

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4

This RFP amendment No. 4 is raised to;

- 1- Remove Mandatory Requirement #9 from Attachment 1 to Part 4 'Evaluation Criteria; and
- 2- Publish Canada's responses to Bidder questions received during the question period.

1. At Attachment 1 to Part 4 '**Evaluation Criteria**', at section 2.0 '**Mandatory Requirements**' **REVISE** as follows;

DELETE: M9 User Interface Customization

The software solution must allow users to customize the software to adapt to the look and feel to match Public Service Commission custom logos and multiple languages.

2. **Publish Canada's responses to Bidder questions received during the question period.**

Question	Answer
<p>#44. Mandatory 9 as previously stated was interpreted as a look and feel localization as well as the ability to provide descriptions and content in either language, which we can do. However, as amendment 3, response 41, raises some concerns. My competitive capture team tells me that they are unaware of any password solution that offers a fully bilingual interface and under the recently released clarification (answers to question 41 & 42) SSC would receive a very limited, if any, field of responses. To ensure that SSC and PSC respectively receive a fully competitive set of responses from industry recognized leaders in this space we are requesting the following.</p> <p>We are asking that Mandatory 9 be remove from the requirement completely.</p> <p>We feel this request could be justified by precedent within the federal government as is this is an internal tool that is used by a team of administrators and as this is not an inter-departmental, nor citizen facing tool where both official languages are often required. There are many software solutions that are in use by the federal government today that are similar in scope of use that are english only. Further, once our solution is installed and deployed, there are only two screens that are used, one simple screen for login and password, something that is easily understood as this is common IT terminology, and a second screen for selecting access to an end system via a list which can/does hold multi-lingual descriptions for what is being accessed.</p>	<p>Mandatory Requirement #9 has been removed in this RFP amendment.</p>

<p>#45. We are asking that Mandatory 9 be remove from the requirement completely.</p> <p>As it is an internal tool that is used by a team of administrators and as this is not an inter-departmental, nor citizen facing tool where both official languages are often required.</p>	<p>Mandatory Requirement #9 has been removed in this RFP amendment.</p>
<p>#46. Does the crown expect « Section III : Certification » be included in a separately bound document?</p>	<p>Yes. Bidders should include Section III as a separate document.</p>
<p>#47. Should the Supply Chain Security Information (Form 5) be included with the other certifications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>#48. Section 3.2 (b) (ii) refers to the « Substantiation of Technical Compliance Form (Annex A) ». Annex A is not a form but the Statement of Requirement. Should we refer to « Attachment 1 to Part 4 » instead?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>#49. Should the pricing tables of Annex B be replaced by the amended tables of Attachment 2 to part 4?</p>	<p>Yes. Annex B will be updated in the resulting contract using the prices provided.</p>
<p>#50. The paragraph just above section (B) of the «Supply Chain Security Information Assessment Process » refers to « ...use the SCSI Submission Form... », could the crown provide such form?</p>	<p>This form has been provided in this RFP amendment.</p>

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THIS RFP
REMAIN UNCHANGED.

=====