12:52.480 --> 00:12:59.500

<v SPEAKER\_3>So that has a huge impact on, say D&D, if that's who the client organization is.

00:12:59.500 --> 00:13:16.020

<v SPEAKER\_3>It also has a really big impact on PSPC, because it means that they are no longer the holder of the contract terms and conditions that go into every bid.

00:13:16.020 --> 00:13:34.880

<v SPEAKER\_3>They, in fact, are going to have to play a little bit of a give and take on each program, where as needs evolve through cyclical processes, we begin to realize, well, this contracting mechanism might not be the most applicable way to address that issue.

00:13:34.880 --> 00:13:41.120

<v SPEAKER\_3>So we need to redefine how we're going to do the contracts in this way.

00:13:41.120 --> 00:13:49.720

<v SPEAKER\_3>So that has a fairly significant impact on how PSPC would manage an agile procurement program.

00:13:52.980 --> 00:13:58.700

<v SPEAKER\_3>It's not something that I think they have a strong comfort zone with right now.

00:13:58.700 --> 00:14:14.500

<v SPEAKER\_3>And that's one of the reasons why, and Phil will get to this later on, why we suggested that we take a small test case study and see if we can work around that without breaking all of the rules.

00:14:17.720 --> 00:14:27.780

<v SPEAKER\_3>When you engage the stakeholders, then you're bringing in people from a larger pool of organizations than just those two.

00:14:27.780 --> 00:14:35.380

<v SPEAKER\_3>And we kind of talked out a little bit that we didn't really address ICED.

00:14:35.700 --> 00:14:51.360

<v SPEAKER\_3>We said that in the initial approach, we're going to consider a case study or a test bed that is not subject to the ICED principles of ITBVP.

00:14:51.360 --> 00:15:01.120

<v SPEAKER\_3>Because we just felt that that was too difficult a process to wrestle while we're trying to sort out everything else at the same time.

00:15:04.560 --> 00:15:15.660

<v SPEAKER\_2>David, I just wanted to add that there's already the seeds of some of this thinking, and there's already some elements of this process that are already there.

00:15:15.660 --> 00:15:25.720

<v SPEAKER\_2>I think the challenge is that, as you point out, this discussion has been going on for some time in Canada, but there hasn't really been a push to make it happen.

00:15:26.580 --> 00:15:36.120

<v SPEAKER\_2>And in part, again, one thing we discovered, and I'll get into this a little bit more in a bit, there's already thinking around all of this happening in the government of Canada.

00:15:36.120 --> 00:15:42.100

<v SPEAKER\_2>There's just, you need external forces that keep pushing that boulder up the hill at the end of the day.

00:15:42.100 --> 00:15:54.820

<v SPEAKER\_2>And one thing I will say when it comes to the requirements piece is that this kind of thinking does align with the underlying idea of performance-based acquisition to some extent, and high-level mandatory requirements.

00:15:54.820 --> 00:16:23.740

<v SPEAKER\_2>And how do you compel decision-makers and the procurement process to put front and center the high-level mandatory that kind of describe an outcome that you're looking at, and make those more central to what you're trying to achieve than the more detailed tiered and mandatory that you're going to end up having in the statement of requirement, and then a request for a proposal.

00:16:23.740 --> 00:16:32.220

<v SPEAKER\_2>So we're in an interesting stage where a lot of this thinking is already seeded in the government.

00:16:32.220 --> 00:16:36.240

<v SPEAKER\_2>It's just much like performing procurement writ large.

00:16:36.240 --> 00:16:48.040

<v SPEAKER\_2>And this is something we discovered, is you're trying to get different parts of the system to all kind of land on the same basic process and ideas that could be put in place.

00:16:48.180 --> 00:16:52.060

<v SPEAKER\_2>And that's strangely enough, the toughest part.

00:16:52.060 --> 00:17:02.480

<v SPEAKER\_2>It's just convincing all the different parts of government and all the different stakeholders involved that this is A, something that you want to do, and B, that it's feasible, right?

00:17:02.480 --> 00:17:11.620

<v SPEAKER\_2>Because, and as we noted even as part of this conversation, there's a propensity to simply say, well, this will never happen, or we can never do this.

00:17:11.620 --> 00:17:17.080

<v SPEAKER\_2>And once that thinking kind of sets in, then of course,

you're never going to give it a shot.

00:17:17.180 --> 00:17:19.100

<v SPEAKER\_2>You're never going to take it up.

00:17:20.700 --> 00:17:28.800

<v SPEAKER\_1>We, of course, are having this conversation as we await some clarity on what the government's envisioning, that the new Defence Procurement Agency will do.

00:17:28.800 --> 00:17:32.400

<v SPEAKER\_1>So quite timely in terms of the research and the findings.

00:17:32.400 --> 00:17:36.320

<v SPEAKER\_1>And also, as you said, parts of what you're describing here are new.

00:17:36.320 --> 00:17:42.840

<v SPEAKER\_1>I'm old enough to remember a couple of decades ago when performance-based approaches to procurement and sustainment and a few other things were in vogue.

00:17:42.840 --> 00:17:50.320

<v SPEAKER\_1>And I would be fascinated to see a follow-up audit on exactly what came of all of those things, which seemed to have come and gone.

00:17:51.340 --> 00:17:57.100

<v SPEAKER\_1>So maybe if we can pivot off that, Phil, just talk a little bit about some of the specific research that you did in developing this report.

00:17:57.480 --> 00:18:00.960

<v SPEAKER\_1>I know you did a workshop because I had the opportunity to participate in that.

00:18:00.960 --> 00:18:07.400

<v SPEAKER\_1>But beyond that, can you just talk a little bit about the journey you got to getting to some of the observations?

00:18:07.420 --> 00:18:07.780

<v SPEAKER\_2>Right.

00:18:07.780 --> 00:18:17.420

<v SPEAKER\_2>So I think it's important to note from the outset that we already had a bit of an idea in mind around what Agile was at a theoretical level.

00:18:17.420 --> 00:18:24.220

<v SPEAKER\_2>And some of the previous reports on Agile was again, they were operating very much at an abstract level.

00:18:24.220 --> 00:18:47.240

<v SPEAKER\_2>One of the core principles that we brought forward to the D&D Minds people when we made this application was saying, we want to learn from various stakeholders, not only here within Canada, but also internationally, to try and get a better sense of what this looks like, what are the challenges and how do people approach it.

00:18:47.240 --> 00:19:01.220

<v SPEAKER\_2>So the basic research design was very much centered on semi-structured interviews to try and build up lots of different perspectives of those that might be involved.

00:19:01.220 --> 00:19:03.880

<v SPEAKER\_2>And we went about that in various ways.

00:19:03.880 --> 00:19:11.640

<v SPEAKER\_2>So within Canada, we ensured that we had a good number of discussions with people from PSPC that were working on this.

00:19:11.640 --> 00:19:17.520

<v SPEAKER\_2>We had discussions with people from that group at D&D.

00:19:17.520 --> 00:19:27.560

<v SPEAKER\_2>And we also went out to a number of executives at Canadian defence companies to try and get their points of view on what they thought would be worthwhile.

00:19:27.560 --> 00:19:34.360

<v SPEAKER\_2>Equally important, and I found this quite fruitful, we did a number of interviews in Washington.

00:19:34.360 --> 00:19:37.760

<v SPEAKER\_2>And that was really eye-opening for a number of reasons.

00:19:38.240 --> 00:19:45.100

<v SPEAKER\_2>The first is that you have seen the US government experimenting with this approach in a number of contexts.

00:19:45.100 --> 00:19:51.300

<v SPEAKER\_2>And perhaps most interestingly for Canada, I had one interview in particular with US.

00:19:51.300 --> 00:19:56.980

<v SPEAKER\_2>Customs, where they've really made this kind of part and parcel of how they do business.

00:19:56.980 --> 00:20:10.620

<v SPEAKER\_2>And the reason I highlight that is, as you might imagine, that level of acquisition and spend is somewhat analogous to what Canada is doing in terms of dollar for dollar, as opposed to trying to compare yourself to the US.

00:20:10.620 --> 00:20:17.120

<v SPEAKER\_2>Department of Defence slash war in terms of what kind of scale and what it will look like.

00:20:17.120 --> 00:20:20.540

<v SPEAKER\_2>And it was really just interesting seeing within US.

00:20:20.540 --> 00:20:40.060

<v SPEAKER\_2>Customs, they have individuals whose sole task it is to teach teams how to do this, to keep them on track when it comes to agile, to get them to kind of understand what they're doing, and to basically almost act as a sherpa throughout the process, to try and not only hold them accountable with their agile process, but equally important to guide them.

00:20:40.060 --> 00:20:55.920

<v SPEAKER\_2>As well, speaking to a number of stakeholders in the United States, on the private sector side and on the tech side, you really see where this thinking has taken off, and Alex R will be able to speak to that a little bit more.

00:20:55.920 --> 00:21:12.420

<v SPEAKER\_2>One thing I have to note, and this was a bit of a surprise as part of the research, but it really proved quite interesting, the MINDS program asks you to consider underrepresented communities as part of your grant.

00:21:12.420 --> 00:21:19.040

<v SPEAKER\_2>We decided to also see what does Agile look like in the context of indigenous procurement.

00:21:19.040 --> 00:21:26.920

<v SPEAKER\_2>That proved to be a fascinating piece of research for us, almost meriting its own report.

00:21:26.920 --> 00:21:56.840

<v SPEAKER\_2>What we discovered was a number of indigenous companies who really feel that the current setup does not allow them to flourish, and that they could flourish far more effectively in an Agile system that really allowed them to compete as small and medium businesses on their own terms, and that the current setup, which very much favors shell companies and fronts, just doesn't benefit them.

00:21:57.500 --> 00:22:10.740

<v SPEAKER\_2>For those that are interested in how do you get more

small and medium businesses and enterprises involved in defence procurement and as importantly, how do you really encourage Canadian indigenous businesses to get involved in defence?

00:22:10.740 --> 00:22:30.780

<v SPEAKER\_2>There's a number of nuggets in the report that I would point you to because we weren't aiming necessarily to find all this information, but not only were a number of indigenous businesses really keen to speak to us, but they gave us some really interesting insights into what the defence space looks like from their perspective.

00:22:32.160 --> 00:22:37.560

<v SPEAKER\_1>I just ask you to build off that a little bit more because you also talk on some of the implications for small and medium businesses too.

00:22:37.560 --> 00:22:49.580

<v SPEAKER\_1>I guess on my reflection of reading the report, I guess I should elaborate a little bit about what specifically those types of businesses saw as the potential applicability of a more agile process.

00:22:49.580 --> 00:23:02.840

<v SPEAKER\_1>Because part on my read and having done some similar work, I'm sure some of these interviews tended to get into an airing of grievances about the general state of the existing procurement system and the way that it works or doesn't.

00:23:02.840 --> 00:23:37.160

<v SPEAKER\_1>I read a lot of what they were saying to be the structural factors that limit the ability of small and medium companies, of which Indigenous firms, from my observation, are just one slightly unique but a most obvious case, perhaps, of small businesses and some of the structural factors that they have, difficulty getting into all the different things you need to do to compete in this market, a high degree of overhead, people to do business development, and ability to do security compliance, and a whole bunch of stuff that basically makes it...

00:23:37.160 --> 00:23:42.080

<v SPEAKER\_1>It's very difficult to do if you are small and don't have as much bandwidth as the bigger companies.

00:23:43.120 --> 00:23:46.200

<v SPEAKER\_1>You have to be able to sustain in a market where opportunities are too slow.

00:23:46.200 --> 00:23:57.920

<v SPEAKER\_1>There's a whole bunch of things that basically has created a market, not just in Canada, but elsewhere, where it tends to

be biased towards large companies because large companies are the ones that have been established over time.

00:23:58.020 --> 00:24:04.860

<v SPEAKER\_1>In response to the government's approach, that is how they posture themselves to be able to position themselves for success.

00:24:04.860 --> 00:24:14.480

<v SPEAKER\_1>That was a way too long-winded intro to what specifically did you take that an Agile approach could offer to Indigenous and smaller businesses?

00:24:14.480 --> 00:24:28.020

<v SPEAKER\_2>Well, I think the key thing for me, and we'll get to this when we discuss the recommendations, is that you don't want to apply this methodology to large major crown projects of \$100 million right now at the outset.

00:24:28.020 --> 00:24:39.820

<v SPEAKER\_2>It would not be favorable to that, and that is a type of approach given the dollar amounts that are necessarily going to need more traditional types of oversight and process.

00:24:39.820 --> 00:25:06.320

<v SPEAKER\_2>What's fascinating, though, is that this arrangement that really encourages innovation and encourages minimum viable products, and encourages the government to select a firm that they're going to work with closely, mirrors very well with what we are hoping to achieve in terms of encouraging smaller indigenous and medium businesses in Canada to get involved in the defence sector.

00:25:06.320 --> 00:25:24.460

<v SPEAKER\_2>So what this type of process does is effectively, it provides that seed funding and that seed approach to say, we're going to be working with you, we're going to develop this minimal viable product, we're going to develop it together through a series of sprints.

00:25:24.920 --> 00:25:41.020

<v SPEAKER\_2>And therefore, as opposed to making it this black and white binary where you pass, you fail, and whatnot, and because you're keeping it at a smaller scale, you're actually encouraging an approach for some of these smaller enterprises that may not feel that they ever really have a leg in to the process.

00:25:41.020 --> 00:25:59.380

<v SPEAKER\_2>And this is part of a wider discussion that's a bit beyond the report, but around how do you reform the ideas program within defence to ensure that that enables people to get involved more closely and actually allows Canadian companies to not only develop a

product but then sell it.

00:25:59.380 --> 00:26:27.580

<v SPEAKER\_2>But I think to answer your question, the big takeaway was that there are a number of indigenous suppliers who really feel that if there are different pathways for them to compete and to get involved in defence, and it doesn't necessarily have to look like what it looks like with the big primes, but providing different mechanisms that allow the government to work with them and not simply work with them as part of a 5% offset.

00:26:27.580 --> 00:26:35.100

<v SPEAKER\_2>To allow them to actually be frontline companies working directly with Government of Canada on capabilities.

00:26:35.100 --> 00:26:39.440

<v SPEAKER\_2>I don't know if the two Alex's want to jump in on this, but.

00:26:39.840 --> 00:26:43.480

<v SPEAKER\_3>I echo everything that you say.

00:26:44.600 --> 00:26:55.160

<v SPEAKER\_3>There is a program right now under the ITBBP strategy to integrate SMBs into the supply chain.

00:26:55.640 --> 00:26:58.640

<v SPEAKER\_3>That has some success.

00:27:00.420 --> 00:27:08.360

<v SPEAKER\_3>The problem with that program is that really shifts the dynamics of the marketplace for small and medium-sized businesses.

00:27:08.360 --> 00:27:15.700

<v SPEAKER\_3>Instead of selling widgets or services or whatever it is they're selling, they're actually selling Canadian content value.

00:27:16.260 --> 00:27:25.800

<v SPEAKER\_3>And that's what the big primes are interested in, in order to meet their CCB obligations under a major contract.

00:27:26.240 --> 00:27:39.440

<v SPEAKER\_3>And it changes the way in which SMBs manage and operate their businesses and the currency that they use in order to achieve success.

00:27:40.860 --> 00:28:06.720

<v SPEAKER\_3>And so, when you have organizations that work in an environment where there is not an ITB VP component to it, they feel much more shut out, simply because the major primes won't pay

attention to them, even though they have a viable product, because they can't offer the Canadian content value that primes are looking for.

00:28:07.640 --> 00:28:21.220

<v SPEAKER\_3>So, we noted that, and we felt that there might be some opportunity to play with that, but honestly, that was beyond the scope of this study that we were undertaking.

00:28:24.000 --> 00:28:27.440

<v SPEAKER\_1>This episode of Defence Deconstructed is brought to you by Irving Shipbuilding.

00:28:27.440 --> 00:28:29.960

<v SPEAKER\_1>Canada's national shipbuilder is currently hiring.

00:28:29.960 --> 00:28:34.980

<v SPEAKER\_1>For more information on the many jobs and opportunities currently available, please visit [www.shipsfocanada.ca](http://www.shipsfocanada.ca).

00:28:43.489 --> 00:28:47.629

<v SPEAKER\_1>I don't want to get sucked totally down this rabbit hole, but that point you just made was a really interesting one.

00:28:47.629 --> 00:28:54.629

<v SPEAKER\_1>Could you just spell out for listeners why a Canadian company like that would have difficulty providing Canadian content?

00:28:54.629 --> 00:28:56.409

<v SPEAKER\_1>Canadian content value, sorry.

00:28:56.409 --> 00:29:00.649

<v SPEAKER\_3>Yeah, so Canadian content value is basically a currency.

00:29:00.649 --> 00:29:03.009

<v SPEAKER\_3>It's measured in dollars.

00:29:03.009 --> 00:29:19.109

<v SPEAKER\_3>It's something that I said monitors and manages in connection with every major defence contract issued through Department of National Defence and sometimes through the Coast Guard, which is going to be D&D soon anyway.

00:29:20.449 --> 00:29:33.069

<v SPEAKER\_3>In those programs, there is an obligation where the prime contractor must divert, invest whatever word you want to use.

00:29:33.069 --> 00:29:38.609

<v SPEAKER\_3>A certain percentage is often 15 percent of the contract value into small and medium sized businesses.

00:29:39.409 --> 00:29:50.589

<v SPEAKER\_3>And then a proportion of that investment in the SMB, not 100 percent, but a proportion of it is credited as Canadian content value.

00:29:50.589 --> 00:29:52.949

<v SPEAKER\_3>And the rules go on and on and on.

00:29:52.949 --> 00:29:56.469

<v SPEAKER\_3>I'm not going to go down that rabbit hole here.

00:29:56.469 --> 00:30:02.209

<v SPEAKER\_3>So it's both an incentive and a stick.

00:30:02.209 --> 00:30:03.389

<v SPEAKER\_3>It's a carrot and a stick.

00:30:03.389 --> 00:30:08.029

<v SPEAKER\_3>If you don't meet the 15 percent, then you are in violation of the contract.

00:30:09.109 --> 00:30:19.189

<v SPEAKER\_3>So prime contractors are motivated to meet the 15 percent obligation that they signed up to when they put in their proposal.

00:30:19.189 --> 00:30:22.969

<v SPEAKER\_3>So they're motivated to find that Canadian content value.

00:30:22.969 --> 00:30:33.109

<v SPEAKER\_3>And when you have a supplier who's selling, I'm making this up, say they're selling a wiring harness for a complex aviation system.

00:30:33.109 --> 00:30:35.849

<v SPEAKER\_3>So there's a lot of technology that goes into it.

00:30:35.849 --> 00:30:39.169

<v SPEAKER\_3>There's a lot of research and development, a lot of engineering.

00:30:39.169 --> 00:30:43.849

<v SPEAKER\_3>They go to a prime contractor and they say, we have this really cool wiring harness.

00:30:43.849 --> 00:30:45.329

<v SPEAKER\_3>It's better than the one that you use.

00:30:45.329 --> 00:30:47.209

<v SPEAKER\_3>It's less expensive than the one that you use.

00:30:47.209 --> 00:30:56.769

<v SPEAKER\_3>And the prime contractor says, yeah, but changing our supply chain at this point costs more than the savings we obtained from going with you.

00:30:56.769 --> 00:30:59.309

<v SPEAKER\_3>So thanks, but no thanks.

00:30:59.309 --> 00:31:06.589

<v SPEAKER\_3>If on the other hand, they go to that prime contractor and they say, we have this wiring harness, it may be better, it may be worse.

00:31:06.589 --> 00:31:07.209

<v SPEAKER\_3>We're not sure.

00:31:07.769 --> 00:31:14.749

<v SPEAKER\_3>But we can sell you 80% of the value of the wiring harness in CCVs and Canadian content value.

00:31:14.749 --> 00:31:21.349

<v SPEAKER\_3>Now the prime is going to sit up and they say, well, we have to, we have an obligation to meet CCVs on this contract.

00:31:21.349 --> 00:31:28.489

<v SPEAKER\_3>We are there going to kick off the European supplier because we don't get any CCVs from foreign suppliers and we're going to take you.

00:31:28.489 --> 00:31:36.129

<v SPEAKER\_3>So the incentive is to bring on board Canadian companies who can maximize the Canadian content value.

00:31:38.149 --> 00:31:43.749

<v SPEAKER\_3>This is good for Canadian companies, small SMBs who have that capability.

00:31:43.749 --> 00:31:51.229

<v SPEAKER\_3>It's, unfortunately, it's a small subset of the overall group of Canadian companies.

00:31:51.229 --> 00:32:07.309

<v SPEAKER\_3>I don't have the figures in front of me, but according to ICED's own figures, it's a tiny proportion of the SMBs that actually qualify to participate in the SMB ICED CCV program.

00:32:07.309 --> 00:32:09.449

<v SPEAKER\_3>Sorry, too many acronyms there.

00:32:10.889 --> 00:32:15.409

<v SPEAKER\_3>So that's the boundary that they're hitting.

00:32:15.689 --> 00:32:28.249

<v SPEAKER\_3>They're coming up with really good, innovative, advanced products that will help prime contractors, and because they don't understand CCV economics in the marketplace, they're hitting a wall.

00:32:29.929 --> 00:32:30.569

<v SPEAKER\_1>Okay.

00:32:30.569 --> 00:32:47.689

<v SPEAKER\_1>So basically, you can be Canadian, be highly innovative, have a potentially applicable product, it could be great, but the existing formula counts that such that it translates into the prescribed and defined Canadian content value, and those two things are distinct.

00:32:47.689 --> 00:32:48.609

<v SPEAKER\_3>Correct.

00:32:48.609 --> 00:32:49.949

<v SPEAKER\_1>Okay.

00:32:49.949 --> 00:32:51.329

<v SPEAKER\_1>Thanks for that digression.

00:32:51.329 --> 00:32:57.369

<v SPEAKER\_1>Alex Rudolph, I want to come to you and talk a little bit about some of the case studies that you folks did, that you drilled into in the research.

00:32:58.129 --> 00:33:07.469

<v SPEAKER\_1>So I can ask you to walk through some of those, and maybe give a sense of, you mentioned that, I think, Alex McPhail, you mentioned that an agile approach is used more broadly.

00:33:07.469 --> 00:33:18.569

<v SPEAKER\_1>Can you give us a bit of a sense of how broad a universe of cases could you have looked at, Alex Rudolph, when you folks decided to select and focus in detail at the ones that you had?

00:33:18.569 --> 00:33:19.829

<v SPEAKER\_1>How many other options were there?

00:33:20.069 --> 00:33:29.609

<v SPEAKER\_1>Are these the only set that you could have done in great detail, or did you have a giant panoply of options from which you selected a few?

00:33:29.609 --> 00:33:38.809

<v SPEAKER\_4>Well, I could have easily gone for a lot as Agile processes have their roots, I think, it's either 60s or 70s in software development.

00:33:38.809 --> 00:33:52.509

<v SPEAKER\_4>So this isn't necessarily a new process by any means, but it's really been in the past couple of decades where we've been starting to see that, oh, these methods work for things, not just software.

00:33:52.689 --> 00:33:55.929

<v SPEAKER\_4>So it's been included in more and more areas.

00:33:55.929 --> 00:34:12.509

<v SPEAKER\_4>And so our focus was on specifically what cases would really inform us the most about for Canada, what can really help us to understand what can be applied for Canadian procurement.

00:34:12.509 --> 00:34:30.429

<v SPEAKER\_4>So we largely focused on NATO and Five Eyes countries and then narrowed it down to there, particularly in on kind of varying degrees of what these different cases kind of tell us about agile processes.

00:34:30.429 --> 00:34:58.569

<v SPEAKER\_4>And the first is that it can be applied on the minute small scale to billion dollar projects, because as Alex McPhail detailed, it's a lot of these processes that they're not tied to a specific capability or technology, but they're management processes and how to conduct business.

00:34:58.569 --> 00:35:18.789

<v SPEAKER\_4>And so the three of our case studies look at the United States, but that's largely just because there's most a lot of information on United States cases, and the specific ones we look at do provide a unique look at how agile processes can be applied.

00:35:19.689 --> 00:35:42.289

<v SPEAKER\_4>So the first case that we looked at was of Connecticut and their work with NORAD, that it was in the late 2010s that NORAD was wanting some sort of technology to improve their air situational command and control and awareness.

00:35:43.409 --> 00:36:09.369

<v SPEAKER\_4>And they partnered with the US Defense Innovation Units, which we'll talk a bit more later, to look for a prototype, for something to ingest all the data from air traffic control, from the military radar and anything that essentially ingested data on air situational awareness.

00:36:09.369 --> 00:36:15.549

<v SPEAKER\_4>They wanted to ingest this all in one program and be able to have full situational awareness of the skies.

00:36:17.269 --> 00:36:35.589

<v SPEAKER\_4>They partnered with Kinetica DB for a prototype that they were thrilled with by all measurements and quickly entered this, or deployed the software within a few years.

00:36:35.589 --> 00:36:48.829

<v SPEAKER\_4>They first contracted with Kinetica in 2019 for a prototype, and it was in August 2020, the next year that they gave a full contract.

00:36:48.829 --> 00:36:54.929

<v SPEAKER\_4>So that shows how quickly that they went from just a prototype to a full contract.

00:36:54.929 --> 00:37:12.749

<v SPEAKER\_4>And this capability, although NORAD hasn't omitted, it's many believe that this capability, what came to be known as Pathfinder and now NORAD cloud-based command and control that Canada also uses.

00:37:12.749 --> 00:37:20.489

<v SPEAKER\_4>It's heavily believe that it was responsible for identifying the Chinese surveillance balloons from a few years ago.

00:37:20.489 --> 00:37:34.509

<v SPEAKER\_4>And it was first identified as a, NORAD identified this as a need of capability when gyrocopters flew in Washington DC.

00:37:34.509 --> 00:38:07.369

<v SPEAKER\_4>And identifying this problem, they worked with the Defence Innovation Unit to quickly stand up this capability and enter it into deployments using the other transaction authority in the United States, which allows the DOD to partner and procure prototypes and using Agile methods more so than a regular procurement vehicle and contracts.

00:38:07.369 --> 00:38:20.409

<v SPEAKER\_4>This allows them to take that extra risk and use Agile methods compared to regular federal acquisition regulation contracts.

00:38:20.409 --> 00:38:28.409

<v SPEAKER\_4>There is a bit of a give and take there where there is an increased risk to use an OTA contract.

00:38:28.409 --> 00:38:58.989

<v SPEAKER\_4>But what many in the space and in the Defence Innovation

Units kind of say is that they believe in shifting the risk from the soldier and those on the front line to themselves and their risk as they believe taking on a risk of maybe spending a few more dollars or something going wrong in the procurement process is a much better risk to take than your people dying.

00:38:58.989 --> 00:39:04.729

<v SPEAKER\_4>And that is very much the kind of idea of risk that they approach this with.

00:39:04.729 --> 00:39:18.149

<v SPEAKER\_4>And so with Connecticut, this was a relatively small contract, where the initial prototype was 8 million and the full contract later on was 100 million.

00:39:18.149 --> 00:39:29.129

<v SPEAKER\_4>But compared to the modernization of the Department of Defence's healthcare management system, this is a 4.3 billion contract.

00:39:29.129 --> 00:39:43.689

<v SPEAKER\_4>But despite how massive this contract and deployment was, which I believe at the time was one of the largest, if not the largest software deployments that has ever occurred.

00:39:43.889 --> 00:39:56.229

<v SPEAKER\_4>They included some agile processes with this deployment, particularly in a phased deployment of the software.

00:39:56.229 --> 00:40:01.869

<v SPEAKER\_4>The intention was watching how this and engaging it on user feedback.

00:40:02.349 --> 00:40:17.709

<v SPEAKER\_4>Kind of as Alex McPhail detailed, they wanted to ensure the user feedback in the deployment of this and take their time to do so as a health care management system and a very large deployment at that.

00:40:17.709 --> 00:40:23.269

<v SPEAKER\_4>They understood just how bad this could go if things went wrong.

00:40:23.269 --> 00:40:27.249

<v SPEAKER\_4>And during their first deployment, things did go very wrong.

00:40:27.949 --> 00:40:38.509

<v SPEAKER\_4>In the Pacific Northwest, they initially did deployment amongst some hospitals and found that by all measurements, it was a

disaster that they deployed.

00:40:38.509 --> 00:40:44.589

<v SPEAKER\_4>But such a disaster that they even started considering if this would even work out in the first place.

00:40:44.589 --> 00:41:14.209

<v SPEAKER\_4>But Laidos and their partners who were deploying the software just took a step back, identified kind of the key problems in that first deployment, including user training and in subsequent deployments, they developed a user training program and mentorship program, where individuals that were in earlier deployments would be able to mentor and help those in later deployments.

00:41:14.209 --> 00:41:24.569

<v SPEAKER\_4>And kind of understanding the problems that occur in these initial deployments, they're able to modify in their approaches as it goes on.

00:41:25.089 --> 00:41:39.809

<v SPEAKER\_4>And so, even though this is a very large deployment, taking these agile processes and methods and integrating them can produce some major results.

00:41:39.809 --> 00:41:48.469

<v SPEAKER\_4>The third case, we looked to Australia and their organization that they called DiggerWorks.

00:41:48.469 --> 00:42:06.249

<v SPEAKER\_4>So, this case I found particularly good in the port sense related to the discussion that Dave, you and Phil had about how to get various stakeholders involved when you have various competing definitions.

00:42:06.249 --> 00:42:15.389

<v SPEAKER\_4>And so, in Australia, their Department of Defence was looking at improving how their soldier systems were procured.

00:42:15.389 --> 00:42:23.789

<v SPEAKER\_4>And they took, developed a virtual organization comprised of individuals from various parts.

00:42:23.789 --> 00:42:30.989

<v SPEAKER\_4>And essentially told, this is all that you're doing, working on improving the procurement of soldier systems.

00:42:30.989 --> 00:42:51.189

<v SPEAKER\_4>And they integrated almost every level procurement processes to break down stovepipes and ensure soldiers directly using these, the soldier systems, provided feedback on how they would

procure them.

00:42:52.849 --> 00:43:14.369

<v SPEAKER\_4>And as they developed these processes, I think one of the key results from this organization was there was a lot of different managements and that it did increase initial costs.

00:43:14.369 --> 00:43:40.489

<v SPEAKER\_4>But what they found was as much as the cost of change management and creating new systems and organizations, they found that these initial costs were offset by the major cost savings from a lack of obsolescence and be able to provide technology directly to the soldiers based on their feedback.

00:43:40.489 --> 00:43:56.009

<v SPEAKER\_4>And in addition to the offsets of that lack of obsolescence, they foresee that the new management that they set up would provide cost savings in subsequent product checks as well.

00:43:56.169 --> 00:44:07.129

<v SPEAKER\_4>So overall that even though there was some initial cost to this, the benefits ultimately outweighed those costs.

00:44:07.129 --> 00:44:25.029

<v SPEAKER\_4>And the last case we looked at was the US Defense Innovation Units, which I believe is probably one of the most important cases to look at as the DIU was created by the Department of Defense in the US in 2015.

00:44:27.009 --> 00:44:45.629

<v SPEAKER\_4>It was initially created to improve relations and outreach with commercial technology firms, particularly Silicon Valley and hyperscalers and emerging technology that you would be familiar with, Silicon Valley.

00:44:46.849 --> 00:44:57.049

<v SPEAKER\_4>Although they found some initial success there, the real benefits of the Defense Innovation Units came in 2016 and what they dubbed DIU 2.0.

00:44:57.049 --> 00:45:01.889

<v SPEAKER\_4>And this was when they created the Commercial Solutions Opening.

00:45:01.889 --> 00:45:13.129

<v SPEAKER\_4>And this is an acquisition mechanism that was used to procure the Kinetica Pathfinder capability that I first talked about.

00:45:13.129 --> 00:45:24.389

<v SPEAKER\_4>And this is a process where the DIU will partner with a

DOD sponsor to address a particular problem.

00:45:24.389 --> 00:45:34.049

<v SPEAKER\_4>And they will find a particular company to provide a prototype within a short time frame.

00:45:35.369 --> 00:46:08.669

<v SPEAKER\_4>And from when the DIU solicits proposals to providing a other transaction authority contract, which is the greater contracting authority that allows government to do more with the procurement, they provide one within 60 to 90 days from the initial proposal to close, which kind of to highlight just how quickly they try and move these processes.

00:46:08.669 --> 00:46:14.429

<v SPEAKER\_4>And within the first even few years, they found massive success with this.

00:46:14.849 --> 00:46:31.029

<v SPEAKER\_4>And that's so much success that earlier this year, the DOD announced that they would be mandating that all software would have to be used, the DIU's Commercial Solutions Opening from now on.

00:46:31.089 --> 00:47:16.309

<v SPEAKER\_4>And so far, it's been an enormous success that it is, they have a list on their website of all the companies that they have worked with, as if they are a success with the program, they provide what is known as a success memo as well, which allows them to conduct business with a federal agency, without a competitive bid, similar to a social source contract, which I would like to compare that to a supply arrangement similar, while there are key differences, but it would be the closest example, I would think, in the Canadian system.

00:47:17.689 --> 00:47:18.409

<v SPEAKER\_1>Okay.

00:47:18.409 --> 00:47:25.989

<v SPEAKER\_1>So Alex, thanks for walking through those case studies, because you had a great snapshot of a couple of different use cases.

00:47:25.989 --> 00:47:34.789

<v SPEAKER\_1>So Phil, to come back to you, get you to focus on the big picture and some of the recommendations that you've got for Canadian acquisition and procurement moving forward.

00:47:34.789 --> 00:47:35.269

<v SPEAKER\_2>Thanks, Dave.

00:47:35.269 --> 00:47:45.989

<v SPEAKER\_2>So one of the things that Alex McPhail kept reiterating

to me throughout the project was, we need to come up with something that's actually doable.

00:47:45.989 --> 00:47:53.329

<v SPEAKER\_2>I had some grand visions of how we might propose that this be applied to a project such as Canadian Patrol Summaries.

00:47:53.949 --> 00:48:00.309

<v SPEAKER\_2>He kept reminding me that this is not, you got to be realistic here.

00:48:00.309 --> 00:48:11.429

<v SPEAKER\_2>So the recommendations were in that date of saying, okay, what can we actually do to acclimatize the Canadian government to this idea as opposed to trying to throw you right deep into the ocean.

00:48:11.429 --> 00:48:27.769

<v SPEAKER\_2>So in that idea, we were saying, okay, you should probably select a smaller project, a smaller acquisition that doesn't necessarily have ITB value proposition obligations.

00:48:27.769 --> 00:48:35.569

<v SPEAKER\_2>And one piece that we haven't really discussed as part of the podcast thus far is how this marries with the in-service support construct.

00:48:35.569 --> 00:48:42.589

<v SPEAKER\_2>But basically, you can leverage the in-service support construct to facilitate this agile sprinting, basically.

00:48:42.589 --> 00:48:48.569

<v SPEAKER\_2>And so what we were saying is, okay, what do you want to look at in terms of pilot project that might be put forward as part of this?

00:48:50.289 --> 00:48:54.489

<v SPEAKER\_2>It probably needs to be complex in order to kind of prove the concept.

00:48:54.489 --> 00:48:59.309

<v SPEAKER\_2>You don't want it too large because then, as we were saying, it'll bog it down.

00:48:59.489 --> 00:49:09.349

<v SPEAKER\_2>You need something that has stability around requirements that you can build upon, but that are also susceptible to agility.

00:49:09.469 --> 00:49:14.089

<v SPEAKER\_2>You need kind of all the stakeholders in the government to kind of agree that they're going to try this out.

00:49:15.269 --> 00:49:20.749

<v SPEAKER\_2>And similarly, you need something that is amenable to a higher degree of risk tolerance.

00:49:20.749 --> 00:49:24.789

<v SPEAKER\_2>It also has to have some kind of cultural fit within what it is that you're trying to do.

00:49:24.789 --> 00:49:31.909

<v SPEAKER\_2>So maybe an IT project or some other high-tech project that is worth pursuing in that regard.

00:49:31.909 --> 00:49:38.489

<v SPEAKER\_2>And the idea really, as part of the recommendation, is you want to follow the basic principles that we've laid out before.

00:49:38.489 --> 00:49:47.309

<v SPEAKER\_2>So you want to deliver a minimum viable product and that has sprint potential under the In-Service Support contract.

00:49:47.589 --> 00:50:04.049

<v SPEAKER\_2>So you basically, in simple layman's terms, buy the most basic thing that you need with the understanding that you will improve it for the operator throughout its life using the existing mechanisms that you have around In-Service Support.

00:50:04.049 --> 00:50:08.709

<v SPEAKER\_2>And then after you kind of go through it, take a look at how it went.

00:50:08.709 --> 00:50:10.109

<v SPEAKER\_2>What lessons can you learn from it?

00:50:10.689 --> 00:50:18.209

<v SPEAKER\_2>And, you know, I don't want to belabor the point, but really the idea is how do you get the Canadian government to be more comfortable with this?

00:50:18.209 --> 00:50:18.449

<v SPEAKER\_2>Right?

00:50:18.449 --> 00:50:21.529

<v SPEAKER\_2>How do you get different people to see that this is not scary?

00:50:21.529 --> 00:50:26.189

<v SPEAKER\_2>How do you get them to see that it's not going to go off the rails?

00:50:26.189 --> 00:50:33.529

<v SPEAKER\_2>And that's really the main recommendations that we have, is can you try and at least take that initial baby step?

00:50:33.529 --> 00:50:41.389

<v SPEAKER\_2>Because going back to the very first part of the conversation and your initial comments, Dave, we've been talking about this for years.

00:50:41.389 --> 00:50:43.609

<v SPEAKER\_2>And the US is well beyond this.

00:50:43.609 --> 00:50:44.849

<v SPEAKER\_2>They've been doing it.

00:50:44.849 --> 00:50:47.309

<v SPEAKER\_2>There's proven concepts in other areas.

00:50:48.609 --> 00:50:56.369

<v SPEAKER\_2>What do we need to do as Canada to at least tip our toe in the water here?

00:50:56.369 --> 00:50:58.549

<v SPEAKER\_2>And that's really the main recommendation at this point.

00:50:58.549 --> 00:51:03.109

<v SPEAKER\_2>I don't know if Alex McPhail, you want to jump in on that?

00:51:03.489 --> 00:51:04.589

<v SPEAKER\_3>I echo everything you say.

00:51:04.969 --> 00:51:26.049

<v SPEAKER\_3>The only thing I might add is that we included a list of factors to consider in selecting an ideal project and an ideal contractor to consider when moving forward with a test case for Agile Procurement.

00:51:26.089 --> 00:51:27.029

<v SPEAKER\_1>Okay.

00:51:27.029 --> 00:51:34.829

<v SPEAKER\_1>So, Phil, Alex, Alex, really appreciate you joining us to walk through the report, some of the analysis, some of the recommendations.

00:51:34.829 --> 00:51:54.009

<v SPEAKER\_1>I guess maybe if I were to suggest one tweak to the report I didn't author, is that we're in a space now with the combination of the current government's different level of enthusiasm

for defence expenditures, the defence industrial base in Canada, as well as our renewed NATO commitments, which we now seem to be somewhat serious about actually meeting.

00:51:55.269 --> 00:51:56.849

<v SPEAKER\_1>We shouldn't be thinking about pilot.

00:51:56.849 --> 00:52:19.049

<v SPEAKER\_1>We should be thinking about a multitude of different pilots as we try a bunch of different initiatives to try and improve things overall, with a recognition upfront that not everything is going to work, but the status quo isn't working the way we want it to either, and we're currently accepting all the risk on the capability side and not actually executing on the money the way we want.

00:52:19.049 --> 00:52:21.249

<v SPEAKER\_1>So we actually need to try a bunch of things differently.

00:52:23.569 --> 00:52:28.269

<v SPEAKER\_1>With that soliloquy for me, the last question to all of you, and I'll start with Alex Rudolph.

00:52:28.269 --> 00:52:29.889

<v SPEAKER\_1>What are you reading these days?

00:52:31.429 --> 00:52:39.869

<v SPEAKER\_4>Reading Active Defense, China's Military Strategy Since 1949, as I'm trying to finish up my dissertation.

00:52:39.869 --> 00:52:40.269

<v SPEAKER\_1>Okay.

00:52:40.269 --> 00:52:41.049

<v SPEAKER\_1>Godspeed with that.

00:52:41.049 --> 00:52:42.489

<v SPEAKER\_1>Phil, what are you reading?

00:52:43.589 --> 00:52:48.889

<v SPEAKER\_2>I'm reading a book in French, Le Bon gouvernement, by Pierre Rosanvallon.

00:52:50.229 --> 00:53:01.409

<v SPEAKER\_2>Really, the argument of the book is that we've become so focused on democracy in terms of voting and we've allowed effective government to basically fall by the wayside.

00:53:01.409 --> 00:53:18.789

<v SPEAKER\_2>I think this is really something that is part of this discussion, is we need to have far more greater discussion about state

capacity, about what good government actually looks like as opposed to simply regulations and auditing and audit culture.

00:53:18.789 --> 00:53:22.069

<v SPEAKER\_2>How do you actually deliver good government to the people?

00:53:22.669 --> 00:53:28.909

<v SPEAKER\_2>It's a clarion call to the dangers of not focusing on actual good government.

00:53:28.909 --> 00:53:29.669

<v SPEAKER\_1>Okay.

00:53:29.669 --> 00:53:31.969

<v SPEAKER\_1>Finally, Alex McPhail.

00:53:31.969 --> 00:53:35.409

<v SPEAKER\_3>I just finished a book called The Prepared Leader by Erika H.

00:53:35.409 --> 00:53:38.409

<v SPEAKER\_3>James and Lynn Perry Wooten.

00:53:38.949 --> 00:53:41.629

<v SPEAKER\_3>It's really a book about crisis management, but it's not.

00:53:43.569 --> 00:53:56.349

<v SPEAKER\_3>It's a study about how companies have succeeded through crises like 9-11 and the recent downturn in the economy.

00:53:56.349 --> 00:54:03.369

<v SPEAKER\_3>It's really talking about the companies that succeeded were the ones that were prepared in advance, not just economically, but had a different mindset.

00:54:03.369 --> 00:54:05.649

<v SPEAKER\_3>It was a lot of fun.

00:54:06.189 --> 00:54:09.349

<v SPEAKER\_3>I'll also answer on the non-fiction side, anything by Michael Connolly.

00:54:11.209 --> 00:54:11.929

<v SPEAKER\_1>You're here to that.

00:54:11.929 --> 00:54:15.769

<v SPEAKER\_1>All right, Phil, Alex and Alex, thanks again for joining us today on Defence Deconstructed.

00:54:15.769 --> 00:54:16.529  
<v SPEAKER\_1>Appreciate it.

00:54:16.529 --> 00:54:17.069  
<v SPEAKER\_2>Thanks, David.

00:54:17.069 --> 00:54:17.769  
<v SPEAKER\_3>Thanks, David.

00:54:17.769 --> 00:54:19.209  
<v SPEAKER\_3>This was a delight.

00:54:21.229 --> 00:54:23.429  
<v SPEAKER\_1>Thanks for listening to Defence Deconstructed.

00:54:23.429 --> 00:54:28.909  
<v SPEAKER\_1>For more of our work, go to [cgai.ca](http://cgai.ca) or follow us on LinkedIn, Twitter, Instagram or Facebook.

00:54:28.909 --> 00:54:34.269  
<v SPEAKER\_1>If you like what we do and want to keep us going, think of donating to us at [cgai.ca](http://cgai.ca)