



**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 0B2 / Noyau 0B2**

**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**

Informatics Professional Services Division / Division  
des services professionnels en informatique

11 Laurier St., / 11, rue Laurier

3C2, Place du Portage

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> TBIPS - Professional Services requi	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> 21120-158459/B	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 011
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 21120-15-2088459	<b>Date</b> 2016-02-23
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZM-615-29745	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 615zm.21120-158459	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2016-03-01</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Barbu, Ana-Maria	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 615zm
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-6282 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

## **AMENDMENT NO. 011**

**This amendment is raised to answer Bidders' questions:**

### **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

**Q1.** Given the number of amendments and revisions to the grids, can you please provide us with updated versions of all resource grids to ensure all changes are reflected accordingly?

**A1.** Canada will provide an updated version of the Attachment 4.1 Bid Evaluation Criteria attached with amendment 012. Bidders must and are responsible to read it in parallel with this amendment 011 and all Q&As. For all modifications in Attachment 4.1, Bid Evaluation Criteria, please see Amendment 012 attachment.

#### **Workstream I, II, III – Amendment 004:**

Re: Amendment #4: Could the Crown please explain the rationale for changing, without any apparent request from any prospective bidders to do so, Corporate Qualification M1 for all 3 Workstreams from:

Each referenced contract must have had a minimum value of \$10 million (options exercised and taxes included);

to:

Each referenced contract must have had a minimum value of \$5 million (options exercised and taxes included)?

**A2:** Canada revised M1 for all three Workstreams in response to Bidders' submitted concerns.

#### **Q3. Workstream II - P.9 Project Manager – Level 3:**

M1 requires that the resource have a Project Management Professional (PMP) Certification and R5 awards points for Prince2 Certification which is a universally recognized Project Management certification. Would the Crown please amend M1 to allow for either PMP certification or Prince2 Certification?

For R5, would the Crown please explain their rationale as to why a Master of Project Management would be worth 5 points when the resource has to already have PMP Certification? Usually only one of these two credentials is pursued by practicing Project Managers (usually the PMP).

**A3.** Canada will remove M1 and revise R5 to include PMP, MBA and MPM with scoring of 5 points per certification up to a maximum of 20 points. Please see solicitation revision #007.

#### **Q4. C.3 IT Security TRA and C&A Analyst- Level 3:**

For R1, could the Crown please explain how any of these certifications are; a. relevant to the identified work, or b. to the C.3 category. They would seem to be misplaced and relate more to other positions like C.15 Computer Forensics Specialist.

R2, R3 and R4 are all related to the proposed resources experience yet only R3 specifies that the experience must be in the National Security Portfolio realm. This is restrictive and difficult to understand as to why it is so stipulated, as Threat and Risk Assessments (TRAs) and Certification & Accreditation (C&A) / Security Assessment and Authorization (SA&A) services follow the same TBS policies, rules and methodologies most especially within the entire Federal Government. Would the Crown please remove the National Security Portfolio restriction within R.3 and provide for Government –wide experience to be included in the bid?

Experience requested in R3 demonstrates work for clients in the National Security Portfolio realm with sensitive and mission-critical IT security posture of these departments. Canada does not require the same experience for R2 or R4.

R4 is asking for experience that is; a. not related to the Statement of Work, or b. to the C.3 Category. Would the Crown please remove R4?

**A4.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion.

**Q5. For Workstream II, IT Security TRA and CA Analyst, Level 3:**

In R1, would the Crown consider accepting a Certified Information Security Manager (CISM) certification in lieu of or in addition to the GIAC Systems and Network Auditor (GSNA)?

**A5.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion.

**Q6. Workstream III, Business Consultant Level 3:**

In R1, the requirement states: "Demonstrate that the proposed resource has the following certifications/designations by including a copy of the certification/designation with their bid:

- Certified Management Consultant (CMC)
- Master of Business Administration (MBA)
- Professional Engineer (P.Eng)

10 points per designation up to a maximum of 30 points".

Our experience is that there are very few resources that have the combination of these 3 certifications/designations, making it very difficult for an otherwise well-qualified candidates to score well. Therefore, would the Crown consider candidates who have a valid PMP designation and add it to the requirement so that it would then state:

"Demonstrate that the proposed resource has the following certifications/designations by including a copy of the certification/designation with their bid:

- Certified Management Consultant (CMC)
- Master of Business Administration (MBA)
- Professional Engineer (P.Eng)
- Project Management Professional (PMP)

10 points per designation up to a maximum of 30 points".

Or alternatively, would the Crown consider adjusting the points allocated to R1, such that each designation/certification is worth 5 points, up to a maximum of 15 points? This would shift the majority of points in the rated so that experience and demonstrated skills would count for more than a certification.

**A6.** Please see RFP modifications #006.

**Q7. Workstream I, A.6 Programmer/Software Developer, Level 3 (Core)**

R1 - The Crown is asking for candidates that have experience " developing applications using a .Net 4.0 framework, with all of the following: (a) Windows Presentation Foundation (WPF); (b) Windows Communication Foundation (WCF); and (c) Oracle 11g or higher database.

Would the crown consider changing the wording to say with any of the following: (a) Windows Presentation Foundation (WPF); (b) Windows Communication Foundation (WCF); and (c) Oracle 11g or higher database.

A7. No, Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion, all three of the listed technologies are important to the tasks this resource category will be performing.

**Q8. Workstream I, A.6 Programmer/Software Developer, Level 3 (Core)**

R3 The Crown is asking for candidates who have" completed projects within the last 15 years in which they both developed and maintained applications based on Visual Basic 6 AND Classic ASP ".

Would the crown consider changing the wording to say " completed projects within the last 15 years in which they both developed and maintained applications based on Visual Basic 6 ORClassic ASP.

**A8.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion, both of the listed technologies are important to the tasks this resource category will be performing.

**Q9. For all rated resource requirements Workstream I, II, III -** would the Crown consider a change in wording to allow projects in excess of the 15 years to be included given the antiquated nature of some of the technologies referenced in this RFP ?

**A9.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion.

**Q10. Workstream 1: A.1. Application/Software Architect, Level 3,**

For R4, R5, R6, R7, in order to allow for more qualified resources to bid, would the Crown please increase the period from 10 to 15 years for projects to be considered acceptable?

**A10.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion.

**Q11. Workstream 1: A.5. ERP Technical Analyst (CRM), Level 3,**

For R1, in order to allow for more qualified resources to bid, would the Crown please change the scoring so that a candidate can score full points if they have 3 of the 4 listed certifications? Also, please include certifications for CRM 2015 as acceptable, as this is the current version.

**A11.** Yes, please see RFP modifications #007 and #006.

**Q12. Workstream 2: P.9. Project Manager, Level 3,**

For R2, in order to allow for more qualified resources to bid, would the Crown please allow experience gained on private sector projects to be considered acceptable?

**A12.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion

**Q13. Workstream 2: C.15 Computer Forensics Specialist, Level 3,**

For R1, would the Crown please consider awarding 5 additional points for an Instructor-level certification in either of the two listed technologies?

**A13.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion.

**Q14. Workstream 3: B.1. Business Analyst, Level 3,**

For R1, in order to allow for more qualified resources to bid, would the Crown please accept an MBA (Master of Business Administration) as equivalent to a Master's Certificate in Business Analysis?

**A14.** No, see RFP modifications #4, R1 has been removed.

**Q15. Workstream 3: B.3. Business Consultant, Level 3,**

For R1, in order to allow for more qualified resources to bid, would the Crown please accept 15 years of experience working as Management Consultant as equivalent to a Certified Management Consultant (CMC) certification?

**A15.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion

**Q16.** With regard to **Corporate Criteria R3 across the Workstreams (I, II and III)**, the designated Client Representative must have worked with his/her current firm for over 8 years continually in order to fully meet the requirement. This excludes any potential bidder who has a senior Client Representative who has worked in the same capacity, but with more than 1 firm in the past 8 years. Limiting this experience to the same firm seems excessively exclusive. In fact, an individual with related experience with more than one firm would likely have broader experience potentially offering greater value to CSC. Would the crown consider opening this requirement to allow Client Representatives to have worked in the same capacity for more than one firm?

**A16.** Please see RFP Questions and Answers #007, Q11.

**Q17. Workstream I, Programmer/Software Developer – Level 3, M2 and M4** require 10+ years of experience with Government of Canada clients. Would the Crown consider accepting experience with private sector clients to allow for more qualified resources to be bid?

**A17.** Please see RFP modifications #012 for updated Bid Evaluation Criteria.

**Q18. Workstream 1 Application/Software Architect Level 3, R4**

In reference to the Application/Software Architect Level 3 position, Rated requirement R4: the requirement states “Demonstrate that the proposed resource has completed projects within the last 10 years in which they architected applications for a GoC client with both Visual Basic 6 and Classic ASP by providing the following information for each project referenced”.

Our experience is that the majority of VB and ASP applications were replaced by VB.NET/ASP.NET in the 2003-2005 timeframe. As such, many qualified resources may possess the required experience but outside of the 10 year timeframe currently indicated in the requirement. Therefore, would the Crown consider amending this requirement to allow for experience within the past 15 years?

**A18.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion.

**Q19. All Workstreams and all categories** - For all resource requirements that state GOC experience, would the Crown please change this requirement to state Government of Canada (GoC) department or Agency, Crown Corporation or Provincial/Territorial Government department or Agency similar to what is stated in the Mandatory Corporate requirements?

With respect to the consultant client references needed across the rated criteria in all streams, would it be possible for the Crown to change this requirement to state that the bidder must provide a maximum of three (3) project references for each? This requirement favours the incumbent who has been working with Correctional Services for some time. For resources who have not worked on this project, in some cases to document the necessary experience over a 10 year period, 10+ references would be required in order to score maximum points.

Workstream I, A.5, ERP Technical Analyst CRM category, would the Crown please reconsider the evaluation methodology for R.2 and R.3? The current point allocation penalizes resources who have worked on long-term engagements.

**A19.** Yes, Canada will change the resource requirements for GoC experience and acceptable alternatives. Resource categories will be considered to be similar if the work in the provided references meets at least 70% of the points of responsibility listed in this solicitation's Statement of Work for the resource category. Please see RFP modifications #011.

Experienced gained on projects for non GoC public sector clients (Provincial, Territorial) will be considered acceptable only if:

1) The contract/task authorization issued by the client for the referenced work was for a category with a name which is the same, or similar, to the category as named in this RFP, and invoices were issued with that category name.

2) The contract/task authorization issued by the client for the referenced work had a statement of work which included at least 70% of the tasks listed in the relevant task list in this RFP.

Please see RFP modifications #012 for updated Bid Evaluation Criteria.

However, Canada is not prepared to revise the references requested in this criterion. Please see RFP Questions and Answers #007, A2.

#### **Q20 Workstream II- ITIL Certifications:**

P.2 Enterprise Architecture Level 3, P.9 Project Manager Level 3, C.3 IT Security TRA and CA Analyst, C.15 Computer Forensic Specialist while having no mention of ITIL or any ITIL-related duties in their respective Statements of Work all have points awarded for ITIL certifications and in some cases those points are a significant percentage of the overall available rated requirements. Would the Crown please consider dropping ITIL certification requirements from all of these categories as ITIL certification does not appear to be relevant to any of them? Or if the Crown is not willing to remove the ITIL certification requirement would the Crown please explain the rationale and justification for the ITIL Certification requirements for each of these categories?

**A20.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise these criteria.

ITIL has been the de facto standard for ITSM, and has been applied at IMS since 2004.

#### **Q21. Workstream II National Security Portfolio Experience:**

It is difficult to understand the importance that the Crown is placing on National Security Portfolio experience. There appears to be no consistency as to the amount or type of experience that is being asked for, ranging from no experience requirements for the C.15 Computer Forensic Specialist to for the P.5 Project Executive 20 out of the 30 available rated requirements points (66.66%) awarded for National Security Portfolio experience.

It is interesting to note that the National Security Portfolio experience requirements for **P.5 Project Executive** are not related to being a Project Executive on a National Security Portfolio project, but for being a Project Manager.

**P.4 Organizational Development Consultant**'s rated requirements include 33.33% of National Security Portfolio experience and it is for experience that does not appear to be related to Organizational Development.

It is further bewildering that for the **P.9 Project Manager** that it is mandatory that they managed one National Security Portfolio project with no available points for managing additional National Security Portfolio projects.

Would the Crown:

- a. provide some consistency as to how they value and rate National Security Portfolio project experience across the related positions, and;
- b. only rate National Security Portfolio experience that is related to the specific category for which the points have been allocated?

**A21. P.5 Project Executive:** Please see RFP modifications #009. **P.4 Organizational Development Consultant**: Please see RFP modifications #012 for updated Bid Evaluation Criteria. **P.9 Project Manager**: Canada will add a rated criteria to P.9 Project Manager. Please see RFP modifications #012 for updated Bid Evaluation Criteria. Canada is not prepared to revise other aspects of these criteria.

**Q22. C.3 IT Security TRA and C&A Analyst- Level 3:**

For R1, could the Crown please explain how any of these certifications are; a. relevant to the identified work, or b. to the C.3 category. They would seem to be misplaced and relate more to other positions like C.15 Computer Forensics Specialist.

R2, R3 and R4 are all related to the proposed resources experience yet only R3 specifies that the experience must be in the National Security Portfolio realm. This is restrictive and difficult to understand as to why it is so stipulated, as Threat and Risk Assessments (TRAs) and Certification & Accreditation (C&A) / Security Assessment and Authorization (SA&A) services follow the same TBS policies, rules and methodologies most especially within the entire Federal Government. Would the Crown please remove the National Security Portfolio restriction within R.3 and provide for Government –wide experience to be included in the bid?

R4 is asking for experience that is; a. not related to the Statement of Work, or b. to the C.3 Category. Would the Crown please remove R4?

**A22.** R3 - No, Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion. Experience requested in R3 demonstrates work for clients in the National Security Portfolio realm with sensitive and mission-critical IT security posture of these departments. Canada does not require the same experience for R2 or R4.

R4 - No, Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion.

**Q23. C.15 Computer Forensics Specialist- Level 3:**

For R1 - While EnCase and AccessData certifications, albeit proprietary, are nice to have, there are many more relevant certifications that would also provide value. Would the Crown please consider adding other certifications such as: Certified Forensic Computer Examiner, Certified Computer Examiner (CCE), GIAC Certified Forensic Examiner (GCFE) and GIAC Certified Forensic Analyst (GCFA), Certified Cyber Forensics Professional (CCFP), or Computer Hacking Forensic Investigator which tend to provide more advanced capabilities?

In R3, ITIL appears to have no relevance to the Statement of Work for this category; would the Crown please consider removing R3?

**A23.** R1 - Please see RFP modifications #012 for updated Bid Evaluation Criteria. R3 - Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion.

**Q24. Corporate M2, all Workstreams:**

As the Crown is allowing references from Provincial governments, and given that most Federal Governments may vary in titles of categories they use for similar business work, please confirm that the eligibility for billings will be based on the nature of the work, and not solely on the title of the category.

**A24.** Please see RFP modifications #012 for updated Bid Evaluation Criteria. Resource categories will be considered to be similar if the work in the provided references meets at least 70% of the points of responsibility listed in this solicitation's Statement of Work for the resource category.

Experienced gained on projects for non GoC public sector clients (Provincial, Territorial) will be considered acceptable only if:

- 1) The contract/task authorization issued by the client for the referenced work was for a category with a name which is the same, or very similar, to the category as named in this RFP, and invoices were issued with that category name.
- 2) The contract/task authorization issued by the client for the referenced work had a statement of work which included at least 70% of the tasks listed in the relevant task list in this RFP.

**Q25. Across all Workstreams for R1 and R3** under the Bidder's Corporate Rated Requirements, we have the following request for clarification

R1. Can the Crown please clarify what is meant by "relevant technologies"? Is the Crown merely asking the bidder to list any of the technologies used on the project?

**A25.** No, the Crown is asking the bidder to list any of the technologies which were transferred by the bidder to its client employees on the project.

**Q26.** Across all Workstreams for R1 and R3 under the Bidder's Corporate Rated Requirements, we have the following request for clarification

R3. This requirement requests bidders to provide "the total number of years of experience of the Bidder's Client Representative in performing the above mentioned tasks;", however there are no tasks referenced. Is this area missing or can we disregard this reference to the above mentioned tasks?

**A26.** The total number of years of experience of the Bidder's Client Representative in performing the Tasks mentioned below, please refer to a) and b) of the rated criteria R.3;

a) Number of months/years of experience providing contract management services and managing teams of resources for Federal, Provincial or Territorial Department or Agency clients (maximum 10 points).

b) Number of resources simultaneously managed, on 1 or more contracts, for a single Federal, Provincial or Territorial Department or Agency client (maximum 10 points),

**Q27. Workstream I, A.6 Programmer/Software Developer, Level 3 (Core)**

R7 States The Bidder's proposed resource has experience within the last 15 years performing C/GDML or Pro\*C programming by providing the following information:

Would the Crown consider similar wording for the following Rated requirements to be similar to how R7 has been worded?

**A27.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion. R7 is different in nature from the other rated criteria for this category. In the case of R7, either technology (C/GDML or Pro\*C) is accepted, and so points are awarded for experience using either technology. On the other hand, the other rated criteria are focused on combination of different technologies in the same environment. Points are awarded for experience working in environments where all the listed technologies were used.

**Q28.** Workstream 2: P.9. Project Manager, Level 3,

For R2, R3, R4, in order to allow for more qualified resources to bid, would the Crown please increase the period from 5 to 10 years for projects to be considered acceptable?

**A28.** Yes, Canada will revise the 5 years to 10 years. Please see RFP modifications #012 for updated Bid Evaluation Criteria.

**Q29. Q:** For the level 2 Business Analyst, the M1 criteria states that, "proposed resource must possess either of the following: A College diploma or a University degree in Science, Engineering, Commerce or Business Administration". Would the crown accept an international Bachelors of Economics degree which received a credential analysis by the World Education Services Canada (which is a recognized and



funded in part by the Government of Ontario) to be equivalent to a bachelor's degree in Business and Administration from a recognized university in Ontario?"

**A29.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion. A degree in Economics will not be accepted as an equivalent to a degree in Business Administration.

**Q30.** The mandatory and rated criteria for both the corporate and resourcing require substantiating information to be within a certain time frame as of the bid closing date. With the current due date of February 23, 2016, cut-off end date for the requirement for past 15, 10, 5 etc years window would be January 2016. Bidders are currently building supporting criteria around this windowed end date. With the possibility of due date extensions, this windowed date would be continually changing. Could PWGSC please provide a non-moving cut-off end date of January 2016 so that Bidders do not need to change supporting criteria should there be extensions to the solicitation closing date?

**A30.** The closing date is March 1, 2016.

**Q31.** Would the Crown please reconsider the requirement to provide client references for each of the resource projects listed in the Mandatory/Rated requirements. In some instances we have permanent employees whom are interested in working with CSC. In these instances, providing a client reference for their current employment could put the resource in a compromising position. We kindly request that for each of the resource requirements where client references are required, that bidders are only required to provide a maximum of three client references.

**A31.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise these criteria. Please see Questions and Answers #007, A2.

**Q32. Workstream III, B.1 Business Analyst, Level 3, M1:** Would a degree in Economics be acceptable to meet this requirement, given that Economics is in large part related to commerce and business administration?

**A32.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion. A degree in Economics will not be accepted as an equivalent to a degree in Business Administration.

**Q33. Workstream II, C.3 IT Security TRA, C&A Analyst, level 3:** M4 and M5 both require 10 years of experience within the last 15 years for Government of Canada clients. Given the large hi-tech industry in Ottawa and the fact that many senior Security consultants provide their expertise to both private and public sector clients, by only asking for government experience the Crown is limiting the pool of qualified candidates who could meet this requirement. We respectfully ask the Crown to consider opening these criteria (M4 and M5) up to include both public and private sector experience within the last 15 years.

**A33.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise these criteria. Private sector experience is not acceptable for this requirement, due to the difference between the operations of private companies and public sector departments. The nature, volume and sensitivity of information handled by public sector organizations necessitates a different IT security standards and practices when compared to private companies. Additionally, public sector clients must comply with public service standards (including from Treasury Board, CSIS, PWGSC and SSC), union standards and governance elements.

**Q34. Workstream II, C.15 Computer Forensics Specialist, level 3:** Given the change in points allocated to R2 in Amendment #6 (previously one needed to demonstrate 5 projects in addition to those cited in M4 to score full points, but now one needs to demonstrate 7 projects in addition to those in M4 for a total of 10 projects within the last 15 years), we respectfully ask the Crown to consider opening this

criterion (R2) up to include both public and private sector experience within the last 15 years. Given the hi-tech industry in Ottawa and the fact that many senior Security consultants provide their expertise to both private and public sector clients, by only asking for government experience for this requirement the Crown is limiting the pool of qualified candidates who could meet this requirement.

**A34.** No, the Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion.

**Q35. For Stream 2, P.5 Project Executive, Level 3, for R2:**

The Canada Revenue Agency was known as the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency (CCRA) until a federal government reorganization in December 2003, when customs enforcement was moved into the Canada Border Services Agency, which is part of the Public Safety Canada portfolio. Given that the Crown is looking for 10 years within the last 15 years, of experience within the National Security Portfolio, would a project at the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency (CCRA) in 2003, prior to the split of the department, count as being within the National Security Portfolio?

**A35.** Please see RFP modifications #012 for updated Bid Evaluation Criteria.

**Q36. Workstream II, C.3 IT Security TRA and C&A Analyst, R1:** the GIAC Systems and Networks Auditors (GSNA) certification is required along with ITIL and CISA in order to score full points. Another certification, called the Certified in Risk and Information Systems Control (CRISC) certification, is very similar to the GSNA; they are both risk management –technique based and auditing certifications. Would the Crown consider amending R1 to include the CRISC certification and amending the scoring such that possessing 3 of the 4 certifications would earn a candidate full points?

**A36.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise this criterion.

**Q37. Further to Amendment 7, Question/Answer #2:** Many required references, both corporate and resource related, are from National Security Portfolio clients. Typically companies are not allowed to publicize that they did any work for these clients let alone provide detailed project information and client identification. We request that the required references both corporate and resource related which could contain sensitive information not be made mandatory at bid submission but that, if required, during the evaluation the Crown can request that the bidder set up contact with appropriate client contacts.

**A37.** No, Canada is not prepared to revise these criteria. Please see Questions and Answers #007, A2.

**ALL OTHERS TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.**