Public Works and Government Services Canada

Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada

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

Title - Sujet	
GCDOCS MIGRATION TOOL	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation	**Amendment No. - N° modif.**
EN869-141670/A	007
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client	**Date**
20141670	2014-09-12
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG	
PW-$EEM-006-27829	
File No. - N° de dossier	**CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME**
006eem.EN869-141670	

Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin
at - à **02:00 PM**
on - le **2014-10-06**

Time Zone
Fuseau horaire
Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT

F.O.B. - F.A.B.
Plant-Usine: ☐ **Destination:** ☐ **Other-Autre:** ☐

Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:	**Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur**
Quenville, Elizabeth	006eem
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone	**FAX No. - N° de FAX**
(613) 937-2727 ( )	( ) -

Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:
Destination - des biens, services et construction:

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

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**

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Mainframe & Business Software Procurement Division / Div des achats des ordi principaux et des logiciels de gestion
11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier
4C1, Place du Portage III
Gatineau
Quebec
K1A 0S5

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation	Amd. No. - N° de la modif.	Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
EN869-141670/A	007	006eem
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client	File No. - N° du dossier	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME
20141670	006eemEN869-141670	

Amendment No. 007
Solicitation No. EN869-141670/A
Occupational Safety and Health E-Learning Solution (OSHELS)

The purpose of this amendment is to:

1) respond to questions relating to this bid solicitation as detailed in Section A; and,
2) to modify the Bid Solicitation, as detailed in Section B.

SECTION A - QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

#	Question	Answer
44	Ref: Bid Solicitation, General: Our proposed solution is available in both French and English which respects the Government of Canada policies and standards. We would like to request an inclusion of a bilingual mandatory requirement.	Given the intended users of this solution, Section 7.2 in the RFP appropriately states that the subscription software must be delivered in English.
45	Ref: Bid Solicitation, Annex A, Statement of Requirements, Mandatory Requirement M-10 and Rated Requirement R-6: M-10 and R-6 specify that source documents are to be marked as being transferred. Given that the sources (eDocs and filesystems) have different interfaces and schemas, where shall these marks be applied? What are the circumstances under which the content would be copied and not moved? .	Marks are used to avoid interference with the file name or its location in order to preserve possible links to the file that's been migrated. i) Solution marks on the source documents must permit links to the document from other documents to continue to work. For instance, document 1 contains embedded links to document 2. Document 2 is migrated, document 1 is not going to be migrated for another 3 months. The links from document 1 to document 2 will continue to work, although document 1 might no longer be updated. To do this, document properties on the file system could include metadata which identifies the **document as being migrated.** PWGSC does not want to be prescriptive in its approach and leaves it up to the Bidder/Software Publisher to determine how to mark the file in a way that it is easy to identify which files have been migrated.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation	Amd. No. - N° de la modif.	Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
EN869-141670/A	007	006eem
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client	File No. - N° du dossier	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME
20141670	006eemEN869-141670	

		(ii) Circumstances under which documents are copied rather than moved are not yet fully defined—this requirement has been added to ensure that the solution is able to perform this activity should the need arise.
46	Ref: Bid Solicitation, Annex A, Statement of Requirements, Rated Requirement R-5: R-5 specifies that link reassignment is a requirement. Can you please elaborate on the addressing scheme to be used for the reassigned links? Are the new links to be absolute or relative? Are they to conform to RFC3986 (or related standards)? What set of file formats is to be supported for rewriting? How does this rewriting affect the versioning scheme? How does this rewriting affect the forensic requirements for ATIP and future eDiscovery requirements? When the target of a rewrite is also the subject of a deduplication, how is the Record-of-Reference to be resolved?	The links must maintain the scheme/format as contained in the source repository. Links will not be reassigned. As per Soliciation Amendment 7, modification number 1, below, R-5 has been modified to replace the word "re-construct" with "preserve". Please see Solicitation Amendment 7, modification number 1, below.
47	Ref: Bid Solicitation, Annex A, Statement of Requirements, Rated Requirement R-8: R-8 specifies that the solution shall make changes to the access controls of migrated documents in the source repositories. As such changes also represent "modification" according to the semantics of the source systems, how should modification dates be treated in the source systems? Is the expected behaviour that the modification dates in the source systems show modifications *after* those in the destination system? .	It is acceptable that the modification dates in the source systems show modifications after those in the destination system.
48	Ref: Bid Solicitation, Annex A, Statement of Requirements, Rated Requirement R-10: R-10 specifies that migrated files should leave behind forwarding stubs. In what format should the stubs be presented? Which addressing scheme should they use? What is the desired behaviour when the format of the replacement stub is different from the format of the original file? Will they comply with RFC 3986 and its related standards?	PWGSC is not prescriptive in the method used to meet the requirement. Flexibility is given to the Bidder to demonstrate in what format the stubs are present by the proposed Solution. Documents are migrated to GCDOCS therefore the stubs must contain a reference to the GCDOCS object. For example: https://gcdocs.gc.ca/tpsgc-pwgsc/llisapi.dll?func=ll&objaction=download&objid=1218765 or https://gcdocs.gc.ca/tpsgc-pwgsc/llisapi.dll?func=Edit.Edit&nodeid=1218765

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation	Amd. No. - N° de la modif.	Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
EN869-141670/A	007	006eem
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client	File No. - N° du dossier	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME
20141670	006eemEN869-141670	

		The stub generated by the solution should be similar to a Windows Internet Shortcut allowing someone to click on the stub which starts the browser which in turn and opens the GCDOCS document.
49	Ref: Bid Solicitation, Annex A, Statement of Requirements, Mandatory Requirement M-15 and Rated Requirement R-13: M-15 and R-13 assume that the writing of scripts is a necessary function of the analyst - this may not be the case with <u>all</u> solutions, will Canada withdraw this requirement?	This requirement remains as the writing of scripts demonstrates the analysts ability to create an automated series of instructions that are carried out to meet a specific business rule or need.
50	Ref: Bid Solicitation, General: We recommend that the provision of support in both of Canada's official languages be made a mandatory requirement	Given the intended usage, Section 7.2 in the RFP appropriately states that the subscription software must be delivered in English.
51	Ref: Bid Solicitation, Annex A, Statement of Requirements, General: The RFP purports to be geared toward the acquisition of software and services, yet there is little evaluation of how the software works. There is no evaluation of the methodology followed, scalability of the solution, how the software works, how documents are analyzed, how documents are classified, how documents are tagged, how quickly documents are processed, the fidelity of the migration etc. Several of the criteria seem to assume a certain process. This process, however, has not been articulated anywhere. We suggest the Crown revisit the mandatory and rated criteria with a view to evaluating the proposed tool and either define a process or allow the vendors to propose one. Canada may be best served by withdrawing this RFP entirely and conducting a more considered RFI and RFP process with industry.	As per Soliciation Amendment 7, modification number 2, below, in addition to the mandatories' referencing solution capabilities, Canada has added the following as a mandatory requirement: *The software must work, be complete, and meet the requirements of the bid solicitation.*
52	Ref: Bid Solicitation, Section 7.26, Termination for Convenience: In reference to section 7.26 Termination for Convenience on page 39 of 54, please clarify whether termination applies to both subscription software and professional services?	Yes, Section 7.26, Termination for Convenience, applies to both subscription software and professional services.
53	Ref: Bid Solicitation, General: What are the total amount of users within PWGSC that will be migrated to GCDocs?	The estimated number of users within PWGSC migrating to GCDocs is 13,000.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation	Amd. No. - N° de la modif.	Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
EN869-141670/A	007	006eem
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client	File No. - N° du dossier	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME
20141670	006eemEN869-141670	

SECTION B – MODIFICATIONS

1. Annex A, Statement of Requirements, Rated Requirement R-5 has been deleted in its entirety and is   replaced with the following R-5:

   R-5: For migrated documents that contain links to other documents, the Solution should preserve the links within the target document. Constructed links should point to newly migrated documents within GCDOCS.

2.   Annex A, Statement of Requirements, is hereby amended by adding the following Mandatory Requirement M-16:

   M-16: The software must work, be complete, and meet the requirements of the bid solicitation.

3.   Form 2, Substantiation of Technical Compliance Form, is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced with the attached Form 2.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE BID SOLICITATION REMAIN UNCHANGED

Form 2 - Substantiation of Technical Compliance Form

Article of Statement of Requirements (SOR) that Requires Substantiation by the Bidder	Bidder Substantiation	Reference to Additional Substantiating Materials Included in Bid
M-1		
M-2		
M-3		
M-4		
M-5		
M-6		
M-7		
M-8		
M-9		
M-10		
M-11		
M-12		
M-13		
M-14		
M-15		
M-16		
R-1		
R-2		
R-3		
R-4		
R-5		
R-6		
R-7		
R-8		
R-9		
R-10		
R-11		
R-12	**DELETED**	**N/A**
R-13		