

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. 008
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20130262	Date 2012-07-05
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 008

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.

Please note that outstanding questions #48 and 52 will be answered in the next solicitation amendment

The answer to question 33 of solicitation amendment 006 has been amended as follows:

At Article 7.8 - Payment, paragraphs (f) and (g) are revised as follows:

DELETE (f) Price and Rate Adjustment in its entirety.

INSERT (f) Price and Rate Adjustment

The firm prices stipulated in Annex B1 - Master Price List and Annex B5 - Published Price List (PPL) for accessories and parts are subject to downward revision in accordance with the following subsections:

- (i) During the Contract Period if a price or rate decrease is published or publicly announced, the Contractor will provide the benefit of such decrease to Canada.
- (ii) During the Contract Period where in accordance with (i) the Contractor is required to reduce the prices or rates listed in Annex B1 and/or Annex B5, it will immediately send a notification to the Contracting Authority to reflect such a price reduction.
- (iii) The Contractor acknowledges and agrees that Canada reserves the right to accept or reject any proposed price or rate revision under this Article and that no such revision will come into effect until formally authorized in writing by the Contracting Authority.

-
- (iv) The firm current prices and rates will not exceed the lower of:
- (A) the unit prices detailed in Annex B1 and/or Annex B5; and
 - B) the unit price after deduction of the published or publicly announced price decrease.

DELETE

- (g) Price Protection - Most Favoured Customer in its entirety.

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, Share 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:

Bidders should refer to Standard Acquisition Clauses and Conditions (SACC) Manual, Supplemental General Conditions 4003 which details the specific conditions applicable to Licensed Software. Based on those conditions, the wording in the RFP will remain unchanged

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:

No, the closing date will remain July 16, 2012 at 2:00 pm EDT

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 content of line item 248 will remain unchanged.

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:

No, the content in Annex B2 - Installation Services will remain unchanged.

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:

No, the content in Annex B - Pricing Tables for MACs will remain unchanged.

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:

For the purpose of completed their submission, bidders must assume that all MAC activities must be conducted on-site. Bidders should refer to line items (334) and (335) of Annex A - Statement of Work for additional information.

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:

Canada will modify Annex A - Statement of Work, line item (381) to read as follows:

(381) 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.

At Annex A - Statement of Work, Section 13 - Information System Training, sub-section 13.1 General Requirements, line item (381) is revised as follows:

DELETE

(381) Following this initial training, Canada will own all rights to the training packages and will be free to train Canada staff without any limitations or further cost.

INSERT

(381) 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.

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:

FIPS140-2 Level 1 validation certificates applies to the Contractor's Secure File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site as per Appendix B Security and Privacy Item # 157 a).

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:

Please refer to answer #37.

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:

Components can be manufactured outside the list of specified countries; however, the design, assembly and integration of sub-assemblies of the information system must occur within the countries indicated in Form 7

At Form 7 - Certification for Origin of Hardware and Software form is revised as follows:

DELETE

Form 7 - Certification for Origin of Hardware and Software form

INSERT

Form 7 - Certification for Origin of Hardware and Licensed Software form (Revised July 4, 2012) on Merx as ATT 7

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:

Canada will remove the requirements for Common Criteria EAL 1+. Annex A - Statement of Work, Appendix B, item #157 will be as follows:

157	SA-13	Robustness (trustworthiness)	The Contractor must provide FIPS 140-2 Level 1 validation certificate(s) for each module required to support the cryptographic requirements and the Contractor's File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site.
-----	-------	---------------------------------	---

At Annex A - Statement of Work, Appendix B - Security and Privacy , item #157 is revised as follows:

DELETE

157	SA-13	Robustness (trustworthiness)	<p>a) The Contractor must provide FIPS 140-2 Level 1 validation certificate(s) for each module required to support the cryptographic requirements and the Contractor's File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site.</p> <p>(b) The Contractor must provide Common Criteria EAL 1+ validation certificate(s) for all IP-enabled Network Products.</p>
-----	-------	---------------------------------	--

INSERT

157	SA-13	Robustness (trustworthiness)	The Contractor must provide FIPS 140-2 Level 1 validation certificate(s) for each module required to support the cryptographic requirements and the Contractor's File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site.
-----	-------	---------------------------------	---

At Form 2 - Substantiation of technical compliance form is revised as follows:

DELETE

Form 2 - Substantiation of technical compliance form

INSERT

Form 2 - Substantiation of technical compliance form
(Revised July 4, 2012) on Merx as ATT 7

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:

For Annex A - Statement of Work, line items (125), (182) and (239), Canada agrees to remove the requirement for the PBX to support MIS administrator interfaces (help text/pages, navigation text/controls) in French.

The line items will be changed to read as follows:

(125): The Class 1 PBX MIS administrator interface (help text/pages, navigation text/controls) must be presented in English.

(182): The Class 2 PBX MIS administrator interface (help text/pages, navigation text/controls) must be presented in English.

(239): The Class 3 PBX MIS administrator interface (help text/pages, navigation text/controls) must be presented in English.

At Annex A - Statement of Work, Section 7.1.1.3 - Class 1 PBX -Management Information System (MIS) is revised as follows:

DELETE

(125) The Class 1 PBX MIS administrator interface (help text/pages, navigation text/controls) must be in the language preference specified by the MIS administrator (French or English).

INSERT

(125) The Class 1 PBX MIS administrator interface (help text/pages, navigation text/controls) must be presented in English.

At Annex A - Statement of Work, Section 7.1.2.3 -Class 2 PBX - Management Information System (MIS) is revised as follows:

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| DELETE | (182) The Class 2 PBX MIS administrator interface (help text/pages, navigation text/controls) must be in the language preference specified by the MIS administrator (French or English). |
| INSERT | (182) The Class 2 PBX MIS administrator interface (help text/pages, navigation text/controls) must be presented in English. |

At Annex A - Statement of Work, Section 7.1.3.3 - Class 3 PBX - Management Information System (MIS) is revised as follows:

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| DELETE | (239) The Class 3 PBX MIS administrator interface (help text/pages, navigation text/controls) must be in the language preference specified by the MIS administrator (French or English). |
| INSERT | (239) The Class 3 PBX MIS administrator interface (help text/pages, navigation text/controls) must be presented in English. |

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:

Bidders should refer to answer #45 for more additional details.

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 rational 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:

Bidders should refer to answer #45 for more additional details.

Question #51:

By limiting the countries of origin to NATO countries, the Shared Services Canada has significantly increased it's 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:

Bidders should refer to answer #45 for more additional details.

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:

Please refer to answer #37.

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:

Canada will remove the requirements for AS SIP and for EAL 1+ as follows:

- i) For EAL 1+, Bidders should refer to Canada's answer # 46;
- ii) For AS-SIP, Canada modifies Annex A- Statement of Work, line item (248) to read as follows:

(248) The Network Gateways must support Session initiation protocol (SIP).

All requirements for FIPS 140-2 Level 1 will remain unchanged.

At Annex A - Statement of Work, Section 7.2 Gateway Network Products (Gateways), sub-section 7.2.2 Network Gateways, line item (248) is revised as follows:

DELETE

- (248) The Network Gateways must support:
- a) Session initiation protocol (SIP); and
 - b) Assured services session initiation protocol (AS-SIP).

INSERT

- (248) The Network Gateways must support Session initiation protocol (SIP).

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:

Bidders should refer to Canada's answers #46 and #54 for additional details.

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 wording in the Pricing Workbook will remain unchanged.

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:

Bidders should refer to Annex A - Statement of work, line item (69) for the scope of "Network Products" as the wording in Annex A, Appendix C, Section 23.4, line item (515) a) specifically reads as follows:

a) The Contractor's access(es) to the Network Products; and

Canada's vulnerability assessments will evaluate the information system for potential vulnerabilities including both of those identified by the bidder in Question #57.

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:

Canada agrees to remove requirement in Annex A - Statement of Work, line item 245 h). Annex A - Statement of Work, line item 245 i) was removed from RFP in solicitation amendment 003, Answer 6.

At Annex A - Statement of Work, Section 7.2.2 Network Gateways is revised as follows:

DELETE

- (245) The Network Gateways must support the following network connections:
- a) Ethernet as per IEEE 802.3 at 10 / 100 Mbps;
 - b) Gigabit Ethernet as per IEEE 802.3ab and IEEE 802.3z at 1000 Mbps;
 - c) Full duplex Ethernet flow control as per IEEE 802.3x;
 - d) VLAN tagging as per IEEE 802.1q;
 - e) 10 Base-T (category 5e UTP, RJ-45 interface);
 - f) 100 Base-TX (category 5e UTP, two pair, RJ-45 interface);
 - g) 1000 Base-T (category 5e UTP, balanced four pair); and
 - h) 1000 Base SX (multimode fibre).

INSERT

- (245) The Network Gateways must support the following network connections:
- a) Ethernet as per IEEE 802.3 at 10 / 100 Mbps;
 - b) Gigabit Ethernet as per IEEE 802.3ab and IEEE 802.3z at 1000 Mbps;
 - c) Full duplex Ethernet flow control as per IEEE 802.3x;
 - d) VLAN tagging as per IEEE 802.1q;
 - e) 10 Base-T (category 5e UTP, RJ-45 interface);
 - f) 100 Base-TX (category 5e UTP, two pair, RJ-45 interface);
 - g) 1000 Base-T (category 5e UTP, balanced four pair).

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:

Correct. As per Part 3, Article 3.1 - Bid Preparation Instructions, Canada requests that Bidders provide their bid separately into Section I: Technical Bid, Section II: Financial Bid and Section III: Certifications.

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:

Bidders can select the design the access methodology and deploy the secure FTP site that best suits their environment. In all cases, the FTP site must meet all requirements listed in Annex A - Statement of Work, Section 4, line items (42) to (46).

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:

Bidders should refer to Canada's answer #58 for additional details.

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 Supplemental General Conditions 4003 (2010/08/16) - Licensed Software will not be deleted from the RFP.