Various Level 3 Resources For Cyber and IT Security

REQUEST FOR PROPSAL

AMENDMENT NO. 3

This RFP amendment No. 3 is raised to;

- 1- Make administrative changes; and
- 2- Publish Canada's responses to Industry questions received during the question period.

1. At Part 3 of the RFP 'Bid Preparation Instructions', article 3.1 'Bid Preparation Instructions' REVISE as follows:

DELETE: (iii) Section III: Certifications (1 hard copy).

2. At Attachment 1 to Part 4 of the RFP, REVISE as follows:

DELETE: the previous version in its entirety.

INSERT: the following new version attached hereto this amendment.

3. Publish Canada's responses to Industry questions received during the question period.

Question	Answer
#37 - In our global business model operations, we have clients in multiple time zones around the world, as such, would the Crown consider allowing Bidders 72 hours to respond to SSC's request for the Organization's name and other contact information of Confidential clients?	Canada will allow Bidders 72 hours to respond to SSC's request for the Organization's name and other contact information of Confidential clients.
#38 - As per Amendment 2, QA 2, instructing bidders to delete article 3.4 with regard to Section III: Certifications. Could the Crown please confirm if this means that only Section I - Technical Bid and Section II - Financial Bid are required for this opportunity? If this is true, could the Crown confirm that Article 3.1 (iii) should also be deleted?	Confirmed. Bidders must submit content for Section I (Technical Bid), Section II (Financial Bid). Section III 'Certifications' are not required for this RFP.
#39- Please confirm that Shared Services Canada (SSC) cannot be used as a reference for this Solicitation as it would be a conflict of interest having the same entity act as both the RFP issuer and a reference.	Bidders are permitted to use applicable SSC contracts as references for this solicitation.
#40- Answer to question 31 in amendment two (2) makes; as stated in the response, an	SSC will accept a maximum of 10 reference

"assumption " that bidders would have billed multiple resources in each category on a full time basis (220 days per year) over a five year term.	contracts to demonstrate the experience required in M1 and R1.
This " assumption " is simply unrealistic, faulty, limits bidders to incumbents and contradicts the idea of consulting services as a practice. SSC themselves references (in response to question 11 in the same amendment) that today contracts are typically awarded in 6 month intervals with options to extend. Therefore, by SSC's own admission, multiple consultants for 220 days per year for five years would be categorized as a full time employee, not a consultant.	
Although project references are not limited to Government of Canada, limiting the number of client references to five handcuffs organizations that have a very successful consulting practice to a very narrow scope and does not achieve the goal of demonstrating capability for this requirement. It should not matter if a bidding organization meets the billable number of days in five or more contracts. In fact one might argue that holding more contracts demonstrates greater value as a greater number of clients have confidence in the organization and services.	
We request that SSC substitute within M1 & R1 the following:	
Remove the following:	
"The services provided must have been provided under a maximum of five contracts. It is not necessary for each contract to demonstrate all categories of personnel. Referenced contracts must have an excess ("Billed") value in excess of \$1M."	
Insert the Following:	
"The services provided must have been provided under a maximum of ten contracts. It is not necessary for each contract to demonstrate all categories of personnel. Referenced contracts must have an excess ("Billed") value in excess of \$1M."	
If SSC chooses not to make the change, please	

provide reasoning and highlight how making this change would compromise the goal of the mandatory and Rated criteria M1 & R2. Additionally please comment on how not making the change will address the national Procurement strategy initiative relating to fair procurement	
#41- SSC's response to question 33 within Amendment two (2) highlights the need for bidders to demonstrate a record of providing high volume delivery to a single client within the NCR. Although the reference client is not limited to Government of Canada, SSC will likely be the only organization within the NCR that 30 or more resources would have been placed in the 12-24 months; this ask will limit 70% - 100% scores to incumbent organization(s) only limiting the number of qualified security organizations that will be able to bid.	SSC has considered this request and maintains its position regarding R2. For better clarity with R2, please see the new Attachment 1 to Part 4 attached hereto this amendment.
Given the desire is to demonstrate the ability to provide high volume of resources – we request that R2 be changed to include multiple clients, for individual consultants (resources can only be counted once). By limiting to individual consultants, a resource will not be able to be counted more than once, ensuring that the bidding organization has the necessary bench strength to fulfill forecasted requirements.	
If SSC chooses not to make the change, please provide reasoning and highlight how making this change would compromise the goal of the mandatory and Rated criteria M1 & R2. Additionally please comment on how not making the change will address the national Procurement strategy initiative relating to fair procurement.	
 #42- With respect to responsibilities listed under section 5.1 Role Descriptions: Where the responsibilities are not numbered, can the Crown please confirm that these responsibilities are not part of the total sum of responsibilities against which reference projects need to demonstrate 70% performance? For example: 	The Crown confirms that only numbered and associated alpha sub-items are to be used by bidders for which reference projects are to demonstrate the 70 percent performance criteria.
Under section 5.1.1, all responsibilities listed after # 18 "Assists in detailed design	

 and development by maintaining "To-Be" process models, undertaking issues analysis and ensuring architecture and technical teams understand the underlying business objectives and functional capabilities required for project success" are not part of the total sum of responsibilities; and Under section 5.1.4, all responsibilities listed under the three paragraphs starting with "Additional deliverables requirements" are not part of the total sum of responsibilities. 	
#43 - Question and Answer #13 in the latest amendment clarifies that 70% of the tasks need to be demonstrated for each of the 5 contracts used by the bidders to demonstrate relevant categories in M1. In the case where a bidder uses CPSA as 1 of the 5 contracts for demonstration of M1, we assume that bidders need to demonstrate 70% of the tasks for each category claimed, overall – across CPSA work within the 5 years time frame. <u>For example</u> , under the CPSA a bidder may have had multiple (say 10) assignments where they provided IT Security Specialist (Privacy) services to different clients. We assume that in order for the category to be considered demonstrated, 70% of the SOW task for this category must be covered <u>across the 10 assignments</u> (as opposed to within each assignment). Can you confirm that this is correct?.	The Crown confirms and agrees that as CPSA can be treated a one contract the interpretation as identified in this question is correct.
#44- Can you please clarify which SOW items need to be demonstrated for the C7 IT Security Design Specialist? We are assuming at this point that only <u>numbered items including the lettered</u> <u>sub-items</u> (Revised SOW provided in Amendment 2) need to be 70% demonstrated. We are assuming that the "additional deliverables requirements" bulleted lists are not included and bidders are not to demonstrate those additional deliverables items. Can you please confirm our assumption?	Refer to Canada's answer for question #42.
#45 - Given the extent of details that need to be provided for demonstration of categories across a great number of assignments within 5 large contracts; given the number of bulleted tasks to be demonstrated for each of the categories (Up to 46 items not counting sub-bullets); as well as the intricacies involved in counting days worked under specific categories within large multi-resources	The Crown will not grant a further extension to closing date.

contracts; as well as gathering and confirming references for all contracts; <u>we request 2 weeks</u> <u>extension to the closing date so there is sufficient</u> <u>time to develop the detailed proposal that is</u> <u>required to address all of the requirements of this</u> <u>RFP fully</u> . Would SSC please consider giving bidders another extension with the benefit that SSC will receive more comprehensive and fully compliant proposals?	
Would the Crown consider as meeting the mandatory requirements for the Privacy Specialist and the IT TRA and C&A Specialist, a single engagement reference from a single client, providing the combined total of at least 2400 days of effort towards both roles? Privacy and TRA work are generally conducted in tandem for IT initiatives and it is not always possible to determine retroactively the allocation of effort between specific tasks. The 2400 days would reflect the total of the current minimums of 1800 and 600 days respectively for the two roles.	The bidder must demonstrate the billable days as shown in M1. If tasks listed in different resources categories where performed on the same reference project, the corresponding billable days can be counted towards different resource category values in M1, providing that at least 70 percent of the category bullets were performed. A referenced project's billable days claimed by one category may not be duplicated in another category.
In response to question #7, the Crown stated that they would accept CPSA as one contract. Given that CPSA is a supply arrangement and work is awarded by individual contracts a bidder can in fact reference a number of contracts for different client departments which exceeds the maximum of 5 stipulated in the M1 and R1 requirements. By allowing firms to use CPSA the Crown is providing them a competitive advantage over other firms who are restricted to using only a maximum of 5 contracts. Will the Crown consider increasing the maximum number of contracts to up to 10, which would be similar to the use of multiple client contracts under CPSA?	M1 and R1 were amended to allow the use of CPSA as one reference contract, provided that at least \$5M was billed within the last 5 years, in order to substantiate the elements of this solicitation related to the Statement of Work. Given the manner in which CPSA was used, and the nature of the requirements for which it was used, potential bidders that frequently conducted business through CPSA would have been at a clear disadvantage without the amendment. No other changes to M1 and R1 will be considered.
The clause on page 51 of the RFP regarding working hours states the following: 9. Service Levels 9.1 Normal Working Hours Normal working hours will be no earlier than 7:00 am to no later than 6:00 pm EST Monday through Friday (with the exception of statutory holidays as defined by the province of work). The Contractor will be expected to work 7.5 hours/day within normal working hours, unless arrangements are made ahead of time with the Technical Authority. The Technical Authority will authorize additional hours of work in advance at the same rate as normal office hours. The Contractor will normally work during regular business hours, on site, unless otherwise agreed upon by the Contractor and the Technical Authority. For the duration of the contract all personnel must be available to work outside normal office hours as required.	Canada agrees to the proposed change and will include it in the resulting contract(s).

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THIS INVITATION TO QUALIFY REMAIN UNCHANGED.

Following is a summary of Amendments issued to date to this Request for Proposal (RFP)

Document Tracking	Date	Description
Amendment No. 001	001 August 26, 2014 Administrative changes and published to questions	
Amendment No. 002	September 04, 2014	Extend the bid closing date, administrative changes and publish responses to questions
Amendment No. 003	September 17, 2014	Administrative changes and publish responses to questions

ATTACHMENT 1 TO PART 4 Evaluation Criteria

1. Evaluation Disclaimer

The mandatory criteria will be evaluated on a "Met/Not Met" (i.e. compliant/non-compliant) basis. Proposals <u>must</u> demonstrate compliance with all of the following Mandatory requirements and must provide the necessary documentation to support a determination of compliance. Proposals that fail to meet any mandatory requirements will be deemed non-compliant and will be given no further consideration.

The Contracting Authority reserves the right to request reference(s)* from any of the SA Holder's listed projects to verify and validate the information stated in the proposal. If the reference is unable to verify or validate the information stated in the proposal, the bid will be deemed non-compliant.

2. Customer Reference Contact Information

The Bidder must provide customer references for point rated requirements R2 and R3 who must each confirm, the facts identified in the Bidder's bid. For each customer reference, the Bidder must, at a minimum, provide the name and either the telephone number or e-mail address for a contact person. Bidders are also requested to include the title of the contact person. If the named individual is unavailable when required during the evaluation period, the Bidder may provide the name and contact information of an alternate contact from the same customer.

Canada is not obliged to, but may in its discretion contact the Primary reference and, where applicable, the Backup reference, in order to validate the information submitted for point rated requirements R2 and R3. Canada may conduct any Project Reference validation check in writing by e-mail. Canada will email (cc) the Respondent's contact when an e-mail is sent out for Project Reference validation checks.

If Canada chooses to contact one or more references to validate information provided by a Bidder, Canada must receive the reference's response within 5 Federal Government Working Days (FGWDs) from the date of the request. If Canada does not receive confirmation (within 5 FGWDs) from either the Primary or Backup reference that the information in their bid is accurate (or that any inaccuracies are not material to whether or not the project meets the mandatory requirements), that Bidders Project Reference will not be considered in the evaluation. Canada may also contact a Primary or Backup reference for clarification purposes, either by email or by telephone.

If during a bid validation by Canada it becomes apparent that the address, telephone number, or email address for any of the references is incorrect or missing, the Bidder will be permitted to provide the correct address, telephone number, or email address within 1 FGWD of a request. If the named individual for the Primary reference is unavailable because they are on leave, or no longer working for that organization, Canada will contact the Backup reference from the same customer organization.

The Bidder will not be permitted to submit an alternate customer organization or project as a reference for the RFP after the bid closing date.

3. Mandatory Criteria

Corporate Mandatory Requirement									
Criteria		Mandatory Require		Bid	Bidders Response				
					Met	Not Met	Reference to Additional Documentation within the Bid		
M1		must have demonstrated contract e esource categories, for the required I							
		Category of Personnel							
		Business Analyst	1600						
		IT Strategic Security Planning and Protection Specialist	1000						
		IT TRA & C&A Specialist	1800						
		IT Security Design Specialist	2000						
		IT Security VA Specialist	600						
		IT Privacy Specialist	600						
	Bidders must complete Appendix A and B to Part 4.								
		es provided must have been provide t is not necessary for each contract t							

	Corporate Mandatory Requiremen	t	
personnel. excess of \$	Referenced contracts must have an excess ("Billed") value in S1M.		
date. The elements of the date	ence must occur within the past five years prior to the RFP closing experience may occur at any time during the five year period, so -total number of Billable Days when added together meets the sillable Days requirement.		
the associa	elivered by the Category of Personnel must include at least 70% of ated tasks listed in the Statement of Work of this bid solicitation for bry of Personnel.		

RFP No - N° de DDP 13-18801-0/A

This page has been left intentionally blank.

4. Point-Rated Technical Criteria

	Corporate Rated Requirements								
							Bidder's Response		
#	Rated Evaluation Criteria						Demonstrated Experience	Reference to Extra Documentation Within The Bid	
R1	The Bidder should demonstrate its billable days experience in excess to the minimum billable days under M1.								
	The Bidder's demonstrated "Total Billable Days" provided in response to M1 will be used to evaluate this criterion. Example Evaluation Scenario:								
		Billable DAYS	(B)	(C)	(D)				
	CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL	TOTAL BILL DAY PROVIDED BY BIDDER	MINIMU M DAYS REQUIRE D UNDER M1	BIDDER	BIDDERS % INCREASE TO A MAXIMUM 100 PTS				
	Business Analyst	2175	1600	575	35.94				
	IT Strategic Security Planning	1225	1000	225	22.5				

Corporate Rated Requirements								
							Bidder's Respo	nse
#	Rated Evaluation Criteria				Points Max	Demonstrated Experience	Reference to Extra Documentation Within The Bid	
	and Protection Specialist							
	IT TRA & C&A Specialist	4000	1800	2200	100.00			
	IT Security Design Specialist	3000	2200	800	36.36			
	IT Security VA Specialist	850	600	250	41.67			
	IT Privacy Specialist	800	600	200	33.33			
	BIDDER SCORE = SUM (D) / # of CATEGORIES							
	Sum (D) / 6 = 44.97							
	The Bidder will be awarded points for billable days in excess of the minimums identified under M1 as demonstrated in the example evaluation scenario provided below. In this example the Bidder would score 44.97 points out of a possible 100 points. Bidders must complete Appendix A and B to Part 4							
R2	R2 SSC believes that the most significant risk associated with this contract is that the Contractor will be unable to provide the required number of qualified resources, in the required categories/level, within the timeframe specified in the Task Solicitation process. Vendors should demonstrate their ability to supply, manage and retain					50	 10 points- A team of <u>10</u> resources were provided to a single client in the NCR; 25 points- A team of <u>15</u> resources were provided to a single client in the 	

	Corporate Rated Requirements								
		Bidder's Response							
#	Rated Evaluation Criteria	Demonstrated Experience	Reference to Extra Documentation Within The Bid						
	 large groups of resources in support of a <u>single client/project</u> within the region of delivery. Bidders should supply a <u>single</u> client contract with a contact reference within the past 24 months encompassing a minimum of 10 resources in the NCR in support of a single client project for a minimum 6 consecutive months To be considered, reference project information must include: Client Organization Name Client Contact Phone # Client Contact Email Address Project start and end dates (yy/mo) Total number of PS resources provided for a 6 month period within the last 24 months 		 NCR; 35 points- A team of <u>25</u> resources were provided to a single client in the NCR; 50 points- A team of 30, or more, resources were provided to a single client in the NCR. 						
R3	The Bidder should describe its proposed Risk Mitigation strategy, including the approach and or measures it proposes to undertake, to ensure its ability to propose fully qualified resources to Shared Services Canada (SSC) within 5 days of receipt of a TA Request.	150	The extent to which the proposed risk mitigation strategy is <u>fully and clearly</u> described:						
	The Bidder's mitigation strategy should include current corporate processes, as well as specific measures it proposes to implement to manage the resulting contract.		30 points: The risk mitigation strategy is described;						

Corporate Rated Requirements						
			Bidder's Response			
#	Rated Evaluation Criteria	Points Max	Demonstrated Experience	Reference to Extra Documentation Within The Bid		
	In addition, the Bidder must provide a single Reference Project where it has successfully used a similar/same approach to ensure the timely provision of qualified resources to the client.		75 points: The risk mitigation strategy is reasonably described with a good level of detail of existing corporate processes,			
	 To be considered, the reference project information must include: Client Organization Name Client Contact Name and Title Client Contact Phone Number Client Contact Email Address Project start and end dates (yy/mo) A description of the approach and/or measures implemented to ensure the timely provision of qualified resources to the client 		100 points: The risk mitigation strategy is thoroughly described, including complete details of existing supporting corporate processes and specific measures to be implemented. Relevance of the proposed risk mitigation strategy to ensure the timely provision of qualified			
			 15 points: Response proposes a risk mitigation strategy (i.e. methods and/or activities) that demonstrates a minimal understanding of the stated risk; 			

Corporate Rated Requirements					
			Bidder's Response		
#	Rated Evaluation Criteria	Points Max	Demonstrated Experience	Reference to Extra Documentation Within The Bid	
			 25 points: Response proposes a risk mitigation strategy (i.e. methods and/or activities) which demonstrates some understanding of the stated risk; 35 points: Response proposes a risk mitigation strategy (i.e. methods and/or activities) which demonstrates a good understanding of the stated risk; 50 points: Response proposes a risk mitigation strategy (i.e. methods and/or activities) which demonstrates a clear and profound understanding of the stated risk. 		
Maximum Points Available:		300			
Minimum Score Required:		210			
	Bidder's Score:				