

**RETURN BIDS TO:**  
**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**  
Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -  
TPSGC  
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier  
Place du Portage, Phase III  
Core 0A1 / Noyau 0A1  
Gatineau  
Québec  
K1A 0S5  
Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

**SOLICITATION AMENDMENT**  
**MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION**

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

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

**Comments - Commentaires**  
THIS REQUIREMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY  
REQUIREMENT. / CE DOCUMENT CONTIENT  
UNE EXIGENCE DE SÉCURITÉ.

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

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**  
Informatics Professional Services Division / Division  
des services professionnels en informatique  
11 Laurier St., / 11, rue Laurier  
3C2, Place du Portage  
Gatineau  
Québec  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> DATABASE STAKEHOLDER INF. MAN. SYS.	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> B8807-110096/A	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 005
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> B8807-110096	<b>Date</b> 2012-07-13
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZM-381-24442	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 381zm.B8807-110096	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2012-07-16</b>	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Aresta(zm div), Arden	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 381zm
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-5633 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-5078
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

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

---

**Nombre de l'invitation / Solicitation No.: B8807-110096/A****Demande de Proposition / Request For Proposal****Pour / Required By****Citoyenneté et Immigration Canada / Citizenship and Immigration Canada****Modification de l'invitation / Solicitation Amendment No.5**

This amendment is raised to answer Bidders' questions and to make revisions to the Request For Proposal:

**1. Bidders' Questions****Question 16:** Advantage to closer integration with Outlook? :

Is it fair to assume that all of the intended users are presently using Outlook – as per requirement 6.1.2.2 – 'must use data information to and from (interoperate) with Microsoft Outlook 2007..'?

There are advantages to integrating the Database Stakeholder Information Management System (DSIMS) with Outlook providing a single user interface. This is a very large benefit to the end users as the same Outlook interface would be used for connecting with the Stakeholders as the users utilize for communications with their regular contacts. Is this an acceptable option for this RFP?

Note that while this would partially conflict with RFP requirement 6.1.6.1 (web-based user interface), it would be configured that while running within Outlook, the application would be accessed over the web - residing in a managed hosted environment through internet (VPN) connectivity.

**Answer 16:** Canada requires the solution to interoperate with Microsoft Outlook, as well as the file formats identified in Section 6.1.2.5 (Requirements). The proposed solution does not have to be integrated with Microsoft Outlook.

**Question 17:** Data conversion Effort:

The previous Q& A – (question 14) indicated 'data migration will be approximately 2,000 records in .XLS format, approximately 10GB in size.

A 2,000 record XLS file would be substantially less than 10GB. Is this a typographical error, or do the indicated 2,000 stakeholder records have associated records, notes or attachments, which would increase the size to 10GB?

If there are associated records, notes or attachments, such as prior communications, correspondence, associated files, etc. would it be possible to get a list of these, the volumes (in number of records) and the relevant file formats? As the data conversion of associated records usually is the majority of the conversion effort rather than that of the stakeholder 'profiles' themselves.

---

**Answer 17:** The 10GB is an estimate based on contact records and potential related attachments. The anticipated volume of attachments has not been identified. Canada requires the solution to operate with the file formats identified in Section 6.1.2.5 (Requirements).

**Question 18:** Calendar/event planning function?:

Requirement 6.1.4.5 is 'The solution must include a calendar/event planning function which allows information to be categorized by date.'

This is a very general statement and could be interpreted quite differently by responding vendors. It could be addressed by as simple a solution as links to an Outlook calendar, or by a full event planning and management function (to use two extremes).

Our solution has a specific calendaring function for contact events and event based follow-up. However to ensure this meets your requirements, would it be possible to get further elaboration on this requirement? Ideally at a use case level?

**Answer 18:** Canada requires the solution to have a specific calendar/event planning function built into the tool. This function will be used for event planning, as well as record keeping/information management.

**Question 19:** System Demonstration in 10 days:

Evaluation procedure 4.2 (c) Demonstration, calls for a demonstration with no fewer than 10 days' notice. Certainly we can provide a demonstration in 10 days. We would prefer to provide a demonstration with some sample data loaded and configured to the requirements. If this is agreeable, then would any additional time or delays in receiving and loading sample data extend the timeline accordingly?

**Answer 19:** An extension of 5 days can be made to allow time for sample data to be loaded and configured to the requirements. In other words, the demonstration would be required within 15 days.

2. At Part 4, EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND BASIS OF SELECTION, at Article 4.2, Technical Evaluation, at Paragraph (c), Demonstration, at Sub-paragraph (i):

**DELETE:** 10 working days

**INSERT:** 15 working days

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFP REMAIN UNCHANGED.**