

**RETURN BIDS TO:**

**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

**Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions  
- TPSGC**

**11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier**

**Place du Portage, Phase III**

**Core 0A1 / Noyau 0A1**

**Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5**

**Gatineau**

**Québec**

**K1A 0S5**

**Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776**

**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**

Network equipment and services/Equipment de réseau  
et services

Portage III 5C2

11 Laurier Street/11 rue Laurier

Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT SERVICES		
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EN869-055068/E		<b>Date</b> 2013-07-02
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> EN869-055068		<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 004
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 004nes.EN869-055068	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>	
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$NES-004-25964		
<b>Date of Original Request for Standing Offer</b> Date de la demande de l'offre à commandes originale		2013-04-12
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-07-12</b>		<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Stefanski(NES), Michael		<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 004nes
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-0262 ( )		<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-1411
<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>Accusé de réception requis</b>	<b>Yes - Oui</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No - Non</b> <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>		

---

**Revision #004 to the Request for Departmental Individual Standing Offers (DISO for the provision of Networking Infrastructure Management Services (NIMS)**

**This Revision is raised for the following:**

1. To provide answers to bidders questions relating to the RFSO as detailed in Appendix "REV-5".
2. To amend the RFSO as detailed in Appendix "REV-6"

=====

**APPENDIX "REV-5"**

**Question 32:**

Appendix N, Section Change Management, subsection 4.3.1 (paragraph 29)– indicates SORs are initiated by Canada for moves, adds and changes to CE inventory that influence the financial properties or physical location of the CE. Can the Crown confirm if vendors are expected to perform the actual move? If so, can the Crown confirm if the cost of the move is outside the monthly maintenance fee?

**Answer 32:**

No, vendors are not expected to perform the actual move.

**Question 33:**

Appendix T, Green Procurement Baseline questionnaire – In the spirit of the Government of Canada's green procurement initiative will the Crown allow vendors to add a non evaluated option to the pricing for environmental recycling of products at the end of the product life?

**Answer 33:**

No, the requirements in Appendix T remain the same.

**Question 34:**

Part A: RFSO – Bidding Process, Section A.19 Technical Offer (b) indicates the Crown will not accept a list of Authorized Agents or Re-seller who would be authorized by the bidder to act on its behalf for the purposes of receiving call-ups against any resulting DISO(s) for Group C. Can the Crown confirm if they just do not want such a list include in the Technical Offer, or if the Crown will not accept the use of Authorized Agents or Re-sellers to forward call-ups under the DISO to the successful Offer? (Basically

the question is whether Authorized Agents or Re-sellers are allowed under this contract, similar to the way they are allowed under NESS?)

**Answer 34:**

No, the requirement remains the same.

**Question 35:**

Can the Crown confirm if vendors should complete the pricing tables using the only the current posted NESS equipment, or if vendors have NESS equipment waiting to be posted should this equipment also be included in the pricing tables?

**Answer 35:**

The Offeror must complete the pricing tables using only the listed equipment in Appendix P.

**Question 36:**

Can the Crown confirm if a vendor has no software products on the NESS that require maintenance, can the contract terms and conditions relating to software be removed at vendor contract signing?

**Answer 36:**

The NIMS RFSO is not related to the NESS. The requirement remains the same.

**Question 37:**

Part A: RFSO – Bidding Process, Section A.37 Price Protection – Most Favoured Customer/Certification. This section has two terms indicated in bold. One is 'Canadian Public Sector customer'. The second is 'public sector customer'. Can the Crown confirm if the use of the second term 'public sector customer' is restricted to Canada and is not meant to reference public sector customers outside of Canada (for example, public sector in in the USA, Mexico, Europe, Asia, etc..)?

**Answer 37:**

Both terms are to state "Canadian Public Sector Customer".

**Question 38:**

Appendix N Statement of Work, Section 5.1.2 Maximum Time to Replace Service Credit (paragraph 65) & 5.2.2 Maximum Time On-site (paragraph) 74, indicates an additional service credit of 1% for CE's that are affected by the failure to meet SLAs. Will the Crown agree to waive this fee in situations where the network is designed with a single point of failure that impacts the other CE? The vendors are not responsible for network design and single points of failure. Therefore it does not seem reasonable to ask

vendors to provide Service Credits for design that is outside of their control. Alternatively, would the Crown remove the clause?

**Answer 38:**

The failure must reside within the CE or CE components for the service credit to take effect. Please refer to Appendix N section 5.1.1 paragraph 60 and 61.

**Question 39:**

Appendix, Section 5 Maintenance Services (M) (paragraph 49). This section discusses maintenance for CE located in a region covered by a Land Claims Agreement. The Offeror shall notify the appropriate firm (to be identified by the Crown) to perform the maintenance services as the Offered has determined to be required. Can the Crown confirm if the Crown covers the cost of using these 3<sup>rd</sup> parties? If the vendor must cover the cost, does the Crown have any established pricing or cost arrangements with these firms and will the Crown share that information with vendors during the Q7A process? Essentially what protects vendors from unreasonable costs for maintenance on CE in regions covered by CLCA?

**Answer 39:**

All costs related to maintenance on CE shall be covered by the Vendor. The requirement remains unchanged.

**Question 40:**

Part B: Model Standing Offer - The model contract references some SACC clauses that have been updated with more recent versions. At contract signing will the Crown allow vendors to update SACC clauses to current versions?

**Answer 40:**

As this is a refresh of the original RFSO as original SACC clauses must remain the same.

**Question 41:**

Part B: Model Standing Offer, Section B.22 Delivery (a) - indicates a Committed Due Date for provision of services shall not exceed 30 calendar days from the date of call-up. Can the Crown confirm vendors would be correct to interpret provision of services to refer to the start date of the maintenance, not the actual delivery of service? For instance, if a call-up provides for 12 months of maintenance service on a CE, the maintenance must start within 30 days but the vendor is not expected to deliver 12 months of service within 30 days.

**Answer 41:**

Agreed.

**Question 42:**

Part B: Model Standing Offer, Section B.25(a) (i) – indicates the Offer shall be paid in the firm monthly recurring prices subject to downward revision in accordance with paragraph (d) below. There does not appear to be a paragraph (d) further in the section. Is the reference paragraph '(B)'?

**Answer 42:**

**Yes.** Please see the amended NIMS RFSO solicitation document.

**Question 43:**

Part B: Model Standing Offer, Section B.29 Supplemental Invoicing Instructions - part (b) references a certification that includes the legal name, address, and Revenue Canada identifier, (c) or (d) as applicable. Can the Crown confirm if (c) or (d) refers to (iii) or (iv) immediately above?

**Answer 43:**

Yes, it does refer to (iii) or (iv) immediately above.

**Question 44:**

Part B: Model Standing Offer, Section B.30, Insurance, Subsection (iii). Will the Crown waive this requirement, or make it optional on the Crown's request, for vendors who already have this information on file with PWGSC?

**Answer 44:**

This requirement will not be waived. The requirement remains unchanged.

**Question 45:**

Appendix P, Is the Index number a set number (1, 2 , 3 ...) or can the item part number be used instead?

**Answer 45:**

The index number column must remain the same. Please add your part number to the information listed in the model column.

**Question 46:**

Does the PPL refer to the published price of the actual model or does it refer to the base price for the service warranty?

**Answer 46:**

The NIMS PPL only refers to the base price for the service warranty.

**Question 47:**

If the PPL refers to the service warranty, most manufactures do not have a single PPL that would reflect all of the different maintenance plans that have been listed in this RFSO. Usually a different PPL would be available for each of these warranty plans which could then be averaged out over the 12 month period. Would the Crown please provide further clarification on the PPL value?

**Answer 47:**

The Offeror must propose a base price for the service warranty for each device proposed along with associate discounts for each maintenance level. This will provide the monthly reoccurring price for each model.

**Question 48:**

Appendix S, Must a price be entered for every service plan? If the OEM does not offer a particular service plan and the Offeror also does not have the resources to meet a particular service plan and no PPL is available, would this make the proposal non-compliant.

**Answer 48:**

Please refer to Appendix O - Offeror User Guide for NIMS Group C Pricing Workbook

**Question 49:**

Would the Crown amend the pricing schedule to reflect the various regions instead of a single price that would meet all of the locations listed in Appendix S? Some of the locations currently listed in Appendix S would be considered remote by the OEM and pricing for some of the maintenance plans may be more expensive than others. With the current price file only a single price can be submitted for all locations, this may result in a higher price being submitted to help cover locations that may be difficult to provide these services.

**Answer 49:**

No. The requirement remains the same.

**Question 50:**

Would the Crown amend Appendix S to remove some of the requirements or remove some of the locations. Some of these locations are considered remote by our OEM such as Whitehorse and Yellowknife. Being able to submit pricing for all maintenance plans for these locations could be difficult.

**Answer 50:**

No. The requirement remains the same.

**Question 51:**

Is there an option to include additional services at the time of contract or at a later date that don't fit within the current service plans included in the RFSO? This could include options for replacement products such as batteries.

**Answer 51:**

No. The requirement remains the same.

**Question 52:**

Appendix P, can additional models be added for this RFSO? Currently these cells are locked and cannot be modified. Reviewing the products currently listed and some of these are already EOL and do not reflect all of the known product to be used by Shared Service Canada and other government departments.

**Answer 52:**

No. The requirement remains the same.

**Question 53:**

Many federal users have long standing and close working relationship with their NESS agents. In these cases, the NESS agents have a very good understanding of the user's infrastructure, inventory, configurations and on-going requirements. Centralizing all contracts with one vendor would likely compromise such relationships and therefore the successfulness of the users in question. Would you consider a vendor held vehicle with authorized agents for NIMS?

**Answer 53:**

No. The requirement remains the same. The NIMS RFSO is not related to the NESS.

**Question 54:**

Given that we have been available on the NESS contract vehicle via authorized NESS agents from the beginning, many GoC users have developed long standing and close working relationships with their NESS agents. In these cases, the NESS agents have a very good understanding of the user's infrastructure, inventory, configurations and on-going requirements. Centralizing all contracts with one

offeror would likely compromise such relationships and therefore the successfulness of the users in question. Would the Crown consider a vendor held vehicle with named authorized agents for NIMS?

**Answer 54:**

No. The requirement remains the same. The NIMS RFSO is not related to the NESS.

**Question 55:**

Over the years this has proven to be a successful model as it created competition among resellers benefiting government of Canada users (departments). We had to prove and deliver value beyond simply reselling. Should all maintenance contracts be grouped under one reseller this competition will no longer exist and value to the government will be diminished.

Would it be possible for you to consider the same arrangement where a vendor owns the Standing Offer and maintains the authorized agents listed?

**Answer 55:**

No. The requirement remains the same. The NIMS RFSO is not related to the NESS.

**Question 56:**

Is it mandatory to bid a price for each Maintenance Service Plan listed in **Appendix N, Statement of Work Group C – Maintenance Services, Table 2 – Maintenance Service Plans and Service Levels, on page 16 of 22?**

**Answer 56:**

Offerors must provide a PPL base price for each model listed in Appendix P. For further details, please refer to Appendix O - Offeror User Guide for NIMS Group C Pricing Workbook.

**Question 57:**

For completing Appendix P, do we only add the PPL price for the model numbers listed in the Appendix P (in our case, 5 model numbers's were listed by SSC in Appendix P) or do we enter our entire PPL with PPL price (hundreds of items)?

From **Appendix O: Offeror User Guide for NIMS Group C Pricing Workbook, Section 1.3 workbook Structure, 1.3.0.3 i) a):**

“Appendix P1: Pricing sheet for Maintenance Services(reference Section 2.2 ) in which the Offeror manually inputs its Product Price List (PPL) in each Controlled Entity (CE) Class for **each model listed**, and its associated percent change from PPL for each Maintenance Level”

Our interpretation of the above line is that we only enter the PPL price for the 5 model numbers that were listed in Appendix P.



**Answer 57:**

Yes. Confirmed.

**Question 58:**

As of Monday, May 6, no amendments containing bidder questions and answers have been released. We have a number of outstanding questions (including requests for missing documentation) that could have a significant impact on our proposed offering. Therefore, we are requesting that the closing date of the solicitation be extended from May 27th to June 3<sup>rd</sup> to allow bidders an appropriate amount of time to assess the impact of the Q&A once they are released.

**Answer 58:**

The closing date has been extended to July 12, 2013.

**Question 59:**

Since the OEMs published price list is in US dollars and we must provide a PPL price in Canadian dollars in Appendix P, should we be using the PPL price that is listed on the NESS NMSO?

**Answer 59:**

The requirement remains the same. The NIMS RFSO is not related to the NESS.

**Question 60:**

Other NMSO's like the NESS NMSO have provisions that allow for a yearly update of the exchange rate used if the offer is based on a US PPL. Is there such a provision with the NIMS RFSO EN869-055068/E so that we can adjust the Canadian price accordingly if there are exchange rate fluctuations?

**Answer 60:**

There are no such provisions. The requirement remains unchanged.

**Question 61:**

In Appendix N-SOW, there are different Controlled Entity Classes listed in section 2.1. "Appendix P - Pricing Workbook for NIMS Group C" have tabs for the following 3 controlled entity classes:

- a. MFD
- b. Security
- c. Specialized

Are we to bid for all 3 controlled entity classes (ie. complete all the tabs) or only bid the controlled entity class that SSC has pre-populated with product part numbers? In our case, SSC has included 5 part numbers for the Security Controlled Entity Class (P1-Security and P2-Security tabs in the spreadsheet)

### Answer 61:

The Offeror must only bid CE classes that have been pre-populated with product models in Appendix P. Please refer to revised Appendix P for each OEM.

### Question 62:

In section 5.1 Replacement Maintenance Plan (58) it is states that the Offeror shall develop and implement a process that tracks the shipment to Canada and that enables and authorizes Canada to return defective product(s) through the Offeror at the offeror's own expense.

Within the RFSO section B.25 Basis of Payment subsection (d) Transportation Changes: (A) &(B) it states;

(A) The Crown shall bear the transportation costs of Controlled Entities (CEs) From the Crown's site to the offeror's designated maintenance service depot.

(B) The Offeror shall paid the transportation changes of CEs from the offeror's designated maintenance service depot to any Crown's site in Canada.

We request clarification as to which section is applicable to replacement Maintenance transportation Charges.

### Answer 62:

RFSO article B.25 (d) (i) refers to replacement and on-site maintenance transportation charges. The prices and rates include all transportation charges to any sites in Canada for all services provided for Group C, except for the Return to Depot. Article B.25 (d) (ii) (A) and (B) refers to transportation charges for Return to Depot Maintenance Plan.

### Question 63:

In consideration of the newly revised Appendixes and there is more Q&A in process will the Crown extend the RFSO response due date by two weeks?

### Answer 63:

The closing date has been extended to July 12, 2013.

### Question 64:

In the past the Crown has allowed Agents to be added to DISOs. For the Infrastructure Management Services will the Crown allow Offerors the option of including a section to the DISO for Agents, so long as those clauses are approved by the Crown?

**Answer 64:**

No. The requirement remains the same.

**Question 65:**

In Amendment 001, Question #25 the Crown clarified that moves, adds are not part of the maintenance services. To provide SSC the option to support this type of work will the Crown allow Offerors the option to add standard PWGSC clauses for a Task Authorization or Request Under Contract (ROCs) in support of the products covered by the DISO?

**Answer 65:**

No. The requirement remains the same.

**Question 66:**

SOW, Section 4 Service Management Plan, item (15) iii); The Crown has indicated that the Contractor will be required to provide a Service Portal, however Table 1 item (16) indicates that no Service Portal is required (as it is not checked). Our understanding is that the Service Portal is the OEM-provided Service Portal to be accessed directly by SSC for any Maintenance and Product-related information for that specific OEM. Please confirm.

**Answer 66:**

No. The crown has only requested Offerors to provide web browser access to a service portal.

**Question 67:**

Section 4 Service Management Plan, item (15) iii); The Crown has indicated that Contractor will be required to provide a Service Portal. Can the Crown please confirm how the Contractor can provide this capability is available and validate the functionality of the Service Portal. We recommend that the Crown include as a requirement a Proof of Concept demonstration that shows the following capability:

1. Secure Access and Sign-on
2. Documentation Storage / Repository

### 3. Inventory Management System

### 4. Reporting Functionality as outlined in Section 4.5.1 Monthly Maintenance Report

#### **Answer 67:**

No. The crown has only requested Offerors to provide web browser access to a service portal.

#### **Question 68:**

Amendment 001, Q&A #7: The Crown has deleted Appendix M - Volumetric Data from the RFSO. This information is critical for Bidders to build their financial model and ensure the best price to SSC and the Partners it represents. In addition, there are a number of OEMs that will be bidding exclusively through a single re-seller. As the OEMs are not able to share the Crown's proprietary inventory, this creates an unfair advantage over other Bidders wishing to bid on certain OEM groups. To ensure fair and transparent procurement, please release the Current State information.

#### **Answer 68:**

No. This requirement remains unchanged.

#### **Question 69:**

Please provide the current SMPs (e.g. Replacement Maintenance, Onsite Maintenance, Return to Depot) and level for each of the devices currently in service, by location. This will allow Bidders to properly assess the maintenance requirement. Unless you are the OEM, Bidders will assume the worst case scenario for each SMP listed in Appendix R and build in the appropriate contingency and cost. To ensure the best value to SSC, please provide this critical information.

#### **Answer 69:**

No. This requirement remains unchanged.

#### **Question 70:**

Section 4.1.1 Service Manager; Please confirm the number of SSC Service Managers that will be working on NIMS with the Offeror and also confirm that these Service Managers will be located in the National Capital Region? This will provide Bidders with an understanding of the potential volumes and frequencies to cost into their solutions which will ensure best value to the Crown.

#### **Answer 70:**

No information about NIMS service managers is available at this time.

**Question 71:**

Section 4.1.1 Service Manager requires the Offeror to provide a Service Manager who fulfills a variety of functions, including acting as a single point of contact, managing procurement and delivery of services and ensuring service quality and process improvement. In order to ensure that Canada receives a qualified resource who is familiar with the Federal Government environment and is capable of fulfilling these requirements, it has been our experience that such resources require a minimum of 5 years experience acting as a maintenance Service Manager supporting Government Contracts. Would Canada please confirm that the Offeror must provide this resource directly (not as a sub-contractor) to ensure such resource is directly engaged and accountable and that the resource must meet the minimum years of experience requirement? To ensure the Crown receives the appropriate competency, will the Crown please include the following requirement in Section 4.1.1:

• *The Service Manager must possess a minimum of 5 years experience acting as a maintenance Service Manager supporting Government Contracts for the Offeror. As part of their RFSO responses, the Bidder must provide a copy of the proposed Service Manager's resume.*

**Answer 71:**

This requirement remains unchanged.

**Question 72:**

Would Canada confirm how an "End of Life" Equipment renewal is currently handled within the NIMS group C? For example, if certain equipment listed is now end-of-life and the OEM no longer supports such equipment, will SSC confirm it will either: (i) replace or upgrade the equipment; (ii) remove such equipment from the list; or (iii) retain equipment on the list but require maintenance on a best efforts basis only such that service levels do not apply to such equipment. Would Canada also confirm the process for the Offeror to inform SSC of end-of-life equipment?

**Answer 72:**

For "End of Life" equipment, maintenance services will terminate on the End-of-Support date or on the end of the maintenance contract whichever comes first. Equipment that has reached its end of support date must be removed from the Offeror's PPL.

**Question 73:**

Section 4.3.1.1 Service Order Acceptance; Our understanding is that SSC will issue a Service Order when the end Partner moves, adds, deletes or changes a piece of equipment or software. Please confirm.

**Answer 73:**

Yes. Confirmed.

#### Question 74:

Section 4.3.1.1 Service Order Acceptance; in the event that SSC fails to issue a Service Order to the Contractor for a piece of equipment or software that has been changed or moved, the Contractor cannot be accountable to provide the associated SMP and, as such, would be accountable for any related SLAs (see 5.1.1 and 5.2.1). Please confirm.

#### Answer 74:

Yes. Confirmed.

#### Question 75:

RFSO, Section B.18 Reports on Usage; In order to provide maximum value to SSC and its Partners who will utilize this contracting vehicle, would Canada revise section B.18 in the Model Standing Offer to specify that the Bidder must provide monthly usage reports in EXCEL format.

#### Answer 75:

SEE Appendix REV 6 below.

#### Question 76:

RFSO General; In order for an Avaya device to be supported under this NIMS Group C (that includes Avaya in the list of OEMS to be supported), our understanding is that the Avaya devices must contain an Avaya label (permanently engraved) and/or be branded "Avaya" on the device. All other Nortel labeled (permanently engraved) or branded Nortel devices would be supported under a separate stream under NIMS Group C specific to Nortel. Please confirm.

#### Answer 76:

Yes. Confirmed.

#### Question 77:

SOW Section 4.5.1 of the SOW requires the Offeror to provide Monthly maintenance reports where the MTR and MTO Service Levels were missed. Please confirm that these reports must be in EXCEL format and must include at minimum the following:

1. Service Management Plan

2. Date of Occurrence

3. Time to Resolve the reported Maintenance Issue

4. Site Location

5. Monthly Billing

6. Total Service Credit

**Answer 77:**

A report format will be discussed and agreed upon contract award.

**Question 78:**

Does Canada have any mandatory requirement in the Technical Response that the Offeror is able to provide references to demonstrate the history and successful delivery of maintenance on a national basis for the OEM products for which they are submitting an Appendix P response?

**Answer 78:**

This is not a requirement of the NIMS solicitation

**Question 79:**

**Section 3: Evaluation Methodology A.28 Conduct of Evaluation (c)** conduct a survey of the offeror's facilities or its technical capabilities to determine if they are adequate to meet the requirements of this solicitation;

will Canada be implementing a Mandatory (M) requirement that the offeror provided proof of these capabilities within their bid submission.

In reference to **appendix P: Pricing Workbook for NIMS Group C for Avaya Networks**. We are not able to enter values within the spreadsheet. Will an update spreadsheet be provided?

**Answer 79:**

See the latest revision of the Appendix P provided in Amendment 003. Appendix P excel fields have been unlocked in latest revision.

**Question 80:**

How many Offerors will the Crown select, per manufacturer, for each DISO ?

**Answer 80:**

---

The crown will only select one compliant Offeror per manufacturer.

**Question 81:**

In appendix N, Statement of Work, article 13, the offeror is being asked to respond to maintenance dispatch service requests initiated by a client or other identified service provider. However in article 16, Table 1 – Service Management Plan C1, incident management is not included in the service management plan. Can Canada confirm that incident management is not required and delete article 13?

**Answer 81:**

See the revised Appendix N provided with solicitation Amendment 002.

**Question 82:**

In appendix N, article 16, Table 1 – Service Management Plan C1 the incident management is not required as per the service management plan. As Incident management is not required can Canada remove article B.30 credits for non performance by the offeror in the standing offer and also modify article 5.1.2 and 5.2.2 in appendix N to reflect service level objectives?

**Answer 82:**

See the revised Appendix N provided with solicitation Amendment 002.

**Question 83:**

We are requesting that the due date for NIMS be extended. We appreciate your help in this manner.

**Answer 83:**

The closing date has been extended to July 12, 2013.

**Question 84:**

Given the complexity of this RFP in regards to partnership, subcontracting arrangements as well as OEM certifications, the timeline provided in the RFP schedule is not sufficient to provide a detailed and complete response. We respectfully request an extension to the closing date of two (2) weeks in order to provide a complete and compliant response.

**Answer 84:**

The closing date has been extended to July 12, 2013.



**Question 85:**

The Draft model contract, Section B.17 describes the Call Up Process a Limitations. Under the contract does the vendor have the option to decline a Call Up?

**Answer 85:**

No, this requirement remains unchanged.

**Question 86:**

Appendix N, Section 5 Maintenance Services paragraph (48) indicates the Offeror shall at a minimum provide the OMP-6/OMPUW-6, RMP-6 and DMP-1 Maintenance Service Plans for any service location that is not identified in Appendix S. If there is a location in Canada that is so remote or difficult to reach, does the vendor have the option of not offering service at that site, if the issues are reasonable and know in advance? (For instance, a network switch on board a coast guard ship in the high artic would make any OMP service impossible).

**Answer 86:**

No, this requirement remains unchanged.

**Question 87:**

We have been checking buyandsell.gc.ca frequently, watching for updates/amendments to the NIMS RFSO but there hasn't been an update since Amendment 002.

We understand that there will be new Excel spreadsheets to work with and a possible extension. We are trying to plan the proper level of effort and timing to complete.

Could you let us know if there has been an amendment (perhaps we're looking in the wrong file!) or if one is expected soon?

**Answer 87:**

Solicitation Amendment 003 was released on Thursday June 15, 2013. The closing date has been extended to July 12, 2013.

**Question 88:**

There are questions that have not yet been answered and we need to final documents for printing. If a change in due date is coming we will hold off.

**Answer 88:**

The closing date has been extended to July 12, 2013.

**Question 89:**

Since the amendment has not been released and only three business days before the due date, would the Crown extend the due date to July 12<sup>th</sup>.

**Answer 89:**

The closing date has been extended to July 12, 2013.

=====

**APPENDIX "REV-6"**

**1. At B.18 Reports of Usage, paragraph (a) (i)**

**DELETE:** A report summarizing the overall Standing Offer Activity. This report shall be in table format and include as a minimum the call-up number, the Client name, the call-up date, the equipment/services ordered with a reference to the DISO sub-category and the total call-up value.

**INSERT:** A report summarizing the overall Standing Offer Activity. This report shall be in **Excel format with** table format include as a minimum the call-up number, the Client name, the call-up date, the equipment/services ordered with a reference to the DISO sub-category and the total call-up value.

**2. At B.25 Basis of Payment, (a) For NIMS Group C, (i)**

**DELETE:** For the provision of Maintenance services for the Controlled Entities identified in Appendix P, the Offeror shall be paid the firm current monthly recurring prices subject to downward revision in accordance with paragraph **(d)** below.

**INSERT:** For the provision of Maintenance services for the Controlled Entities identified in Appendix P, the Offeror shall be paid the firm current monthly recurring prices subject to downward revision in accordance with paragraph **(B)** below.