



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

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

**Place du Portage, Phase III
Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2
11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier
Gatineau
Québec
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
Shared Systems Division (XL)/Division des systèmes
partagés (XL)
4C1, Place du Portage Phase III
11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet INCIDENT COMMAND SYS INFO MGMT SOL	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EN578-161892/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20161892	Date 2016-01-13
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$XL-127-29687	
File No. - N° de dossier 127xl.EN578-161892	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2016-02-03	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Flemming, Brock	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 127xl
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-5708 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
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

This solicitation amendment 002 is issued to:

Part 1 - Answer the questions from the Industry

Part 2 - Extend the Solicitation Closing Date

Part 1

Answers to Questions from the Industry

#	Question	Answer
6	Would it be possible to receive a 3 week extension to the solicitation close date in consideration that the response period spans several public and religious holidays?	Canada has reviewed your requirement and the Due Date will be extended to February 3, 2016.
7	"In the spirit of a fair and open competitive process, and in order for the Crown to receive the best possible value for taxpayer money, would the Crown amend the "cloud concept" as outlined in the RFP to allow for the Incident Management System to be installed and managed outside of a GOC managed network so that Commercial Cloud solution providers can respond?"	Canada is requesting a COTS solution to be installed on Canada's infrastructure. Section 7.20 (c) is to add to the scope of the solution in the event that the winning bidder evolves its solution into a cloud based solution.
8	What is the expected award date of this solicitation?	A contract will be awarded once Canada has completed all process as per Part 4 of the RFP document.
9	If declared a responsive bid, will vendors be expected to demonstrate in-person or through remote conference their proposed solution? If so, what is the expected date and location of that demonstration?	Please refer to Part 4.5 of the RFP for details regarding the steps involved with the Proof of Proposal (PoP) test. Only the highest ranking bid will be invited to do the PoP. Provided that the top-ranked bidder can demonstrate to the Contracting Authority that the solution is running in a technical environment that closely approximates the described environment, the Contracting Authority may approve a PoP via the web.

10	<p>Annex B: M10 states that ICS forms must have the ability to add maps/charts/vessel data to the form. Which particular ICS forms need this capability? Do you envision this happening through the ability to upload an attachment (documents, picture, etc.) , or are you looking for a specific integration to pull in water level, ice, and tide/current etc. data from outside sources?</p>	<p>The concept is for the user to upload static map/chart/weather/tide & current/ice/water level/vessel data (tombstone & voyage) data to the appropriate ICS forms, including, but not limited to : ICS 201, 202 & 209. Please see R79 for further information regarding vessel data, which is the only integrated external data source. Once uploaded into a form, the vessel data remains static. See table at chapter 8 of the SOR (Annex B).</p>
11	<p>Annex C: 3.3.1 & 3.5.2.6 – What is the timeframe for resolution of failures during testing?</p>	<p>The rescheduling of tests will be negotiated between the Contractor and the Project Authority with the intent that the timings do not negatively impact the overall schedule.</p>
12	<p>Annex C: 3.5.2.4 – This states that the vendor will include a demonstration of integrating GIS information from an external ArcGIS source selected by Canada. There are many potential sources and file types support by the ArcGIS platform, will you specify what source is intended?</p>	<p>Please see Annex B, SOR M17 (Annex B). Details regarding the ArcGis information source will be discussed at the Kick Off meeting.</p>
13	<p>A. Annex C: 3.6.1.3 – As stated in this section, the SAT will include use of the system by field units. What devices or device types will field units use to perform the SAT? B. Will the vendor be expected to provide field unit devices for testing?</p>	<p>A. The field unit mobile devices will be Government of Canada tablets and smart phones using the operating systems specified in R 83. B. The vendor will not be expected to provide field units for testing.</p>
14	<p>Annex C: 3.6.1.3 – This section states that the application will be load tested using jMeter (or a similar application). Will the vendor be expected to provide load testing software? If so, would the Canada technical team consider SoftLogica's WAPT application a suitable similar application to jMeter?</p>	<p>Yes the vendor is expected to provide load testing software and Yes SoftLogica's WAPT application is acceptable.</p>

15	<p>11. Bid Solicitation: Part 7 B – This section states that the “Contracting Authority can add additional Clients from time to time, which may include any department or Crown Corporation...” Could you clarify the meaning of this statement?</p> <p>A. Does this imply that users from other Canadian departments can login with a user account the Initial Client’s system and participate in an incident?</p> <p>B. Does this imply that other departments have the right to purchase an identical solution for the same price?</p> <p>C. Does this imply that other departments are entitled to their own identical software solutions at no additional cost provided the licensed user limit is not exceeded? If so, are additional clients expected to receive installation, implementation, training, support maintenance, and all other services commensurate with the initial client?</p>	<p>A. No, Section 7.1(B) is for other client departments requiring a common solution and will be acquiring this solution for their own department. (Please refer to Part 1.2 (B) that covers the right to increase the number of users during an incident).</p> <p>B. Yes</p> <p>C. Clients added to this contract will purchase each component on behalf of their own department, for the same price as listed in the bidders Annex A.</p>
16	<p>Can we assume that we will be mapping the software to existing and defined ICS processes, or should the services in our proposal include the definition of the ICS processes in conjunction with the Coast Guard?</p>	<p>Unless otherwise noted in the requirements, the ICS processes are standard ICS processes as articulated by the ICS Canada training program, which closely follows standard American Federal Emergency Management Agency ICS processes.</p>
17	<p>When documentation is not available to substantiate a requirement, may we explain the workflow or functionality in the matrix instead of referring to documentation?</p>	<p>This would be acceptable only for workflow and functionality that is not expected to be existing “COTS” as defined in the RFP SOW 1.7 in Annex C.</p>

18	<p>In relation to requirement M11 (off-line capability) can you please clarify whether the requirement to have downloaded/cached ICS forms is simply to facilitate data delivery, collection and user entry in off-line mode or , whether there is a requirement to actually generate copies or versions of the ICS forms in the off-line mode?</p> <p>For example, if a user is able to see, edit, update and fully interact with the information that would be required in an ICS 204 form (work assignment) would that meet the requirement, notwithstanding that the user could not print that information in the ICS 204 format in off-line mode?</p>	<p>The requirement is to generate or amend the ICS forms in the off-line mode in an interface appropriate to the device. The user must be able to complete the forms and work using basic GIS capability while off-line. In the example cited above, the ICS 204 assignment would have been received whilst on-line and is then available off-line for use. In the case of an ICS 201 the form would be initiated off-line from scratch and completed, including the required map/chart in the appropriate section of the form. In the context of a smart phone the interface would probably not look like an actual form. In the case of a tablet or PC the form should look like very much the same as when on-line. Printing is not relevant to this requirement, but a function of the pc/tablet/phone capability to send any document to a printer.</p>
19	<p>Could you confirm if a draft Project Management Plan (PMP) is expected in the technical proposal?</p>	<p>As per SOR R101 in Annex B and SOW 2.1.1.3 in Annex C, the PMP is required with the bidder's proposal.</p>
20	<p>Requirements R5, R24, R62, and R63 are centred around the concept of a personnel data base that is accessible to the Coast Guard through the ICS IMS. Would the Coast Guard be open to interfacing the solution to an existing competency database instead of storing the information within the ICS system?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
21	<p>Would you consider amalgamating requirements R5, R62 and R63 into a single requirement as they appear to be extremely similar in their nature content?</p>	<p>The three requirements are different aspects of a single capability and assessed separately for compliance. The bidder's proposal could provide a consolidated answer that covers the entire capability and use it as the response to all three.</p>

22	Would you please provide additional detail on what you are seeking with requirement R50, including an example?	R50 "The ICS IMS should enable user geographical database search of geo-referenced points by name." It is customary to name a geo-referenced point/object. This requirement capability enables the user to find a point/object by conducting a name search in ICS IMS, as an alternative to another search method, such as lat/long.
23	Would you please clarify whether requirement R52 is for embedded pdf editing functionality, or whether it is more about consolidated storage of IAPs, which might involve clustering them into storage containers?	It is expected that the creating/editing of pdf files would be done using another application, such as Adobe Acrobat. It is desirable to have a simple way of aggregating such files into a single file for distribution, such as the various IAP documents that have been saved as PDF's.
24	Would you please confirm what functionality you are seeking for the user as part of requirement R54? Beyond being able to edit their own password, what additional user log-in information do you envisage the user being able to edit?	Along with their password the user should be able to change any profile information i.e. role, home organization, contact information. Ideally the system administrator would be able to turn the editable fields on or off, or that the turning on or off of fields could be done with minimal customization.
25	Would you please provide additional detail on requirement R87? What examples of "account details" are you seeking to confirm?	Please see the answer to Question 28.
26	Would you please provide additional clarity on what functionality you are seeking in requirement R79? Would this be achieved through a live interface to an existing and dynamic data set?	This requirement is related to SOR requirements (Annex B) M10, R78 and the first table in SOR Chapter 8. ICS IMS will access a snapshot of a vessel's dynamic and static (tombstone) data from another system that uses ArcGIS. How this is achieved (e.g. as the result of a data query from ICS IMS) is left to the discretion of the bidder.

27	In light of R99, where compatibility with Oracle 11gR2 is repeated, may we ask that requirement R98 be removed?	The purpose of having separate requirements is to award points for a system that uses Oracle 11gR2 and then additional points for a systems that uses Oracle 11gR2 as well as MS SQL Server 2012 on Windows Server 2012.
28	Could DFO divulge the estimated budget available to procure the intended Incident Command System?	No budget information will be provided. Canada is open to obtaining a solution that offers best value for taxpayers.
29	What is the desired timeline for deploying and installing the solution? Will points be negated from bids with longer delivery plans? Will more points be provided for "out of the box" solutions?	The application must be a usable ICS solution out of the box as per Mandatory Requirement M1. Required timelines are found in Annex C, Statement of Work.
30	Is an "out of the box" solution desired or will DFO accept a proposed systems development and integration plan? Is there a maximum timeline accepted for delivery?	The application must be a usable ICS solution out of the box as per Mandatory Requirement M1. Customization will be to localize, bilingualize, and make it meet Government of Canada accessibility standards. The customization is also to tweak the out of the box application to meet the Canadian Coast Guard's specific situation. Required timelines are found in Annex C, Statement of Work.
31	Is DFO able to quantify how much data integration will be required? We envision this to be a significant effort. Examples include the number of forms to be included, ETL or data integration with INNAV or other tracking systems, S-AIS, GIS, DFO equipment and assets, resources, etc. Could DFO list out the systems we'll be integrating with and the underlying infrastructure/platform(s).	The ICS IMS application will not integrate with any other system other than simple communication with an ArcGIS system (such as the Common Operating Picture) providing vessel data (see R79 in Annex C, Statement of Work). The ability to input data from another application (Mandatory Requirements M14-17) in a set file format is required and output information into a specific file format to possibly be read into other systems is required. In essence, it will have the ability to exchange data using standard data protocols with other applications.
32	Section 2.7 mentions that volumetric data will be provided to the bidders to help in preparation of the RFP response. Will this be provided?	All data has been provided in the bid, including data estimates in Annex A used for evaluation purposes only.

33	What is the time period between contract award and acceptance of the software solution that the Canadian Coast Guard is expecting?	Acceptance is completed once all requirements in Annex C have been satisfied.
34	A. Has the Coast Guard established a budget for this effort? B. What is the budget allocated for the time period between contract award and acceptance of the software solution?	A. No budget will be divulged. B. This is based on the bidder's proposal.
35	In order for us to substantiate and demonstrate to the crown forms creation for Section 4 form 2.01. We require an extension of three weeks to February 17th 2016. This is a large complex bid with multiple pieces making up a complete solution. For this to be put together we require this extension be granted.	Canada has reviewed your requirement and the Due Date will be extended to February 3, 2016.

Part 2

Extend the Solicitation Closing Date

The solicitation closing date is extended until February 3, 2016 at 2pm Eastern Time.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE SOLICITATION REMAINS UNCHANGED