

**PASSWORD MANAGEMENT TOOL SOFTWARE SOLUTION  
Request for Proposal (RRP)**

**AMENDMENT NO. 1**

This RFP amendment No. 1 is raised to;

- 1- Amend Page 1 of the RFP document to extend the RFP closing date;
- 2- Make Changes to Section 2.0 of the RFP, 'Bid Preparation Instructions';
- 3- Make Changes to Part 4 of the RFP, 'Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection';
- 4- Make Changes to Attachment 2 to Part 4 'Financial Evaluation of Proposal';
- 5- Make Changes to Part 7 of the RFP, 'Resulting Contract Clauses'; and
- 6- Publish Canada's responses to outstanding Qualified Respondents questions.

**1. At Page 1 of the RFP document;**

At 'RFP End Date';

**DELETE:** the previous 'RFP End Date' in its entirety and;

**INSERT:** January 29, 2016.

**2. At Part 2 of the RFP, 'Bid Preparation Instructions', REVISE as follows;**

**A) INSERT** the following new article:

**2.7 Conflict of Interest**

Without limiting Canada's rights under Article 17 of 2003 (2010-01-11) Standard Instructions - Goods or Services - Competitive Requirements, the following private sector individuals and non-crown employees have been engaged in the preparation of the mandatory and rated requirement of this solicitation:

- i) Donald Spry - Mindwire Systems Ltd

**B) At Section 2.2 "Submission of Bids", REVISE as follows;**

**DELETE:** the previous section 2.2 in its entirety; and

**INSERT:** the following in its place;

**2.2 Submission of Bids**

2.2.1 The following replaces Sections 6 and 7 of Standard Instructions - Goods or Services - Competitive Requirements:  
Bids must be submitted to SSC by:

- a. the Bidder's representative in person; or
- b. registered mail; or
- c. an incorporated courier company

to the Contracting Authority by the date and time and at the address indicated on page 1 of the bid solicitation. If the Bidder plans to deliver the bid by hand or by courier to the Contracting Authority, the Bidder is requested to contact the Contracting Authority at [gary.cooper@canada.ca](mailto:gary.cooper@canada.ca) mailbox at least 48 hours before the closing date to make arrangements for the delivery date and time of its intended bid. If the Bidder does not make arrangements 48 hours in advance with the Contracting Authority for delivery of its bid, SSC may be able to accommodate the Bidder, but SSC is not responsible for making a representative available to receive the bid at any time other than the closing time. Upon receipt of any bid delivered by hand or by courier, the Bidder or the courier, as well as the SSC Contracting Authority, must sign an SSC bid receipt confirmation form, a copy of which will be provided to the Bidder or courier company.

2.2.2 Due to the nature of the RFP, Bids transmitted by facsimile or e-mail to Shared Services Canada will not be accepted.

2.2.3 Bidders are requested to send an e-mail notification to [gary.cooper@canada.ca](mailto:gary.cooper@canada.ca) prior to the closing date indicating their intention to submit a bid.

3. At Part 4 of the RFP '**Evaluation Procedures and Basis of Selection**', at Section 4.2 '**Conduct of Evaluation in Steps**', **REVISE** as follows;

**DELETE:** 'b) **Step 2 – Evaluation of Financial Bid:**' in its entirety;

**INSERT:** the following in its place;

**b) Step 2 – Evaluation of Financial Bid:**

i) The financial evaluation will be conducted by calculating the Total Bid Evaluated Value (BEV) using the completed Attachment 2 to Part 4.

ii) BEV calculation is as follows 'Total Software and Support' for Table 1 + 'Option Year Software and Support' for Table 2.

iii) Compliant Bidders will be rank based on the BEV. The lowest compliant Bidder will be identified as the top-ranked Bidder.

Formulae in Pricing Tables: If the pricing tables provided to bidders include any formulae, Canada may re-input the prices provided by bidders into a fresh table, if Canada believes that the formulae may no longer be functioning properly in the version submitted by a Bidder.

4. At Attachment 2 to Part 4 '**Financial Evaluation of Proposal**', **REVISE** as follows;

**DELETE:** the previous version in its entirety and;

**INSERT:** the following new version attached hereto this amendment.

5. At Part 7 of the RFP, 'Resulting Contract', Section 7.7.4, **REVISE** as follows;

**INSERT:** the following new clause;

### 7.7.4 Exchange Rate Fluctuation Risk Mitigation

C3010T (2014-11-27) Exchange Rate Fluctuation Risk Mitigation

#### 6. Publish Canada's responses to Bidder questions received during the question period.

Question	Answer
<p><b>#1.</b> Can you clarify or expand further on what is being requested for Rated Requirement R6 “Software Solution allows users to store different types of sensitive information in different format” (page 36)?</p>	<p>This refers to the ability to export / import sensitive information to and from other programs or formats. The most common and simple example is exporting / importing to and from a .CSV formatted file. With "different types of sensitive information", but I'm referring to users personal information as well as server detail information such as; IP addresses, host names, account names, and passwords.</p>
<p><b>#2.</b> Why is there a request to provide pricing based on number of users (Annex A, Section 1.0 &amp; Annex B)?</p>	<p>Normally I see software licensed by 'Number of seats' or users. Others such as Oracle licenses based on hardware such as CPU, processing speed, etc. . I believe the most straightforward licensing agreements would be by user.</p>
<p><b>#3.</b> Would Shared Services be willing to accept pricing based on number of assets protected, and if so, how many assets are in scope?</p>	<p>Just to clarify, when they say 'Shared Services' in this question, do they mean us? I cannot answer for Shared Services I presume? As for us being willing to accept pricing based on 'number of assets protected', I am not sure if by 'assets' they mean; cpu's, servers, applications, databases, or actual account (i.e. passwords). The interpretation of 'assets' would be needed to determine how many are in scope. Having said this, it does not seem like the most straightforward way to manage the licensing. I would prefer to manage the licensing based on a more consistent and ascertainable measure (i.e. users).</p>
<p><b>#4.</b> I have two related clarification questions. You ask:</p> <p>i) Software Solution allows users to store different types of sensitive information in different format; and</p> <p>ii) Software Solution allows users to easily navigate stored sensitive data to efficiently locate information</p> <p>Could you please elaborate on what types of “sensitive information” SSC might be implying here and what you mean by “different format”? Are you referring to storing and searching for passwords stored by an individual to allow them to access various applications? Document storage? Credit card info? Since the primary purpose of this tool is to store passwords for shared accounts I’m wondering if you are implying something different here. I just want to</p>	<p>As I mentioned in the answer to question 1, this refers to the ability to export / import sensitive information to and from other programs or formats. The most common and simple example is exporting / importing to and from a .CSV formatted file. With "different types of sensitive information", but I'm referring to users personal information as well as server detail information such as; IP addresses, host names, account names, and passwords.</p> <p>I am referring to organizing the grouping of sensitive information in such a way that it can be easily accessed by multiple IT teams using the same central repository but only having access to the appropriate areas. Additionally being able to drill down to the information they are looking for based on their specific requirements. eg. Application developers may prefer to customize their view of accounts/passwords grouped by applications while System Administrators may prefer to customize their view of accounts/passwords based on Servers. Views could</p>

<p>be sure we are answering your requirements</p>	<p>be organized by; location, business unit, different IT teams, DBA's, UNIX system admins, Windows Server admin's, etc.</p> <p>With "different types of sensitive information", but I'm referring to users personal information as well as server detail information such as; IP addresses, host names, account names, and passwords. I am referring to storing and searching for passwords stored by an individual to allow them to access various applications, servers, user accounts, etc. There is no document storage or Credit card info involved.</p>
<p><b>#5.</b> The Public Service Commission of Canada has a requirement for a commercial off-the-shelf password management tool software solution, to secure and maintain the accounts and passwords for the information technologies group with a 12 months maintenance and support services and five (5) optional 1 year period for the maintenance and support services. It is estimated to have 60 licenses for the initial contract period; the PSC shall have option to increase or decrease the number of licenses.”</p> <p>The product we are bidding is not licensed per user. Rather it is based on the total number of managed devices (servers, workstations, routers, switches, virtual hosts, etc). Our licensing allows an unlimited number of users to access the product and an unlimited number of deployed servers for production, high availability, test, development, etc.</p> <p>Would SSC please revise the requirement to allow for different licensing models and provide an approximate number of such devices to be managed in order to allow us to prepare an accurate financial proposal.</p>	<p>Canada would be willing to accept the licensing quote based on managed devices. Here is a rough estimate* of our managed devices: 25 HP/Linux Servers 25 Windows Servers 2 Routers 20 Database Servers</p> <p><i>*Provided for evaluation purposes only to assist Bidders in the creating their Financial Bids.</i></p>
<p><b>#6.</b> Section 3.0 of Attachment 1 to Part 4 indicates session recording is a required functionality. Our licensing model is based on the number of target systems for which you would like to provide session recording. Can you provide a rough estimate on the number of target systems that would require session recording?</p>	<p>Canada would be willing to accept the licensing quote based on target systems.</p>
<p><b>#7.</b> Section 1.0 of Annex A indicates there is an estimate of 60 licenses that would be required. Can you please clarify what constitutes a license to your understanding? Would this be the</p>	<p>Yes, this refers to User Licenses or number of users having access to the password repository.</p>

number of users requiring access to the password vault?	
<b>#8.</b> Can Shared Services Canada provide the Bidder Forms in an editable format, like Microsoft Word?	A Word Version of the RFP is provided in this RFP amendment.
<b>#9.</b> Is a hard copy of the technical and financial bids required or is a soft copy only sufficient? Wording of Section 2.2 (on page 6), "...Due to urgency of the bid solicitation, bids may be transmitted electronically to the Contracting Authority", and that in Section 3.1, creates some confusion as to how to deliver the bid response.	Bids must be delivered in person, by the time of big closing. Section 2.2 of the RFP has been updated in this RFP amendment.
<b>#10.</b> "We wish to inform you that we intend to respond to this RFP, however we are asking for a 1 week extension at this time.	A one week extension has been provided in this RFP amendment.
<b>#11.</b> Our licensing is based on the number of human users that will require access to our application. Do you have any estimated user count? This will allow us to provide more accurate pricing.	60 – 75*  <i>*Provided for evaluation purposes only to assist Bidders in the creating their Financial Bids.</i>
<b>#12.</b> Does Shared Services have a preference on virtual or physical appliances?	Virtual.
<b>#13.</b> Can you please advise on when we can expect responses to enquiries, or when an Q&A Addendum may be posted?	Answers to Bidder Questions are provided in this RFP amendment.
<b>#14.</b> Are you looking for just a password management system, or a full Privileged Identity management/ Privileged Access Management solution for your administrators.	At this point we are looking just for password management system and ID management is not in our scope.
<b>#15.</b> For licensing, our solution is normally based on the number of end-points we are protecting. Allowing you to have more flexibility in your number of users. Is that model acceptable, or do you require per/user licensing?	Canada would be willing to accept the licensing quote based number of end points protected.
<b>#16.</b> Section 6.1 states there are no security requirements. We suggest adding requirement for FIPS 140-2 Level 2 for the password repository/vault as clearly this should be secured.	This is part of the template I believe indicating security requirements normally referring to a security requirements for the physical placement of a contractor on site. Our security requirements for the software itself, are in the sections we provided before this boiler plate was added. Our security requirements for the software are indicated in Mandatory requirements M3.

<p><b>#17.</b> Section 6.1 states there are no security requirements. We suggest adding requirement for FIPS 140-2 Level 2 for the password repository/vault as clearly this should be secured.</p>	<p>Please refer to answer to Q#16.</p>
<p><b>#18.</b> In Item 3.0 of ANNEX A, it states the need to maintain the systems in a manner that is auditable and secure. Do you have a specific requirement for NIST 800-53 r4 (AU) Audit controls?</p>	<p>“Audible and secure” is a generic requirement that looks like it was added after Canada provided our rated and mandatory requirements. Our requirements for Auditing are found in mandatory requirements M10.</p>
<p><b>#19.</b> In item 4.0 of ANNEX A, you list a number of different servers and systems to support. Do you also the need to support virtual environment? Specifically do you require certification for VMware NSX environments?</p>	<p>No, the management of the virtual environment and its access is controlled by SSC.</p>
<p><b>#20.</b> In Item 4.0 of ANNEX A, we don't see any mention of any cloud environments. Do you have any requirements for Amazon Cloud or Microsoft Office 365? As these require special password handling.</p>	<p>No. Canada does not have such requirements.</p>
<p><b>#21.</b> For certifications do require NIAP Common Criteria certification at EAL4+ to ensure security concerns?</p>	<p>Not mentioned as a requirement. Not applicable.</p>
<p><b>#22.</b> The RFP states this is for password management. Do you require protection of the environment listed in Item 4.0 by preventing Leapfrogging?</p>	<p>Canada assumes that the reference is to item 4.0 in the Statement of Requirement. In the context of: “4.0 Operational environment”</p> <p>The solution will be used to securely store and manage passwords on a variety of environments both in the lab and for use in production.” Canada would say no.</p>
<p><b>#23.</b> Our licensing structure is based on how many devices (Window servers, Unix servers, desktops, laptops, mainframes, switches routers, etc.) the solution will be managing. What will be the total number and types of devices for password management?</p>	<p>Please refer to Answer to Q#5.</p>
<p><b>#24.</b> In how many physical locations will the solution be deployed (Production sites, QA sites, DR sites, etc.)?</p>	<p>User workstations (all in one building) and servers at hosting centre.</p>
<p><b>#25.</b> How many users will be authorized to access &amp; administer the solution?</p>	<p>60-75*</p> <p><i>*Provided for evaluation purposes only to assist Bidders in the creating their Financial Bids.</i></p>

<p><b>#26.</b> If once a user is authorized to gain access to a device, do you want the session to be recorded and stored? And if so, how many devices do you want to have Session Recording enabled?</p>	<p>We do require recording active at all times. Functionality to enable it at any time on any device non-concurrently would be sufficient.</p>
<p><b>#27.</b> If recording is necessary, how many of concurrent recording sessions will be needed?</p>	<p>One (1)</p>
<p><b>#28.</b> For pricing purposes, the solution is delivered on an appliance. That appliance can either be a hardware based appliance, an AWS based appliance, or a VM OVA based virtual appliance. So which type of appliance best fits your environment? You can mix any type of appliance seamlessly with any other.</p>	<p>Virtual.</p>
<p><b>#29.</b> Is mainframe connectivity needed? (AS400, 3090, etc.)</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p><b>#30.</b> Given the significance of these questions to preparing our proposal, we request a two week extension.</p>	<p>A one week extension is provided in this RFP amendment.</p>
<p><b>#31.</b> The hyperlink bound to the SSH term in M5, on pg 34 references a competitors solution. I was thinking maybe you could have the technical team on your side disclose their conversations and dealings with this company. Have they seen demonstrations, have they been in meetings or webex's, have they downloaded and tried the software in any fashion? While it is pretty common for online researching to be done, this is a little concerning and we all want to ensure that we have a fair playing field.</p>	<p>Based on our research of password solutions we decided to pursue further information on password solution products of the following four companies: CyberArk Software Inc., Dell Inc., Thycotic Software Ltd., and Pleasant Solutions Inc..</p> <p>We had demonstrations via meeting in Webex with 3 companies; CyberArk Software Inc., Thycotic Software Ltd., and Dell Inc.</p> <p>We tested a demo of a password solution offered by Pleasant Solutions Inc. They provided answers and feedback on questions we had during the evaluation of the demo.</p> <p>As per the Conflict of Interest clause in this amendment, the PSC used the services of a contractor to assist with the development of some of the evaluation criteria. While the PSC's intention was to provide a link to information on SSH, a hyperlink bound to the SSH term erroneously referenced a supplier's solution. The following links should have been included instead:  <a href="http://searchsecurity.techtarget.com/definition/Secure-Shell">http://searchsecurity.techtarget.com/definition/Secure-Shell</a> and;  <a href="https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Secure_Shell">https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Secure_Shell</a></p>
<p><b>#32.</b> In Annex A-Part1 you request 60 licenses for the initial contract period, but we would like</p>	<p>This is the number of users who will need access to the password management tool. The number of account/passwords combinations we have to manage</p>

<p>additional clarification:</p> <p>Is that the number of users who will need access to the password management tool or the number of user/password pairs to be managed? To complete submission we must know BOTH the number of users accessing credentials as well as the number of user/password pairs to be managed.</p>	<p>is approximately 2000 to 3000.</p>
<p><b>#33.</b> Will there be any clause in the contract to adjust option year pricing based on changes to the exchange rate?</p>	<p>The RFP has been revised to accept submissions in both Canadian and US Dollars. SACC Clause C3010T will be inserted which offers bidders a choice to mitigate their risk by having Canada assume the risks and benefits of exchange rate fluctuations. The total price paid by Canada will be adjusted up or down based on currency fluctuations. The Bank of Canada Rate that will be used to evaluate USD bids will be 1.4589.</p>
<p><b>#34.</b> In section 4.2b (evaluation of financial bid) the BEV calculation includes "Option yr1 support" and "Option yr2 support" but the optional table includes support for 5 optional years. Please clarify how many option years are used in the BEV calculation.</p>	<p>All option years are included in BEV. This has been clarified in this RFP amendment.</p>
<p><b>#35.</b> In section 4.2b (evaluation of financial bid) the BEV calculation includes Professional Services, but PS is not mentioned anywhere else in the RFP. Please clarify if professional services are required</p>	<p>No. Professional Services are not required. This has been clarified in this RFP amendment.</p>
<p><b>#36.</b> In the pricing tables (Annex B) it refers to meeting requirements of Annex A but not the Mandatory &amp; Rated requirements of Attachment1-to-Part4. Please clarify which functional requirements need to be included as part of the bided solution.</p> <p>a. If the Mandatory &amp; Rated requirements of Attachment1-to-Part4 need to be included as part of the bided solution:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">i.</p> <p>Please include the quantity of application servers that require access to credentials and specify if they are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Datasource application servers (J2EE, Websphere, Tomcat, JBoss etc)</li> <li>2. Standard application servers (Windows, *nix, zOS, iSeries, Java, .NET, CLI, C/C++ &amp; COM etc.)</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: center;">ii.</p> <p>Please include the quantity of target servers for which you wish to enable session recording</p>	<p>Please refer to amendments, as well as Answers to other Bidder questions included in this RFP amendment. Please direct any clarification questions to Canada as required.</p>



---

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THIS RFP  
REMAIN UNCHANGED.

=====

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

<b>Document Tracking</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
Amendment No. 001	January 21, 2016	Make RFP updates and Answer Questions Submitted by Bidders