

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
Quebec
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

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Network and Satellite Services Division / Division des
services de satellite et de réseaux
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
Place du Portage, Phase III, 4C2
Gatineau
Quebec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet ICSS FOR NCR	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 2B0KB-130262/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 009
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20130262	Date 2012-07-06
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$SEO-017-24526	
File No. - N° de dossier 017eo.2B0KB-130262	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2012-07-16	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: St-Onge, Josée	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 017eo
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-0576 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 934-1411
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

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

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT 009

Questions and answers

Question #48:

Regarding the Answer to Question #14: If “each bid will be evaluated separately”, how does Canada reconcile that a single bidder could submit 3 identical proposals to usurp the spirit of the process? Although we fully appreciate that truly Canadian goods and services are important in our nation’s economy, it is a fact that in the high tech industry very little R&D or product manufacturing can be proven to take place within our borders. Furthermore, the form provided is a simple Yes/No checkbox, with no space provided for the analysis described in “Example 2” of the SACC’s Annex: Canadian Content Policy, section 3.6. Will Canada exercise its right, in accordance with the SACC manual, to investigate bidders claims of Canadian Content at the onset of the review process, so that a simple check in a box does not unduly limit her options, and undermine the competitive process?

Answer #48:

Canada maintains the discretion to verify the certifications.

Question #52:

Today’s global supply chains are complex and far reaching. In the event that a product appears from a country other than those identified on the country of origin, will Canada please identify the risk to the bidder? Will future audits be performed, and if so, how will the government determine which standing offer the product was sourced from, and whether or not the bidders will be responsible for replacing the product with a product from an approved country of origin?

Answer #52:

This bid solicitation is intended to result in the award of a contract not a standing offer. Form 7 is a mandatory requirement of this bid solicitation, which means that any bid which does not submit a completed certification will be declared non-responsive. In addition, by signing Form 1 Bidders are certifying that all the information provided in their bid is complete, true and accurate which representation Canada is relying upon.

At Annex A - Statement of Work, Section 24 - Origin of Hardware and Licensed Software is added as follows:

INSERT

(519) All Hardware delivered under this contract must have been designed, assembled and have the integration of sub-assemblies of Hardware and Licensed Software occurred within one or more of the following countries:

Albania	Greece	Portugal
Belgium	Hungary	Romania
Bulgaria	Iceland	Slovakia
Canada	Italy	Slovenia
Croatia	Latvia	Spain
Czech Rep	Lithuania	Turkey
Denmark	Luxembourg	United Kingdom
Estonia	Netherlands	United States
France	Norway	Mexico
Germany	Poland	

Question #65:

We respectfully requested that items (f) Price and Rate Adjustment and (g) Price Protection - Most Favoured Customer be deleted from article 7.8 Payment of this RFP, or that the RFP state that the Most Favoured Customer clause will be exercised only if there is a sole Bidder or only a sole proposal received.

The answer received June 29 was , "No. Both clauses will remain unchanged."

This answer directly contradicts the opening remarks to SACC C0100C (2010-01-11) that state, "Use the following clause in non-competitive contracts for commercial goods and/or services valued over \$50,000 whenever price certification clause C0002T or C0004T or C0006T is used, or when rate certification clause C0600T is used."

The answer also contravenes the agreement reached between PWGSC and ITAC that clauses such as item (f) and (g) would be exercised only if there is a sole Bidder or only a sole proposal received.

We request that items (f) Price and Rate Adjustment and (g) Price Protection - Most Favoured Customer be amended to state that item (f) and (g) will be exercised only if there is a sole Bidder or only a sole proposal received.

Answer #65:

Canada has deleted the (g) Price Protection - Most Favoured Customer clause from the RFP and made some amendments to the (f) Price and Rate Adjustment clause. Please refer to solicitation amendment 008.

Question #66:

19.5 (489) – Question - In a typical well designed network, powered devices, that require 802.3at, are connected to a layer 2 or layer 3 switch, which is interconnected to other network equipment in a manner to provide redundancy and stability not at the voice gateway. Would the Crown consider removing this requirement for voice gateways?

Answer #66:

Canada agrees to remove in Annex A - Statement of Work, line item (489) in its entirety.

At Annex A - Statement of Work, Section 19.5 - Power over Ethernet (PoE) is revised as follows:

DELETE (489) Network Products that specify conformance to Power over Ethernet+ (PoE+) must support the IEEE 802.3at standards and functionality.

Question #67:

19.9 (493) (e) and (f): Question - In reference to section 19.9 (493) (f) as it relates to RFC 6140 support for network products, the registration of multiple phone numbers can be achieved using multiple SIP REGISTER messages. Considering RFC 6140 is recent (March 2011) and a different standards based SIP mechanism is in place to achieve the same result, will Canada consider removing the requirement of RFC 6140?

Answer #67:

Canada modifies Annex A - Statement of Work, line item (493) f) as follows:

(493) f) RFC 6140 - Registration for Multiple Phone Numbers in the Session Initiation Protocol (if available)

At Annex A - Statement of Work, Section 19.9, line item (493), f) is revised as follows:

DELETE f) RFC 6140 - Registration for Multiple Phone Numbers in the Session Initiation Protocol;

INSERT f) RFC 6140 - Registration for Multiple Phone Numbers in the Session Initiation Protocol (if available)

Question #68:

The list of countries of Origin have been expanded to NATO. Australia is not a member of NATO and is a trusted security and military partner of Canada. Is there a particular reason why Australia not an allowed country?

Answer #68:

Bidders should refer to Canada's answer #45 of solicitation amendment 008 for additional details.

Question #69:

There have been a number of NSE procurements issued for VoIP and IP PBX's. None of these procurements restricted a products Origin to a particular set of countries as set forth in this particular solicitation. Would Canada re-consider the its' position of not allowing products from countries other than NATO? The current requirement of NATO countries would allow "suspect" suppliers to assemble products and integrate software in approved countries, meeting the requirements of the solicitation, yet increase the cyber security risk – assembly, integration, etc of systems and subsystems in an approved country does not guaranteed improved cyber security.

Answer #69:

Bidders should refer to Canada's answer #45 of solicitation amendment 008 for additional details.

Question #70:

Could Canada describe the validation and verification process that will be used through the period of the contract to continually validate the origin of products proposed by the bidder?

Answer #70:

Canada has at its disposal several tools and processes to monitor and audit the proposed products for compliance to certification of origin requirements; e.g. vulnerability assessments are but one of many means for Canada to verify compliance of the Contractor-supplied Hardware and Licensed Software.

Question #71:

RFP Part 5 (page 15 of 58) concerns Certifications and requires that, "Compliance with the certifications bidders provide to Canada is subject to verification by Canada during the bid

evaluation period (before award of a contract) and after award of a contract". We have a number of questions with respect to Canadian Content certificates filed with the submitted bids:

- (a) Could you confirm that the evaluators will verify that the Canadian Content certificates filed actually meet the Canadian Content requirements?
- (b) Could you elaborate on the procedure that the evaluators will use to verify compliance with the Canadian Content requirements?
- (c) Could you provide the information that the evaluators will rely on to verify compliance with the Canadian Content requirements?
- (d) Could you provide an indication as to when the evaluators will undertake verification of compliance with Canadian Content requirements? Will the evaluators verify compliance before or after determining whether there are three or more bids with a valid Canadian Content certificate?

Answer #71:

Please refer to answer #48.

Question #72:

RFP Clause 5.6(d) (pg 18 of 58) requires that bidders certify that a minimum of 80% of the total bid price consists of Canadian goods and services. We have a number of questions with respect to this requirement:

- (a) Could you explain procedure that the evaluators will use to confirm that a minimum of 80% of the bid price is made up of Canadian goods and services?
- (b) Could you describe the information that the evaluators will rely on to determine whether 80% of the bid price is made up of Canadian goods and services?
- (c) Could elaborate how the evaluators will verify that the value of the Canadian goods and services component is accurately reflected in the price and has not been inflated so that the bid can be considered to have met the Canadian Content requirement?
- (d) Will the evaluators verify compliance with this specific Canadian Content requirement prior to evaluating the financial bid or will the verification be conducted at the same time as the financial component of the bid is verified?

Answer #72:

Please refer to answer #48.

Question #73:

With a single IP PBX OEM headquartered in Canada there is a possibility a single Canadian based OEM represented in three Canadian Content bids would result in all other bids being eliminated. Will there be oversight to ensure that a single Canadian OEM represented in three Canadian Content bids does not unfairly and eliminate all other bidders from consideration?

Answer #73:

Please refer to answer # 14.

Question #74:

Regarding Proposal reference Solicitation Amendment 007, Answer #17:

Please confirm that only one Form 6A needs to be submitted if one customer reference meets all four mandatory requirements identified in Form 6A.

Answer #74:

Yes, please refer to answer #17 of solicitation amendment 007, Article 3.2 b), iii) - Customer Reference, paragraph 3 which read as follows:

3. The Bidder may reproduce Form 6A and submit as many customer reference names to demonstrate compliance as required, so long as the experience requirements pertaining to the minimum number of user devices per system is met for each mandatory requirement. The Bidder may also use the same customer reference name to demonstrate compliance with more than one mandatory experience requirement, provided that each Form 6A contains only one customer reference name.

Question #75:

Amendment #007 introduced a revised version of Form 6A – Customer Reference Contact Information. With the summer vacation season upon us, it will be difficult to ensure the availability of customer primes to re-sign the new form in time for bid closing. Please confirm that customer references satisfying the requirements of items a) and b) can be submitted using the original version of Form 6A.

Answer #75:

Canada will accept the original version of Form 6A for the Mandatory Experience Requirements A and B only.

Question #76:

Amendment #007 introduced a revised version of Form 6A – Customer Reference Contact Information. Please confirm that the bidder must be the prime contract holder for all referenced projects.

Answer #76:

No, it is not necessary for the Bidder to be the Prime Contract holder for the reference project(s).

Question #77:

Due to the number of questions remaining to be answered and changes to the references required, time is required to review Canada's responses and include in our overall design and solution. A comprehensive understanding of the requirements is vital prior to completing our solution and pricing of the services. In order for industry to incorporate the new information, the solution design, solution rollout, etc, must be revisited requiring further time.

We respectfully request a 6 week extension to August 27, 2012 to complete the fully approved solution along with associated pricing and reference confirmation.

Answer #77:

No. This solicitation has been issued on June 8, 2012 and has already been extended until July 16, 2012.

Question #78:

Canada provided a revised Form 6A (June 29 version) with changes to the table to be completed for the "Confirmation of Bidder Experience for the above requirement" however the Mandatory Experience Requirements C and D contradicts the requirements in the table for C and D. Please confirm which requirements are correct.

Answer #78.

No. There no are contradictions in Form 6A for the Mandatory Experience Requirements C and D. As stated in article 3.2 b), iii) of solicitation amendment 007 for C, the Bidder may submit a combination of customer references to demonstrate that the Bidder has installed a total of 10 VoIP PBX systems. As for D, the Bidder may submit a combination of customer references to demonstrate that the Bidder has installed a total of 5 VoIP PBX systems.

Question #79:

Now that EAL and AS SIP have been removed from the spec for the RFP , there is a huge amount of reworking that is needed to be done to the Bill of Materials ; will the crown please extend the due date for this RFP 2 weeks to enable bidders to provide the best possible technical / services solution at the best possible price ?

Answer #79:

No. Please refer to answer #77.

Question #80:

Upon review of the latest amendment and the potential architecture changes that may be necessary to incorporate into the response as a result, would Canada consider a 2-week extension to the response submission deadline to July 30, 2012?

Answer #80:

No. Please refer to answer #77.