

**RETURN BIDS TO:**  
**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**  
Bid Receiving Public Works and Government  
Services Canada/Réception des soumissions Travaux  
publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
800 Burrard Street, 2nd Floor  
800, rue Burrard, 2e étage  
Vancouver, BC V6Z 2V8  
Bid Fax: (604) 775-7526

**Revision to a Request for a Standing Offer**  
**Révision à une demande d'offre à commandes**  
National Master Standing Offer (NMSO)  
Offre à commandes principale et nationale (OCPN)

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

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

**Comments - Commentaires**

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

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**  
Public Works and Government Services Canada -  
Pacific Region  
800 Burrard Street, 12th Floor  
800, rue Burrard, 12e étage  
Vancouver, BC V6Z 2V8

<b>Title - Sujet</b> Imaging Hardware NMSO	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EZ107-120003/C	<b>Date</b> 2013-04-04
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> EZ107-120003	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 002
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> VAN-2-35013 (576)	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$VAN-576-6971	
<b>Date of Original Request for Standing Offer</b> Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale 2013-03-27	
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2013-05-07</b>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Sobhee, Sachin	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> van576
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (604) 775-7022 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (604) 775-7526
<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	
<b>Security - Sécurité</b> This revision does not change the security requirements of the Offer. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de la présente offre.	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

<b>Acknowledgement copy required</b>	<b>Yes - Oui</b>	<b>No - Non</b>
<b>Accusé de réception requis</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer.</b> <b>Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.</b>		
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant. (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)		
<b>For the Minister - Pour le Ministre</b>		

---

This amendment is created to answer questions from bidders.

### **Questions and Answers**

Q1) Would the crown please confirm that all questions and answers will be publicly listed through "amendments" to the standing offer?

A1) Yes, all questions and answers will be posted to MERX via amendments to the RFSO.

Q2) Would the crown please make available working copies of the document so that we may respond? (Doc files)

A2) Word format (\*.doc) files are available upon request from the Contracting Authority. However, please note that Word format (\*.doc) is not the native file format and some of the formatting may have been lost in the conversion. The documents on MERX are the ones that take precedence and the bidder assumes the risk in using the Word format files.

Q3) Would the crown please make available all answers to questions in both English and French?

A3) Yes, all questions and answers will be made available in both English and French.

Q4) Would the crown please consider making a schedule for Questions and Answers so that we may plan our questions accordingly? Other RFSO's have scheduled processes so as to set the expectations up front?

A4) A schedule for Questions and Answers has now been included at Part 1, Section 1.2.1.

Q5) In 7.8.1 crown has stated that there will be a RVD process for procurement of hardware. Can you please specify exactly how this hardware will be evaluated? Based on straight cost of goods? Or based on BVG over set period?

A5) This is explained in the RFSO at Annex E, Paragraph E2.4.9 – Evaluation Criteria.

Q6) In Part 1 1.2 Summary. The crown has mentioned maximum of one hardware product per sub category. Also if identically or similarly equipped, will NOT be included in more than one sub-category. Would the crown please clarify this requirement? Should this requirement not be included in A2 "general requirements"? If a unit is being used in one certain category could it be used in another category? Eg..CAT 3 unit being used also in CAT 4? Would the crown clarify exactly what is "similarly equipped" as this could be understood differently between manufacturers? To negate any confusion a statement issued clearly that the same model number cannot be used twice in response to this document. EG.. TE510ND or TE510N or TE510 or TE510NDT. It must be clear as to which unit will be accepted and which units would NOT be accepted by the crown. If one is used in CAT 1.1 and another in another category would only the second be ineligible?

A6) This has been clarified to say "Offerors are limited to a maximum of one (1) Hardware product per Sub-Category. Also, the same Hardware product, if identically equipped, will not be included in more

---

than one Sub-Category. Furthermore, no more than one (1) Hardware product from any given Manufacturer will be included in one Sub-Category.

Q7) Crown has stated that a "lease" minimum is required of \$25,000 however crown has not stated what the CPP minimum requirement would be? Please specify?

A7) There is no minimum requirement for the Cost per Page (CPP) therefore clients must be able to obtain a cost per page plan even for the purchase of a single device. This is to ensure that there is no dual listing of consumables between the imaging hardware standing offer and the standing offer for imaging consumables. The cost per page plan is the most accurate way to determine the lifetime cost of a device due to the fixed cost per page cost over the lease period. The majority of vendors have advised that they are able to provide a cost per page pricing model for the purchase of even one device. The cost per page plan also results in reduced administrative costs as toners no longer need to be purchased on a regular basis.

Q8) In A2/1 crown states must "exceed" min but does not clarify that there is a maximum speed in each category listed. Please clarify which prevails.

A8) The clause states "All Hardware must meet or exceed the minimum specifications for the Category and Sub-Category." Maximum hardware speeds cannot be exceeded. This is to ensure that the specifications of any product in any given category is similar to the other products in that category.

Q9) In A2/20 "estimated Monthly Print/Copy volumes" are true "estimates". Although some of our products have estimated monthly volumes these are just generic numbers that would offer a generic "average" volume. Our specifications certainly do not list a "maximum" allowed monthly volume such as described. Would the crown please reword this as such? All Hardware as submitted would allow monthly print volumes as stated in Section J5 Annex J. If specifications do not list in accordance to Section J5, Annex J then a letter from the said manufacturer confirming their compliance would be compliant.

A9) The monthly volume capacity of the printer must be entered at "Rated Volume Capacity (pages/month)" on the data entry website and some form of supporting documentation should be provided.

Q10) In A2/20. Would the crown consider just making these monthly volumes a guide in which calculations are made by the government of Canada. Such as your wording used in J5? There is no way to "test" or confirm these numbers from any manufacturer and is simply an estimate based on different coverage's. Making this mandatory specification unrealistic in which to evaluate.

A10) The "duty cycle" specification from the current copiers/MFDs NMSO has been removed in this Imaging Hardware RFSO. The monthly volume specification in the current RFSO is simply the realistic evaluation volumes that we have listed at J5 and should easily be able to be met by all devices in those respective categories.

Q11) In A2 1.2 requirements. Would the crown consider making Envelopes a mandatory paper size in the default configuration? Although most manufacturers have the ability to do Envelopes it can be a

---

costly addition to their base configuration. Many government departments print to Envelopes on a regular basis and this should be included by default as to not misguide clients.

A11) No, this will not be made mandatory. Workgroups that have a specific need to print on envelopes can choose a product that is able to do so either in the base NMSO configuration or through an added option. We have not received much feedback from clients regarding the envelope printing capability of the NMSO configuration of the current printers and photocopiers/MFDs standing offers.

Q12) In A2 1.2 requirements. Would the crown consider as a cost savings to make it mandatory to have separate Toner and drum (separate supplies).? This is a considerable cost savings in the life of the printer when purchasing the hardware.

A12) No, this will not be made mandatory. If products with this separate toner/drum architecture have a lower total cost of ownership, then this savings should be able to pass on to the client through lower prices on the NMSO.

Q13) In A2 1.3 requirements. Would the crown consider making Envelopes a mandatory paper size in the default configuration? Although most manufacturers have the ability to do Envelopes it can be a costly addition to their base configuration. Many government departments print to Envelopes on a regular basis and this should be included by default as to not misguide clients.

A13) No, this will not be made mandatory. Workgroups that have a specific need to print on envelopes can choose a product that is able to do so either in the base NMSO configuration or through an added option. We have not received much feedback from clients regarding the envelope printing capability of the NMSO configuration of the current printers and photocopiers/MFDs standing offers.

Q14) In A2 1.3 requirements. Would the crown consider as a cost savings to make it mandatory to have separate Toner and drum (separate supplies).? This is a considerable cost savings in the life of the printer when purchasing the hardware.

A14) No, this will not be made mandatory. If products with this separate toner/drum architecture have a lower total cost of ownership, then this savings should be able to pass on to the client through lower prices on the NMSO.

Q15) In A2 1.4 requirements. Would the crown consider making Envelopes a mandatory paper size in the default configuration? Although most manufacturers have the ability to do Envelopes it can be a costly addition to their base configuration. Many government departments print to Envelopes on a regular basis and this should be included by default as to not misguide clients.

A15) No, this will not be made mandatory. Workgroups that have a specific need to print on envelopes can choose a product that is able to do so either in the base NMSO configuration or through an added option. We have not received much feedback from clients regarding the envelope printing capability of the NMSO configuration of the current printers and photocopiers/MFDs standing offers.

Q16) In A2 1.4 requirements. Would the crown consider as a cost savings to make it mandatory to have separate Toner and drum (separate supplies).? This is a considerable cost savings in the life of the printer when purchasing the hardware.

---

A16) No, this will not be made mandatory. If products with this separate toner/drum architecture have a lower total cost of ownership, then this savings should be able to pass on to the client through lower prices on the NMSO.

Q17) In A2 2.1 requirements. Since the government of Canada has and is constantly adopting technology that utilizes less power consumption and green initiatives are a constant. There is a standard in the industry called typical electricity consumption or (TEC). Would the crown consider having a Maximum TEC rating in color categories listed? Some products require the technology being used to be on all the time. This although savings might be achievable in overall printer value. Energy consumption is NOT being considered for the crown. Clients can be misled into thinking they are getting value but not understanding that certain products must be left powered on 24/7.

A17) Energy Consumption already forms a part of other mandatory certifications of the hardware such EnergyStar and Ecologo certification. We will not be introducing any additional energy consumption requirements at this time.

Q18) In A2 3.0 - 6. Would the crown consider making it mandatory to have Printing/Copying and Scanning functions included in this MFD category?

A18) All MFD categories already include this mandatory requirement through the following specification: "include printing and copying functionality along with at least one other function from the following: scan to file, scan to e-mail, or faxing."

Q19) In A2 3.0 - 1 The crown is seeking copier technology. It's standard in the industry especially for "workgroup" type network MFD's to include features built in, for Scan to file, scan to email. Would the crown consider making these mandatory requirements?

A19) All MFD categories already include this mandatory requirement through the following specification: "include printing and copying functionality along with at least one other function from the following: scan to file, scan to e-mail, or faxing."

Q20) In A2 3/2 The crown is seeking copier technology. It's standard in the industry especially for "workgroup" type network MFD's to include features built in, for Scan to fax Would the crown consider making these mandatory requirements?

A20) All MFD categories already include this mandatory requirement through the following specification: "include printing and copying functionality along with at least one other function from the following: scan to file, scan to e-mail, or faxing."

Q21) For Category 3 the crown has eliminated "desktop" units through various specifications listed. We have seen some volume done in CAT 3.2 and CAT 3.4 on the current printer NMSO. Would the crown consider making a new category that would include a sub \$500 desktop MFD for clients to purchase or lease on this document? The current specifications for category 3.4 would be a good upgrade to CAT 3.2 but still consider many clients needs for a simple MFD. Please consider making a new category that

---

would include at a minimum the current 3.4 specifications on this New printer/copier document. This is still a good fit for small department groups or individual executive offices. If a new category cannot be achieved would the crown consider moving the output capacity to 150 so that current units would be considered compliant in Cat 3.1.

A21) The output capacity of Category 3.1 has been reduced to 150 pages.

Q22) For Cat 3.1. We do believe that there easily could be two options as listed in above questions. CAT 3.1.1... - Many manufacturers have a true low end copier....letter/legal with built in HDD. Or something simple as above question. If the above is (only if) approved and output capacity is reduced to 150 and another category is in fact created. Would the new category please include a default HDD as mandatory?

A22) A new category will not be created. A hard drive can be listed as an option for any category that does not require it as part of the mandatory specifications.

Q23) Cat 3.2 4 Would the crown consider moving the HDD requirement to an industry standard 80GB?

A23) This change is accepted. The specification is now 80GB

Q24) Cat 3.2 6 Would the crown consider increasing the paper input capacity to at least 1000 pages seeing as though the monthly estimated volumes is 15,000 pages.]

A24) This change has been made and is reflected in the specifications of the re-issued RFSO.

Q25) Cat 3.2 7 Would the crown please insert wording "collating" as an acceptable sorting feature?

A25) The sorting requirement has been removed from all "Letter/Legal" categories.

Q26) Cat 3.3 3 The crown has asked for 512MB default memory. The industry standard in the monochrome space is 256MB but can be upgraded. This is again monochrome (letter legal) only device and would take a considerable amount of print jobs to utilize the extra memory being asked for. Such clients would order an upgrade to the memory. But asking all clients in this category to pay for upgraded memory would be a wasted expenditure for the crown. Would the crown please reduce this requirement to 256MB?

A26) This change has been made and is reflected in the specifications of the re-issued RFSO.

Q27) Cat 3.3 4 Would the crown consider moving the HDD requirement to an industry standard 80GB?

A27) All the HDD requirements have been changed to a minimum of 80GB.

Q28) Cat 3.3 7 Would the crown please insert wording "collating" as an acceptable sorting feature?

A28) The sorting requirement has been removed from all "Letter/Legal" categories.

Q29) CAT 3.4 Through CAT 3.10. Industry reports would state that there are more requirements for the lower speed devices for small and medium departments that the higher speeds shown in these specifications. We would ask the crown to reduce the speed in each category to reflect the industry demand as such. New departments would be more enticed to move to leasing/purchasing lower cost per page "copiers" versus standard printers if the acquisition and lower payments were enticing. Small low speed copiers can achieve good cpp along with low costs. We would recommend the following to be more in line with industry standard low cost units remaining competitive on CPP/Lease and acquisition costs - CAT 3.4 (20-24) CAT 3.5 (25-29) CAT 3.6 (30-34) CAT 3.7 (35-49)

A29) No, smaller low speed categories will not be introduced into the RFSO. The Government of Canada is undertaking a fleet management approach to its acquisition of imaging devices. As a result, there will be a decreased need for small low volume devices and an increased need for larger higher volume devices required to achieve a higher employee to device ratio.

Q30) A2 CAT 4.0 - 1 The crown is seeking copier technology. It's standard in the industry especially for "workgroup" type network MFD's to include features built in, for Scan to file, scan to email. Would the crown consider making these mandatory requirements?

A30) All MFD categories already include this mandatory requirement through the following specification: "include printing and copying functionality along with at least one other function from the following: scan to file, scan to e-mail, or faxing."

Q31) CAT 4.1 1 Would the crown consider moving the speed down to accommodate a simple color MFD that would accommodate a small department workgroup? This is a letter legal category and would be most like current printer category 3.5. Would the crown please move the speed requirements to 25-35 ppm in this category?

A31) We will not be changing the category definitions at this time. The current category definitions already allow manufacturers to represent their range of products. We have consulted the usage statistics from the current printers and photocopiers/MFDs standing offers in determining the categories for this Imaging Hardware standing offer.

Q32) CAT 4.1 3 Would the crown consider moving the RAM requirement to 512MB since this is a color category that requires more memory to process locally?

A32) This change has been made and is reflected in the specifications of the re-issued RFSO.

Q33) CAT 4.1 7 Would the crown change the input requirements to 750 sheets with 3 paper sources?

A33) This change has been made and is reflected in the specifications of the re-issued RFSO.

Q34) Cat 4.1 8 Would the crown change the output requirements to 150 sheets?

A34) This change has been made and is reflected in the specifications of the re-issued RFSO.

---

Q35) Would the crown consider making two separate categories for 4.2 that would include a 35-44ppm and 45+ ppm category for letter/legal only (color)? This would fit with industry standards amongst manufacturers for true A4 copiers.

A35) We will not be changing the category definitions at this time. The current category definitions already allow manufacturers to broadly represent their range of products.

Q36) Tabloid color should also reflect industry driven speeds. Would the crown consider moving speeds on the selected categories (4.3-4.6) (25-34 entry) (35-44) (45-59) and 60+?? Thus allowing full coverage across Small department level to large departmental level ?

Q36) We feel that the current category definitions already allow full coverage across all typical workgroup sizes.

Q37) A.3.1. Security features. Would the crown consider making HDD over write a mandatory feature (default)? Especially since government is very security conscious about information being "available".

A37) No, we will not make this a mandatory requirement. However, vendors can include this as an option or bid it as part of their NMSO configuration with the appropriate description in the data entry website.

Q38) A.3.1. Security features. Would the crown consider Encrypted PDF mandatory feature (default)?

A38) No, we will not make this a mandatory requirement. However, vendors can include this as an option or bid it as part of their NMSO configuration with the appropriate description in the data entry website.

Q39) A.3.1. security features. Would the crown consider AES 256 bit Encryption mandatory default feature?

A39) No, we will not make this a mandatory requirement. However, vendors can include this as an option or bid it as part of their NMSO configuration with the appropriate description in the data entry website.

Q40) A.3.1. Security features. Would the crown consider Pin code release a mandatory default feature?

A40) No, we will not make this a mandatory requirement. However, vendors can include this as an option or bid it as part of their NMSO configuration with the appropriate description in the data entry website.

Q41) A.3.1. Security features. Would the crown consider Print Job Encryption a mandatory default feature?

A41) No, we will not make this a mandatory requirement. However, vendors can include this as an option or bid it as part of their NMSO configuration with the appropriate description in the data entry website.

Q42) Would the crown please grant an extension to this RFSO to allow manufacturers enough time to respond? This is a new document with many changes to the existing procurement systems for both

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EZ107-120003/C

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

002

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

van576

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

EZ107-120003

File No. - N° du dossier

VAN-2-35013

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

---

printer and copier. It will take more time to respond to this document than normal. We ask that another 4 weeks min be granted as soon as possible so that it would close in May instead of April. Government demands in March can also absorb much of our response capabilities. We kindly ask that you consider the respondents limited bandwidth during this period. Your consideration is greatly appreciated and will allow for a better competition considering this may be in place for 3 years.

A42) The closing date of the RFSO has been extended.

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