

**Various Level 3 Resources For IT Operation Support**

**REQUEST FOR PROPSAL**

**AMENDMENT NO. 4**

This RFP amendment No. 4 is raised to;

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

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

Question	Answer
<p><b>Q31.</b> Based on the Q&amp;A #23 in Amendment 2, please confirm that the use of parent, affiliate or subsidiary references is also acceptable for the Point Rated Corporate Requirements, not just the Mandatory Corporate Requirements?</p>	<p>Canada confirms.</p>
<p><b>Q32.</b> Also, given the Q&amp;A #23 in Amendment 2, we respectfully request an extension to the closing date of two weeks in order to allow Bidders time to gather and compile the necessary information from parent/affiliate/subsidiary companies and prepare a quality bid response.</p>	<p>No additional extensions will be granted.</p>
<p><b>Q33.</b> M1 *Definition of Equivalent: We understand that if bidders are proposing categories that have a different name than the ones listed in M1, bidders have to demonstrate equivalency with the RFP categories. To do this, bidders have to map roles and responsibilities of the proposed 7 contracts to the roles and responsibilities detailed in the RFP at page 43-46 in addition to mapping to the TBIPS category. Please confirm our understanding and clarify the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Q33a)</b> In the case where the category of the contract is the exact same as the TBIPS category (i.e. the resources were engaged by the client as "IT Security Engineers" and we are proposing these days against the IT Security Engineer category), we assume that in this case, there is no requirement to map to the RFP Roles and Responsibilities seeing as the category is the same. Please confirm our assumption?</li> <li>- <b>Q33b)</b> In the case where the category of the contract had a different name but the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Confirmed.</li> <li>b) Confirmed. Demonstration of 70% or more of the Roles and Responsibilities of the TBIPS SOW would be an example of an adequate demonstration of equivalency.</li> </ul>

<p>roles and responsibilities were similar or the same as the RFP category, it is necessary to map against the roles and responsibilities and against the TBIPS category of the RFP to demonstrate equivalency. For most RFPs that we have responded to with the same requirement of demonstrating equivalency, it is requested that bidders demonstrate a certain % of the Roles and Responsibilities and of the TBIPS SOW. Resources working under a contract as Operations Support Specialists, for example, may perform different tasks based on the client environment so may not cover all 42 items listed on page 44 of the RFP. Can you please confirm our assumption that a demonstration of 70% or more of the Roles and Responsibilities and TBIPS SOW is more than adequate and will be accepted as a demonstration of equivalency? We note that 70% was the requirement for the other CITS RFP that closed in March 2015.</p>	
<p><b>Q34.</b> Given that the above clarification is very important to ensure compliancy to M1 and is currently vague, would you please give bidders more time to adjust their response in accordance to your answer to our question #1 above, by extending the closing date by 10 business days?</p>	<p>No additional extensions will be granted.</p>

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	May 05, 2016	Administrative changes and published responses to questions
Amendment No. 002	May 12, 2016	Published responses to questions
Amendment No. 003	May 17, 2016	Published responses to questions
Amendment No. 004	May 18, 2016	Published responses to questions