

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. 007 |
| Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20130262 | Date 2012-06-29 |
| GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EO-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 | |
| 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 007

Questions and answers

In accordance with solicitation amendment 003 the deadline for submitting questions or enquiries was June 29, 2012 at noon. Canada makes no commitment to provide answers to questions submitted after June 29, 2012.

Question #17:

Could the Crown please clarify if the references in Form 6 can reflect multiple customers each providing an element of the reference?

Answer #17:

No, please refer to Article 3.2 (b), iii) of the RFP.

At Article 3.2 b), iii) Customer Reference is revised as follows:

DELETE

iii) Customer Reference:

1. The Bidder must provide written customer reference(s) using Form 6A that confirm the requirements listed within that form have been executed by the Bidder. Only one confirmation of each requirement listed in Form 6A is required.
2. The Bidder can submit up to four Form 6A. Each Form 6A can only contain the name of the one customer reference. In the event more than 4 customer references are submitted only the first 4 names will be considered in the evaluation.
3. A bid will be declared non-responsive if confirmation of compliance is not received for all elements identified within the Form 6A.

INSERT

iii) Customer Reference:

1. The Bidder must provide written customer references using Form 6A, confirming that each of

the mandatory experience requirements identified in the form are met.

2. For the requirements described in A and B of the form, they must each be proven through submission of a single customer reference (i.e.: the minimum number of user devices must be demonstrated through work on one VoIP PBX system.) In respect of experience requirements of C and D, a combination of customer references may be submitted to demonstrate compliance to a single mandatory experience requirement.
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.
4. A bid will be declared non-responsive if confirmation of compliance is not received for all four mandatory requirements identified within Form 6A.

At Form 6A - Customer Reference Contact Information is revised as follows:

DELETE

Form 6A - Customer Reference Contact Information

INSERT

Form 6A - Customer Reference Contact Information
(Revised June 29, 2012) on Merx as ATT 6

Question #25:

Form 6A – Customer Reference Contact Information:

Please confirm that, in form 6A Reference Requirement, items A and B are customer-specific and a client reference name is required and that items C and D are corporate-specific and are not

applicable to a single specific client. As such, bidder's are to detail their corporate experience which would potentially include the names of multiple clients.

Answer #25:

No. Please refer to answer #17.

Question #36:

The RFP requires that any Bidder that is not the Software Publisher of all the proprietary software products or components proposed as part of its bid submit proof of the Software Publisher's authorization. The proof of authorization must be signed by the Software Publisher. The RFP also requires that all software be licensed directly by the bidder pursuant to Supplemental General Conditions 4003 and on a "per user" basis. There is no opportunity for a software publisher's license terms to govern the use of its products or be incorporated into the resulting contract (in whole or in part).

After undertaking a detailed review of the RFP, we have concluded that we are unable to authorize potential bidders to sublicense our products pursuant to the terms of the RFP. Doing so would put our intellectual property into jeopardy, as our company's most important assets would not be protected by what we believe are appropriate restrictions on use. Further, doing so would require that we create a customized licensing and pricing model to address the "per user" licensing requirement.

A simple "fix" to these issues would be for the RFP to provide bidders with the option of flowing through to the government a software publisher's standard software license agreement. Alternatively, Shared Services Canada could separately procure the software on which the PBX hardware and services will rely (to the extent that it's commercially available separate from the hardware). This could be accomplished by adding an exclusion from the software requirements for Government Furnished Equipment and then adding a list of GFE that includes the applicable software programs. Doing so would not unlevel the competitive playing field or create impediments to the rollout of the PBX solutions being procured through the RFP. Additionally, it would not preclude Shared Services Canada from obtaining contractual assurances from a bidder with respect to the overall performance of its PBX solutions.

While we recognize that there may be a reluctance to revise the approach to software licensing found in the RFP, we believe that adopting one or both of the fixes identified above would be in the best interests of Shared Services Canada, the clients that it serves and taxpayers. We are of this view because it will allow for maximum price competition among bidders and the greatest access to competing technologies. Additionally, if the current licensing approach is retained, Shared Services Canada may not receive any compliant bids and any compliant bids which are received would not include the widely used products that we publish.

We appreciate the time and effort that Public Works and Government Services Canada and Shared Services Canada will devote to considering this issue and would welcome the opportunity to answer any questions that you may have.

Answer #36:

The answer to question #36 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #37:

After extensive technical review it is clear that this document requires a significant amount of work to ensure that a complete and comprehensive response can be submitted. Given the time of year and the short notice given for the release of this RFP, a number of key staff have been and continue to be involved in other committed projects and/or on vacation. We would therefore request that Canada provide an extension to the closing date to the end of July at the very least in order to ensure that bidders are able to respond effectively.

Answer #37:

The answer to question #37 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #38:

Annex A - Statement of Work, Section 7.2.2 item 248.

Assured Services Session Initiation Protocol (AS-SIP) is a variation on SIP defined by the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) for mission-critical communication. The US DoD and Cdn DND deploy only JITC (Joint Interoperability Test Command) certified systems to ensure the functioning of key operational features. As the AS-SIP standard is a mandatory for the IP PBX proposed, JITC certification would be required. Can Canada please confirm that SOW item (248) and Form 2 item (248) will be updated as follows:

(248) The Network Gateways must support:

- a) Session initiation protocol (SIP); and
- b) Assured services session initiation protocol (AS-SIP).
- c) it must be JITC certified

Answer #38:

The answer to question #38 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #39:

Annex B2 - Installation Services.

Providing a per user price regardless of class of PBX will not necessarily provide best value to Canada. Would Canada please amend the Installation Services pricing tab to allow vendors to provide a per user price for the installation of each of a Class 1, Class 2 and Class 3 PBX?

Answer #39:

The answer to question #39 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #40:

Annex B3 - Moves, Additions and Changes (MACs).

The level of effort for a MAC can vary considerably depending upon the actual tasks that are requested. The Annex B Pricing Tables for MACs requires a Firm Unit Price per MAC thus requiring Bidders to include a level of effort and risk assumption within their price potentially making MACs more expensive. In order to ensure the best value for Canada and provide MAC pricing that reflects Canada's MAC-specific requirement, please revise the Annex B Pricing Tables for MACs to change the pricing from Firm Unit Price per MAC to Firm Hourly Rate?

Answer #40:

The answer to question #40 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #41:

Annex A: Statement of Work, Section 17 –item 443 d).

Our understanding is that Canada will provide the Contractor remote access for all soft MACs. Please confirm.

Answer #41:

The answer to question #41 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #42:

Annex A: Statement of Work, Section 13.1 - item 381.

As this training material is the intellectual property of the Contractor, please confirm Canada will amend item 381 to read “Following this initial training, Canada will have an unlimited right to use and reproduce the training package and will be free to train Canada staff without any limitations or further cost.”

Answer #42:

The answer to question #42 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #43:

Amendment 003, Q&A 9 (Appendix B Security and Privacy Item # 157).

Canada's response stated: “FIPS 140-2 and Common Criteria EAL 1+ validation certificates are mandatory requirements that apply to all IP-enabled Network Products defined in Annex A, sections 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.5.” Please confirm FIPS140-2 Level 1 validation applies to the Contractor's Secure File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site as per Appendix B Security and Privacy Item # 157 a).

Answer #43:

The answer to question #43 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #44:

Due to the size and complexity of the RFP, and the number of questions and clarifications that have been published, we would like to request a five (5) week extension to the current July 16th 2012 closing date. There is a great deal of work required to respond to a proposal of this magnitude, and the additional time is required to properly evaluate the RFP documents / subsequent amendments and prepare a detailed response that meets the RFP requirements.

Answer #44:

The answer to question #44 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #45:

If an OEM manufactures the product in China but the final assembly and integration testing of software is done in Canada does this comply with the requirements of the RFP?

Answer #45:

The answer to question #45 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #46:

With reference to Answer #9, and (Appendix Item #157, SA-13) the "Robustness" specification, the Common Criteria EAL 1+ validation certificate(s).

The only EAL Common Criteria Protection Profile related to VoIP is the "Low Assurance Protection Profile for a Voice over IP Infrastructure, Version 1.1", written in March of 2005. This protection profile does not speak to the modern realities of securing transport or media streams but rather, it provides guidance on such things as voicemail retrieval, set administration, long distance dialing and toll fraud. It adds little value in today's marketplace, is drastically out of date, and in our long history we've not seen it on any other VoIP RFP. EAL certificates are regularly used as a functional testing baseline for many computing systems, however they are neither current with the VoIP state of the art nor complete, in that they do not satisfy secure interoperability testing in a multivendor environment. To date, there is only one manufacturer that has maintained (limited) EAL certifications in their current VoIP product set, and continuing to leave this mandatory requirement in place will ensure that Canada receives only one compliant proposal.

Be that as it may, we understand the need for 3rd party assurance that OEM's are building products that meet the functional security requirements they purport to. A far more relevant and current evaluation program for VoIP would be JITC approval, which is maintained by the US DoD and used by their NATO allies to provide a full-range of equipment that has passed standardized and customized testing, evaluation, and certification. JITC maintains an approved products list with a healthy cross-section of VoIP industry players, and their APL is publicly available. JITC's vision and mission match those of Common Criteria, and go a step further, in that JITC requires proof of multi-vendor interoperability in order to be certified. It is the de-facto standard (not EAL) required of all solutions embraced by American military and security agencies.

Not all Common Criteria certified products are on the JITC APL, and vice-versa. However, as evidenced by the number of VoIP OEMs who have invested in JITC as opposed to CC, it is clearly the certification that matters to the industry.

Lastly, within this RFP, Canada has requested features such as "AS SIP" which have limited civilian appeal, and are currently applicable only in military and public safety settings. By relying on EAL certifications instead of JITC approval, there is a high likelihood that any IP PBX received in response to this NPP would need to be replaced with a JITC certified or RTS compliant LSC in order to be attached to the US DoD's DSN, as EAL/CC in this context is essentially arbitrary.

For these reasons, we strongly recommend Canada remove requirements pertaining to Common Criteria EAL 1+ validation certificate(s).

Answer #46:

The answer to question #46 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #47:

With regard to Q & A #8, and references to items 125, 182 and 239 of subj solicitation, we continue to believe there is a possible miscommunication. While most OEMs in the VoIP and UC industry have incorporated multi-national and multi-lingual localization support, empowering end-users with a choice of language interfaces on their hard set and soft client, no OEM supports an administrator interface with “help text/pages” and “navigation text/controls” in French. In order to ensure compliance with this article, we request that Canada add French and English screen-shots from each MIS tool proposed by bidders to the Form 2 justification template. Alternatively, we respectfully request the subject article be removed.

Answer #47:

The answer to question #47 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

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:

The answer to question #48 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #49:

In question #15, the crown replaced NAFTA countries, and replaced it with NATO, thereby excluding Mexico from the list of accepted Countries of Origin. Would the crown please confirm that Mexico is an accepted Country of Origin for this RFP?

Answer #49:

The answer to question #49 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #50:

With regards to form 7 and the country of origin, the Government of Canada has excluded countries from the approved list that provide low cost supply of products. Would the Government of Canada please explain the rationale behind this limitation as the outcome is a significant increase of cost to the government. Given the amount of product already in the government's voice and data network that is sourced from these lower cost countries, including products from very recent and large contract awards, why is the government now wanting to limit these product sources? The sources of supply for many these products have been approved by many other NATO countries, including the United States Government under their Trade Agreements Act (TAA). In light of this, would the crown add Mexico, Israel, Taiwan, China, and Thailand as approved countries of origin, if not for all products, then by providing waivers on specific products or allow the ability to have a mix of compliant and non compliant percentages per delivered system, in advance of the bid due date?

Answer #50:

The answer to question #50 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #51:

By limiting the countries of origin to NATO countries, the Shared Services Canada has significantly increased its costs. How will Shared Services Canada audit the vendors product lists, and eventual transactions to ensure full and continued compliance, ensuring vendors do not bid and supply product from low cost countries not on the list following contract award?

Answer #51:

The answer to question #51 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

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:

The answer to question #52 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #53:

Given that some answers are still outstanding, with less than 2 weeks to the bid due date, and more questions submitted which will have an impact on the products bid, will the crown please provide a 2 week extension the ICSS RFP bid, to July 30, 2012?

Answer #53:

The answer to question #53 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #54:

Sections 7.2.2 (AS-SIP) and 23.1 (FIPS140-2 and EAL-1) ask for security validations that have historically only ever been required by Canada for secure implementations such as at DND. It is the bidder's understanding that very few vendors could satisfy these requirements, which would seem superfluous for the majority of Canada's sites. If Canada is to expect these certifications as a baseline standard for its future implementations of VoIP then it seems unreasonable not to provide vendors with prior warning and sufficient time to become certified - insisting on these certifications as a mandatory for this vehicle without providing due notice of their necessity would seem to be an exclusive and potentially prejudicial requirement. We would respectfully request that Canada remove these requirements from this procurement and issue a separate RFP, with due notice, for secure sites that may legitimately require these certifications.

Answer #54:

The answer to question #54 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #55:

Annex A: Statement of Work, Section 7.2.2 and Appendix B – Security and Privacy, Section 23.1, Item # 157, SA-13:

Our company is a 100% Canadian owned and based company. Our communications technology partner, is also a Canadian success story. In order to enable us to bid, could the following requirements be removed:

- FIPS 140-2 Level 1
- EAL 1+
- AS-SIP

Answer #55:

The answer to question #55 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #56:

RFP Annex B6, Pricing Workbook Guide; Section 2 .9:

The Pricing Workbook Guide specifies that the Bidder must propose a unique discount (0 to 99%) that will be applied to the price identified in Annex B5 for additional accessories and parts. Should the hardware proposed by the Bidder originate with multiple OEMs (for example one OEM specific to PBX and a second for UPS), a different discount structure for each OEM's parts and accessories would apply.

a) Will Canada consider revising the financial model allowing bidders to quote separate discounts for each OEM's parts and accessories?

Answer #56:

The answer to question #56 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #57:

RFP Annex A: SOW, Appendix C, Section 23.4:

The Vulnerability Assessment and Mitigation paragraph (515) states: ' At any time during the contract period, subject to one day's notice from the technical authority, the contractor must allow Canada to conduct a vulnerability assessment that includes:

- a) the Contractor's access to the network products
- b) assistance for the duration of any onsite portion of vulnerability assessment of at least one technical resource that is familiar with the technical aspects.

Can Canada please clarify 'a)'? Is it a subject to a vulnerability assessment, e.g. to check access control logs, or is it to enable Canada's access to the network to view the Bidder connecting to

the network and performing actions per Canada request (similar to how PCI auditors do their job).

Answer #57:

The answer to question #57 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #58:

RFP Annex A: SOW Section 7.2.2:

Network Gateways, paragraph 245 states "The Network Gateways must support the following network connections:(h) 1000 Base SX transceiver (multimode fibre);(i) 1000 Base LX transceiver (multi-mode / single fiber)"

Network gateways would typically be installed in close proximity network switching equipment and would usually be connected with copper-based Ethernet connections. It seems unlikely that a Network Gateway, as described in the RFP, would require fibre connectivity. Will the crown please remove the requirement for fibre connections on the Network Gateways by removing items h) and i)?

Answer #58:

The answer to question #58 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #59:

RFP Part 3, Section 3.1:

Part 3, item 3.1 Bid Preparation Instructions states that bids should be bounded separately into Section I: Technical Bid, Section II: Financial Bid and Section III: Certifications. However, Part 3, item 3.3 refers to Section III: Financial Bid and item 3.4 refers to Section IV: Certifications. Please confirm that the Government is requesting that the sections be named as per item 3.1 and not as indicated in items 3.3 and 3.4.

Answer #59:

The answer to question #59 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #60:

RFP Annex A: SOW Section 4:

In reference to Annex A, Section 4, Secure File Transfer Protocol (FTP) Site Requirements. It is not clear if Canada wishes to have access to an FTP server over a secured (VPN) access or if they wish to connect to the site via the SSH FTP protocol (SFTP). Both could work but the requirements listed in the RFP are not clear which route is the preferred method of access. SFTP is the cleanest method and will allow Canada to reach the server with a minimum of effort.

Answer #60:

The answer to question #60 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #61:

Amendment 004, Question #25 on RFP Form 6A:

Amendment 004, Question #25: Please confirm that, in form 6A Reference Requirement, items A and B are customer-specific and a client reference name is required and that items C and D are corporate-specific and are not applicable to a single specific client. As such, bidder's are to detail their corporate experience which would potentially include the names of multiple clients.

Answer #61:

Please refer to answer #17 of this solicitation amendment.

Question #62:

RFP Form 6A:

In Form 6A - Customer Reference Contact Information, the second table appears to link requirements (A) and (B) with the word "and" at the end of requirement (A). Since item (A) requires the bidder to have "supplied and installed, for the customer reference, a VoIP PBX (Hardware and Licensed Software) supporting a minimum of 1,000 user devices; and" item B requires "For PBX on-site maintenance in North America for at least 12 consecutive months during the last 24 months".

If the bidder has installed the VoIP PBX for the client in the last 12 months, we cannot have provided at least 12 consecutive months of maintenance for that system. Will the crown please confirm that it is not necessary for a single reference to comply with both (A) and (B) and that these requirements can be satisfied with different references?

Answer #62:

Please refer to answer #17 of this solicitation amendment.

Question #63:

7.2.2 Network Gateways, item (245) sub-item h):

In a typical Network Gateway installation, the gateway is connected by Ethernet (10/100/1000) to one of 3 entities:

- via copper interface to a Session Border Controllers on the network side,
- via copper interface to a Metro Ethernet connection for multiplexed optical transport, or
- via copper interface to LAN equipment.

Since there is no requirement for native fibre media support, will Canada please remove item 245 h)?

Answer #63:

The answer to question #63 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.

Question #64:

7.4 Standard Clauses and Conditions (b) (ii).

Some software publishers find that SACC 4003 (2010/08/16) contravenes their End User License Agreements and as a result threatens their Intellectual Property. As a result this may make some OEM-based solutions non compliant as they rely on the use of such software as the basic operating system on which their IP PBX system operates. We respectfully request Canada amend the RFP to delete 7.4 Standard Clauses and Conditions (b) (ii) as it applies to the ancillary software provided by third party (non-OEM) providers, thus allowing Canada to separately procure the ancillary software on which the VoIP PBX hardware and services will rely (to the extent that it's commercially available separate from the hardware) under existing alternate procurement vehicles.

Answer #64:

The answer to question #64 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment.