



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

Miscellaneous Special Projects Division (XN)/Division
des projets spéciaux divers (XN)
Canadian Building
219 Laurier Ave. West, 13th Floor
Room 13077
Ottawa
Ontario
K1A 0S5

| | |
|---|---|
| Title - Sujet e-Procurement Solution (EPS) | |
| Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EN578-131350/H | Amendment No. - N° modif. 008 |
| Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20131350 | Date 2016-06-01 |
| GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$XN-111-30112 | |
| File No. - N° de dossier 111xn.EN578-131350 | CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME |
| Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2016-07-12 | |
| F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Thauvette, Maxime | Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 111xn |
| Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 420-2201 () | 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 |

Request for Proposal (RFP)**Solicitation Amendment: 008****Purpose:**

The purpose of this amendment is to amend the Request for Proposals (RFP) and provide answers to questions received with regards to this RFP.

(A) CHANGES**CHANGE: 23**

At Annex 1 - Statement of Work,

DELETE: 6.13 Service Level Requirements in its entirety.

REPLACE BY:

6.13 SERVICE LEVELS REQUIREMENTS**6.13.1 Performance Measurement and Reporting**

The Contractor must provide a Performance Report to the Project Authority on an as-and-when-requested basis containing statistical information on the performance of the EPS as compared to the requirements set out in *Section 6.13 Service Level Requirements*.

The report must include the service request identifier, the service request status and information that the Project Authority requires to understand the service request and its resolution.

6.13.2 Service Standard Failures and Exclusions

With respect to Service Standard Failures or a negative trend towards failing to meet the Service Standards, upon conducting an analysis of the data captured in the Performance Report, the Contractor must identify any discrepancies, including:

- a) Notify the Project Authority as soon as the Contractor becomes aware of such failure;
- b) Carry out a root cause analysis to investigate the underlying cause of the failure and preserve any data indicating the cause of the failure;
- c) Take action as agreed with the Project Authority to minimize the impact of the failure and prevent it from recurring;
- d) If practical, correct the failure immediately in order to resume fulfillment of the Service to the applicable Service Standard;
- e) Prepare and deliver to the Project Authority a report identifying the failure and, where possible, its cause, business impact, remedial plans, timeframe for implementing improvement plans, and any impact on the Services;
- f) Advise the Project Authority of the status of all remedial efforts being undertaken by the Contractor with respect to the underlying cause of the failure; and
- g) In calculating the Contractor's compliance with the Service Standards, any performance issues:
 - (i) caused by factors outside of the Contractor's control;
 - (ii) that resulted from any actions or inactions of GC or any third parties not within the Contractor's control;
or
 - (iii) that resulted from GC's equipment and/or third party equipment not within the primary control of the Contractor must not be included in such calculations (unless the event is the result of acts or omissions of the Contractor).

At the GC's request, the Contractor must provide substantiation that the cause of the service issue is reasonably outside of its control. The Contractor must review Section 7.10.9 Service Level Failure Credits and Earn Backs of Part 7 - Resulting Contract Clauses.

6.13.3 Service Standards

6.13.3.1 Application Availability

This service level measures the availability of the EPS.

Table 21 - Application Availability

| APPLICATION AVAILABILITY | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Service Measure | Performance Target | SLR Performance % |
| Percentage | The percentage of time that the application is available for normal business operations. | Production Applications: 99.5% Non Production Applications: 95.0% |
| Formula | [Number of hours during the month being report on when the production applications and their various components were operating without any Priority Level One or Two incidents] divided by [Total number of hours during such month minus (number of hours of maintenance window + planned downtime)] multiplied by 100 = [percentage of availability of the application during such month]. | |
| Measurement Interval | Monthly | |
| Reporting Period | Monthly | |
| Measurement Method/Source Data | Tool supplied by the Contractor automatically records date and time stamps for each activity within a process, including uptime and downtime data. | |

6.13.3.1.1 Contractor Service Level Failure Credits

| Application Availability Production Applications | Service Level Failure Credits |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Less than 99.5% but equal to or greater than 97.0% | 2% Credit |
| Less than 97% but equal to or greater than 95.0% | 5% Credit |
| Less than 95% | 10% Credit |
| Application Availability Non-Production Applications | Service Level Failure Credits |
| Less than 95% but equal to or greater than 93.0% | 2% Credit |
| Less than 93% but equal to or greater than 91.0% | 5% Credit |
| Less than 91% | 10% Credit |

6.13.3.2 Client Satisfaction

This service level measures the performance of the service provided to the different types of Users based on Users' opinion of the service performance. The results are used to identify and resolve any issues and problems. Resulting actions should improve User management satisfaction.

Table 22 - Client Satisfaction

| CLIENT SATISFACTION | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------|
| GC Satisfaction | Service Measure | Performance Target | SLR Performance % |
| Periodic Sample Satisfaction of Acquisitions Program Users | Acquisitions Program Satisfaction Rate | Acquisitions Program Users surveyed should be very satisfied or satisfied | 70% (3.5 on a scale of 5.0) |
| Periodic Sample Satisfaction of GC Users | GC Satisfaction Rate | GC Users surveyed should be very satisfied or satisfied | 70% (3.5 on a scale of 5.0) |
| | Formula | Number of responses with a very satisfied or satisfied rating ÷ total number of responses | |
| | Measurement Interval | GC Users – Semi-Annually Acquisitions Program Users – Semi-Annually | |
| | Reporting Period | GC Users – Semi-Annually Acquisitions Program Users – Semi-Annually | |
| | Measurement Method/Source Data | TBD by GC (including survey questions/scale) in consultation with the Contractor after Contract Award | |

6.13.3.2.1 Contractor Service Level Failure Credits

| Client Satisfaction | Service Level Failure Credits |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| Less than 60% but equal to or greater than 50% | 5% Credit |
| Less than 50% | 10% Credit |

6.13.3.3 Change and Release Management

This service level identifies the effectiveness of Change and Release Management processes executed by the Contractor, with the objective of improving stability of the environment via high-quality changes released into production in a scheduled and coordinated manner.

Table 23 - Change and Release Management

| CHANGE MANAGEMENT | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|---|---|
| Problem Management | Service Measure | Performance Target | SLR Performance % |
| Defect-Free Changes | Percentage | % of Changes that are implemented with no Defects being determined | 98.0% |
| Release Schedule Adherence | Schedule | % of Changes that are implemented in accordance with the agreed FSR | 99.0% |
| Documentation Timeliness | Elapsed Time | Timeframe for updating documentation and getting GC approval of the updates, in line with the latest Change | 1 business day prior to release of the Change |
| Documentation Quality | Percentage | % of Changes where the related documentation is Accepted by GC to be complete and | 100% |

| CHANGE MANAGEMENT | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|
| | | accurate within the defined Documentation time frames | |
| | Formula | Defect-Free Changes: [Total number of Changes that are not associated with any Defect within the Warranty Period] divided by [Total number of Changes where the Warranty period expires within such month] multiplied by 100 = [percentage of Defect-free Changes during such month]. Release Adherence Schedule: [Total number of Changes that are released in accordance with the schedule in the agreed FSR] divided by [Total number of Changes either contained in the approved FSR within such month] multiplied by 100 = [percentage of Changes released in accordance with the Release Schedule such month]. | |
| | Measurement Interval | Monthly | |
| | Reporting Period | Quarterly | |
| | Measurement Method/Source Data | TBD by GC in consultation with the Contractor after Contract Award | |

6.13.3.3.1 Contractor Service Level Failure Credits

| | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Change and Release Management – Defect Free Changes | Service Level Failure Credits |
| Less than 98% but equal to or greater than 93% | 2% Credit |
| Less than 93% but equal to or greater than 88% | 5% Credit |
| Less than 88% | 10% Credit |
| Change and Release Management – Release Schedule Adherence | Service Level Failure Credits |
| Less than 99% but equal to or greater than 94% | 2% Credit |
| Less than 94% but equal to or greater than 89% | 5% Credit |
| Less than 89% | 10% Credit |
| Change and Release Management – Documentation Timelines | Service Level Failure Credits |
| Greater than 1 business day | 2% |
| Greater than 2 business day | 5% |
| Greater than 3 business day | 10% |
| Change and Release Management – Documentation Quality | Service Level Failure Credits |
| Less than 100% but equal to or greater than 95% | 2% Credit |
| Less than 95% but equal to or greater than 90% | 5% Credit |
| Less than 90% | 10% Credit |

6.13.3.4 Reporting

This service level identifies the adherence of the Contractor to the agreed schedule and accuracy of reports provided pursuant to the Contract for all services.

Table 24 - Reporting

| REPORTING | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Service Measure | Performance Target | SLR Performance % |
| Reporting Schedule | Provision of reports within the defined time lines in of the Contract | 100% |
| Reporting Accuracy | % of report data elements that accurately reflect performance, consumption, pricing or status of services | 99% |
| Formula | Schedule Adherence (%) is based on the number of agreed actions that are completed within the target dates, divided by the total number of agreed actions in the measurement period. Accuracy (%) is based on the number of individual reported data elements that are in line with actuals, divided by the total number of data elements contained in all reports presented within the month. | |
| Measurement Interval | Monthly | |
| Reporting Period | Monthly | |
| Measurement Method/Source Data | TBD by GC in consultation with the Contractor after Contract Award | |

6.13.3.4.1 Contractor Service Level Failure Credits

| Reporting Schedule | Service Level Failure Credits |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Less than 100% but equal to or greater than 95% | 2% Credit |
| Less than 95% but equal to or greater than 90% | 5% Credit |
| Less than 90% | 10% Credit |
| Reporting Accuracy | Service Level Failure Credits |
| Less than 99% but equal to or greater than 94% | 2% Credit |
| Less than 94% but equal to or greater than 89% | 5% Credit |
| Less than 89% | 10% Credit |

6.13.3.5 Service Desk Availability

Table 25 - Service Desk Availability

| SERVICE DESK AVAILABILITY | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Service Measure | Performance Target | SLR Performance % |
| Schedule | Tier 2 Mon- Fri, 07:00-19 :00 Tier 3 Mon- Fri, 06 :00-18 :00 | 99.7% |
| Formula | Availability (%) = 100% - Unavailability (%) where Unavailability is defined as: $(\sum \text{Outage Duration} \times 100\%) \div (\text{Schedule Time} - \text{Planned Outage})$ | |
| Measurement Interval | First month: Measure daily Thereafter: Measure daily | |
| Reporting Period | First month: Report weekly Thereafter: Report monthly | |
| Measurement Method/Source Data | TBD by GC in consultation with the Contractor after Contract Award | |

6.13.3.5.1 Contractor Service Level Failure Credits

| Service Desk Availability | Service Level Failure Credits |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Less than 99.7% but equal to or greater than 97.0% | 2% Credit |
| Less than 97% but equal to or greater than 95.0% | 5% Credit |
| Less than 95% | 10% Credit |

6.13.3.6 Call Abandonment Rate

Table 26 - Call Abandonment Rate

| CALL ABANDONMENT RATE | | |
|--------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| Service Measure | Performance Target | SLR Performance % |
| Percentage | N/A | ≤ 6% |
| Formula | [Number of phone calls to the service desk during that Measurement Interval that are abandoned from the queue before being answered by a service desk agent] divided by [total number of phone calls that entered the queue during the Measurement Interval] multiplied by 100% = “Percent (%) Abandoned” | |
| Measurement Interval | Monthly | |
| Reporting Period | Monthly | |
| Measurement Method/Source Data | TBD by GC in consultation with the Contractor after Contract Award | |

6.13.3.6.1 Contractor Service Level Failure Credits

| Call Abandonment Rate | Service Level Failure Credits |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Greater than 6% but equal to or less than 8% | 2% |
| Greater than 8% but equal to or less than 10% | 5% |
| Greater than 10% | 10% |

6.13.3.7 Incident Acceptance Response Time

Table 27 - Incident Acceptance Response Time

| INCIDENT ACCEPTANCE RESPONSE TIME | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Service Measure | Performance Target | SLR Performance % |
| Percentage | Priority 1 Incident: ≤15 elapsed minutes Priority 2 Incident: ≤ 15 elapsed minutes Priority 3 Incident: ≤ 2 Standard Operating Hours Priority 4 Incident: ≤ 4 Standard Operating Hours | ≥ 95% (all Priority Levels) |
| Formula | [Number of Incidents (of all Priority Levels) received and accepted (i.e., received, logged, and assigned) within the Target Performance during the Measurement Interval] divided by [total number of Incidents (of all Priority Levels) received and accepted during the Measurement Interval] multiplied by 100% = “Percent (%) Attained” | |
| Measurement Interval | Monthly | |
| Reporting Period | Monthly | |

| INCIDENT ACCEPTANCE RESPONSE TIME | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Measurement Method/Source Data | TBD by GC in consultation with the Contractor after Contract Award |

6.13.3.7.1 Contractor Service Level Failure Credits

| Incident Acceptance Response Time | Service Level Failure Credits |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Less than 95% but equal to or greater than 93.0% | 2% Credit |
| Less than 93% but equal to or greater than 91.0% | 5% Credit |
| Less than 91% | 10% Credit |

6.13.3.8 Incident Management: First Contact Resolution

Table 28 - Incident Management: First Contact Resolution

| INCIDENT MANAGEMENT: FIRST CONTACT RESOLUTION | | |
|---|---|-------------------|
| Service Measure | Performance Target | SLR Performance % |
| Percentage | N/A | ≥ 80% |
| Formula | [Number of User contacts to the service desk during the Measurement Interval which are resolved by the initially-contacted service desk agent and did not result in a Call Back] divided by [the total number of User contacts during the Measurement Interval] multiplied by 100% = “Percent (%) Attained” | |
| Measurement Interval | Monthly | |
| Reporting Period | Monthly | |
| Measurement Method/Source Data | TBD by GC in consultation with the Contractor after Contract Award | |

6.13.3.8.1 Contractor Service Level Failure Credits

| Incident Management: First Contact Resolution | Service Level Failure Credits |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Less than 80% but equal to or greater than 78.0% | 2% Credit |
| Less than 78% but equal to or greater than 76.0% | 5% Credit |
| Less than 76% | 10% Credit |

6.13.3.9 Incident Management: Incident Resolution Time

Table 29 - Incident Management: Incident Resolution Time

| INCIDENT MANAGEMENT: INCIDENT RESOLUTION TIME | | |
|---|---|---|
| Service Measure | Performance Target | SLR Performance % |
| Percentage | Priority 1 Incident: ≤ 4 elapsed hours Priority 2 Incident: ≤ 6 elapsed hours Priority 3 Incident: ≤ 24 Standard Operating Hours Priority 4 Incident: ≤ 120 Standard Operating Hours | Priority 1 Incidents: ≥ 95% Priority 2 Incidents: ≥ 95% Priority 3 Incidents: ≥ 90% Priority 4 Incident: ≥ 90% |

| INCIDENT MANAGEMENT: INCIDENT RESOLUTION TIME | |
|--|---|
| Formula | [Number of Incidents received during the Measurement Interval which are Resolved within the Target Performance] divided by [total number of Incidents received during the Measurement Interval] multiplied by 100% = "Percent (%) Attained" |
| Measurement Interval | Monthly |
| Reporting Period | Monthly |
| Measurement Method/Source Data | TBD by GC in consultation with the Contractor after Contract Award |

6.13.3.9.1 Contractor Service Level Failure Credits

| Incident Management: Incident Resolution Time Priority 1 and 2 | Service Level Failure Credits |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Less than 95% but equal to or greater than 93.0% | 2% Credit |
| Less than 93% but equal to or greater than 91.0% | 5% Credit |
| Less than 91% | 10% Credit |
| Incident Management: Incident Resolution Time Priority 3 and 4 | Service Level Failure Credits |
| Less than 90% but equal to or greater than 88.0% | 2% Credit |
| Less than 88% but equal to or greater than 86.0% | 5% Credit |
| Less than 86% | 10% Credit |

6.13.3.10 Incident Management: Incident Resolution Rate

Table 30 - Incident Management: Incident Resolution Rate

| INCIDENT MANAGEMENT: INCIDENT AND SERVICE REQUEST RESOLUTION RATE | | |
|--|---|--|
| Service Measure | Performance Target | SLR Performance % |
| Percentage | Incidents: Priority 1 Incident: ≤ 24 elapsed hours Priority 2 Incident: ≤ 24 elapsed hours Priority 3 Incident: ≤ 120 elapsed hours Priority 4 Incident: ≤ 240 elapsed hours | Incidents (all Priority Levels): 100% |
| Formula | [Number of Incidents or Service Requests during the Measurement Interval which are Resolved or completed, as applicable, and closed within the Target Performance] divided by [total number of Incidents or Service Requests that are open (in the queue) during the Measurement Interval] multiplied by 100% = "Percent (%) Attained" This formula is applied separately to Incidents and Service Requests. | |
| Measurement Interval | Monthly | |
| Reporting Period | Monthly | |
| Measurement Method/Source | TBD by GC in consultation with the Contractor after Contract Award | |

| INCIDENT MANAGEMENT: INCIDENT AND SERVICE REQUEST RESOLUTION RATE | |
|--|--|
| Data | |

6.13.3.10.1 Contractor Service Level Failure Credits

| Incident Management: Incident and Service Request Resolution Rate (All Priority Levels) | Service Level Failure Credits |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Less than 100% but equal to or greater than 95% | 2% Credit |
| Less than 95% but equal to or greater than 90% | 5% Credit |
| Less than 90% | 10% Credit |

6.13.3.11 Software Management – Notification of Available Patches, Updates, and Releases

This service level measures the timeliness of notifying the client about the availability of patches, service packs, updates and new releases across all applications, data bases, middleware and tools.

Table 32 - Software Management – Notification of Available Patches, Updates, and Releases

| SOFTWARE MANAGEMENT – NOTIFICATION OF AVAILABLE PATCHES, UPDATES, AND RELEASES | | |
|---|--|--|
| Service Measure | Performance Target | SLR Performance % |
| Percentage | The percentage of events notified within the target time frame: Patches: Within 5 Business Days after Contractor announcement Other Updates: Within 30 Calendar Days after Contractor announcement | Patches: 99.00% Other Updates: 95.00% |
| Formula | [Number of events notified within the target time frame] divided by [Total number of events in the measurement period] multiplied by 100 = [percentage of events notified within the target time frame during such month]. | |
| Measurement Interval | Quarterly | |
| Reporting Period | Quarterly | |
| Measurement Method/Source Data | TBD by GC in consultation with the Contractor after Contract Award | |

6.13.3.11.1 Contractor Service Level Failure Credits

| Software Management: Notification of Available Patches | Service Level Failure Credits |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Less than 99% but equal to or greater than 94% | 2% Credit |
| Less than 94% but equal to or greater than 89% | 5% Credit |
| Less than 89% | 10% Credit |
| Software Management: Notification of Other Updates | Service Level Failure Credits |
| Less than 95% but equal to or greater than 93.0% | 2% Credit |
| Less than 93% but equal to or greater than 91.0% | 5% Credit |
| Less than 91% | 10% Credit |

CHANGE: 24

At Annex 1, section 3.11 *SECTION J - USER MANAGEMENT*, sub section 3.11.3 *Requirements*, delete requirement J-03.07 in its entirety.

CHANGE: 25

At Annex 2, Section III - Service Level Agreements, under category Service Continuity, sub-category Contingency Planning (first row in Table 3), delete the description in its entirety and replace with:

The Contractor should perform backup, recovery and refresh operations on a periodic basis. The Contractor should provide Recovery Point Objective, RPO (=4 hours) and Recovery Time Objective, RTO (= 72 Hours) as part of the Service Levels. The Contractor should, at a frequency that is consistent with RTO/RPO:

- a) Conduct backups of user-level information;
- b) Conduct backups of system-level information;
- c) Conduct backups of documentation including security-related documentation; and
- d) Protect the confidentiality and integrity of backup information at the storage location in accordance with media protection requirements.

CHANGE: 26

Under subsection (ii) *e-Procurement Solution Operational* of section 7.10.1 *Basis of Payment* of the RFP,

DELETE:

The EPS Operational Firm Lot Monthly Price is payable monthly and begins in the month subsequent to the successful completion (and Canada's acceptance) of milestones #1, #2 & #3 of the EPS Transition-In phase.

INSERT:

The EPS Operational Firm Lot Monthly Price is payable monthly and begins in the month subsequent to the successful completion (and Canada's acceptance) of milestones #1 & #2 of the EPS Transition-In phase.

CHANGE: 27

Delete subsection (i) *Payment Credits* of section 7.10.9 *Service Level Failure Credits and Earn-Backs* in its entirety and replace with:

(i) Payment Credits

Credits for Failure to Meet Minimum Service Level: Starting 6 months following the completion of Milestone #4, if the Contractor fails to meet any of the minimum service levels, identified at *subsection 6.13 of Annex 1, Statement of Work*, at any given time during the remaining Term of the Contract, the Contractor agrees to credit Canada a payment credit of a percentage of the EPS Operational Firm Lot Monthly Price for that month, for each service level that is not met. The percentage of payment credits associated with each failure to meet a service level are detailed in tables entitled "Contractor Service Level Failure Credits" under each service level.

Maximum Payment Credits: The maximum payment credits per month are capped at 15%. However, if payment credits are incurred for 3 consecutive months, the cap for maximum payment credits in the third month will increase from 15% to 30% and will continue to be capped at 30% for each month in the next 12 month period.

Corrective Measures: The Contractor must submit a written action plan describing measures it will implement or actions it will undertake to eliminate the recurrence of the problem. Within 5 working days from the end of the month in which the maximum payment credit has increased to 30%, the Contractor must deliver an action plan to the Project Authority and the Contracting Authority and must rectify the underlying problem and meet the required Service Levels within the remainder of the calendar month.

CHANGE: 28

Delete subsection (vii) *Earn-Back* of section 7.10.9 *Service Level Failure Credits and Earn-Backs* in its entirety and replace with:

(vii) Earn-Back

Following any service level failure, Canada may allow the Contractor the opportunity to earn- back the payment credits charged in one or more measurement period (measured monthly). If a service level for the relevant service and any others that Canada determines to be associated with that service are met, or exceeded, during each of the six monthly measurement periods following the service level failure (or period otherwise agreed to by Canada), Canada will return all of the payment credit, associated with that service level, incurred by the Contractor.

CHANGE: 29

At Annex 1, section 2.5 *Procurement Policies, Acts, Standards, Directives, Regulations and Agreements*, add:

Standard on Enterprise Resource Planning Systems (<http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=25687§ion=text>)

Policy on the Stewardship of Financial Management Systems (<http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=17589>)

Directive on Stewardship of Financial Management Systems (<http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=17590>)

(B) QUESTIONS**QUESTION: 56**

With regard to Section III – Service Level Agreement, 3.1 Remediation(s), the RTO/RPO components of a solution are huge costs drivers in the architecture of a system. Without a defined RTO/RPO, vendors can provide widely different solutions which impact both the technical and financial submissions. In order to ensure that vendors submit consistent architecture and costs based on same understanding of RTO/RPO, would PWGSC provide actual requirements for RTO and RPO instead of the examples provided in Table 3?

ANSWER: 56

The EPS Recovery Time Objective (RTO) is 72 hours and the Recovery Point Objective (RPO) is 4 hours.

An amendment will be made to the RFP.

QUESTION: 57

With regard to Section 6.13.3.11 “Transaction Response Time” of Annex 1 – Statement of Work, the current service level for Transaction Response Time measures the time elapsed from the instant a User enters a command or query within an application until the requested information, query result, report, etc. is returned to the User. Since this is open for interpretation, could PWGSC please confirm if our understanding of Transaction Response Time can be defined as follows:

The Transaction Response Time is the maximum time to perform an HTTP Request which starts when the request reaches the service provider Portal web server and ends when the response is sent back to the user. This excludes, if applicable, any time spent waiting on the GC infrastructure dependencies over a specific business transaction.

ANSWER: 57

Transaction Response Time has been deleted. Please see the amendment to section 6.13 Service Levels Requirements in the RFP amendment.

QUESTION: 58

With regard to Section 6.13.3.11 “Transaction Response Time” of Annex 1 – Statement of Work:

1. Would PWGSC be able to provide clarifications and if possible, examples, as to what constitute an “EPS business transactions”?
2. Regarding “Non-EPS business transactions”, could PWGSC confirm if GETS transactions fall within this category?
3. Also, regarding “Non-EPS business transactions”, the current examples provided are still board and leave room for interpretation. Could PWGSC clearly define all the types of transactions that fall within this category?

ANSWER: 58

Transaction Response Time has been deleted. Please see the amendment to section 6.13 Service Levels Requirements in the RFP amendment.

QUESTION: 59

E2.172 of Annex 2 - Security and Privacy, suggests that all resources need to complete these checks. Please confirm that all resources, even those that have Enhanced Reliability, need to complete the steps outlined in E2.172.

ANSWER: 59

No, these checks must only be completed by a foreign supplier, and only for the employees that will have access to the Protected B or personal information, as per the Security Requirements Check List (SRCL) and section 7.5.3 of the RFP.

Bullet #4 of E2.172, Annex 2, was removed since it is a duplication of what is contained in section 7.5.3 of the RFP.

QUESTION: 60

Current Call Volumes: What is the current volume of incidents by language for the applications being replaced by this solution?

ANSWER: 60

The service desk call volumes for PWGSC’s legacy systems being replaced by EPS for fiscal year 2015/2016 were

approximately 6,500. While not all existing service desks capture the language of the original call / email, those that do indicate approximately 75% are in English and 25% are in French. It must be noted that as the majority of these systems are internal to PWGSC, these volumes cannot be considered indicative of the call volumes for a service desk supporting a GC-wide EPS nor are they representative of an expected high volume of calls during the initial deployment of the EPS.

QUESTION: 61

Under the Training Plan section 6.7.3, point C (page 185), the RFP states “c) Develop, document and maintain training and knowledge transfer procedures that meet requirements and adhere to defined policies;”. Will PWGSC please provide further details as to what specific policies are being referred to?

ANSWER: 61

Point c) of 6.7.3 Training Plan of Annex 1 - Statement of Work was amended to:

c) Develop, document and maintain training and knowledge transfer procedures;

QUESTION: 62

In Section 3.3.2.7 of Annex 1 - Services Supporting Supplier Ability to Analyze Opportunities and Forge Partnership, there are requirements for Suppliers to be able to register their intent to submit a response to a bid solicitation in EPS. Could PWGSC please provide more details on the following:

- a) Could PWGSC confirm that the Suppliers would need to register and be authenticated on GETS to register their intent to submit a response to a bid solicitation?
- b) Could PWGSC confirm if the Suppliers registration on GETS, if required, would also need to automatically register them to the wider EPS system and vice versa, if the Supplier registration on EPS would also need to automatically register Supplier on GETS?
- c) Could PWGSC confirm if Supplier Registration in EPS is the same registration requirements for GETS (i.e. Supplier Registration requirements mentioned in 3.9.2, section H-01 would also be applicable to GETS Supplier Registration)?

ANSWER: 62

a) Confirmed. Suppliers will need to register and be authenticated on GETS to register their intent to submit a response to a bid solicitation.

b) Confirmed. In accordance with 3.3.2 Government Electronic Tendering Service (GETS) the GETS must be provided as a part of the EPS and must deliver, enable and support the functional and technical requirements described in this SOW. This includes the technical requirement identified in Tech.22 of Annex 1 Statement of Work, Part 4 Technical Requirements, section 4.4.2 “to support a single sign on within the solution domain”.

c) Confirmed.

QUESTION: 63

Regarding item J-03.07, where it states “to automatically and regularly send notifications to Users to determine the status, and desired status, of their account in EPS”, we have the following questions:

1. How often are the notifications to be sent?
2. From which email system are the notifications to be sent (i.e. vendor supplied email system or Government)?

ANSWER: 63

This requirement is deleted.

QUESTION: 64

Part 7 - Resulting Contract Clauses; Section 7.10.1; sub-section (ii) e-Procurement Solution Operational; p.50 states "The EPS Operational Firm Lot Monthly Price is payable monthly and begins in the month subsequent to the successful completion (and Canada's acceptance) of milestones #1-3; however Annex 3 - Pricing Schedule; p.272 states that payments begin after completion of milestones #1-2. Please clarify which statement is correct.

ANSWER: 64

Canada confirms that the first Operational Firm Lot Monthly will be paid in the month subsequent to the completion and Canada's acceptance of Milestone #1 and #2. Answer #5 under Amendment 003 is hereby deleted. Section 7.10.1. (ii) e-

Procurement Solution Operational is amended in the "change" section of the RFP amendment.

QUESTION: 65

In Section 7.10.9 - Payment Credits - of the RFP, the Crown provides for Payment Credits for a failure to meet a service level set at 10% of monthly fees for each service level up to a maximum of 20% per month. These Payment Credits increase to 30% if Payment Credits are incurred for three (3) consecutive months. While Service Level credits provide incentive to meet SLA's, service level credit exposure should be capped at a percentage of monthly fees that is not excessive so as to not become punitive. The current fees at risk percentage in the RFP is significantly higher than the higher end 10-12% industry standard fees at risk. Our experience is also that typical SLA frameworks apply weights to each SLA that reflect the importance of the SLA to the client up to a maximum weight per SLA. This weighting is often combined with a pooling mechanism that enables the client to increase the weight of an individual SLA within the framework. We believe that the high percentage of fees as risk (20% escalating to 30%), and lack of weighting and pooling mechanism create an SLA framework that is punitive and imposes a level of risk and cost that is well beyond industry standard and may cause Bidder to not bid.

Given this, would the Crown please consider the following proposed alternative Service Level management framework that brings the framework in the RFP more in-line with industry standards:

1. Reduce the Payment Credits (At Risk Amount) for service levels to align with industry standard which in our experience is 10-12% of the monthly service fees payable for the ongoing services.
2. Establish a weighting and pooling mechanism including allocation of the At Risk Amount across the Service Levels based on priority and criticality to the business where the more critical services levels would be allocated a higher portion of the at risk amount than the less critical services levels. Additionally, we recommend a 200% pooling mechanism (Allocation Amount) allowing the At Risk Amount to be spread across the Service Levels 2 times providing the Crown a means to maximize the at risk amount and weight Service Levels more heavily. Although the amount allocated to the Service Levels is doubled, the amount payable as credits would still be capped at the agreed 10-12% of monthly service fees.
3. Setting Service Levels with heavy penalties can backfire by driving the wrong behaviours from a Bidder and place excessive focus on meeting a number vs focusing on the customer's business outcomes. For this reason, we would recommend limiting the maximum allocation for individual Service Levels to 25% of the 200%
4. Service Level defaults are a serious matter and, upon a Service Level Default, there should be a Root Cause Analysis (RCA) completed to understand and mitigate any further failures. To ensure this process is followed and effective, we would recommend an escalation process that includes a multiplier of the penalty associated with a Service Level if there are subsequent consecutive failures for the same Service Level instead of the recommended increase of the cap on the Payment Credits/At Risk Amount to 30%. This mechanism would increase the Service Level credit for the respective Service Level by 25% when a third default occurs, 50% in month 4, 75% in month 5, and so on. For example, if a Service Level credit is normally 4% of the invoice (At Risk Amount), in the third consecutive months it becomes 5%, in the fourth consecutive month it is 6%.
5. This framework is aligned with leading practices recommended by industry subject matter experts. For more information on the SLA framework, we recommend a whitepaper from Alsbridge, which is an industry recognized third party advisor. This whitepaper can be found at: <http://www.transworldnews.com/NewsStory.aspx?id=482136&%3baut=9290>

ANSWER: 65

Taking into consideration the issues raised in this question, Canada amended RFP Part 7, Section 7.10.9. In addition, Canada amended the SLA's in section 6.13 of Annex 1 - Statement of Work.

QUESTION: 66

Section 6.13.3.2 of Annex 1 – Statement of Work (SOW) of the RFP in Table 8 sets out two Service Levels for Client Satisfaction that are based on user responses to surveys with an associated SLR performance expectation of 80% (4.0 on a scale of 5.0) and associated fees at risk and service credits in the event of an SLR miss. Client satisfaction is an important measure to help IT leadership understand how services are perceived by their users, and we regularly work with clients to complete Client Satisfaction Surveys (CSATs). That said, due to their subjective nature and the fact that they do not measure the actual performance of the EPS solution, our experience is that CSAT scores are therefore not suitable as Service Levels that carry penalties for non-performance but rather should be treated as service objectives that the Bidder will use best efforts to achieve.

We accordingly respectfully request that the RFP be amended to recast the Client Satisfaction Service Levels set out in Section 6.13.3.2 as service objectives to be achieved on a best efforts basis and that all fees at risk and service credits related to Client Satisfaction be removed.

ANSWER: 66

Please see the amendment to Annex 1 – Statement of Work, Part 6, Section 6.13.3.2.1 Contractor Service Level Failure Credits for Client Satisfaction.

QUESTION: 67

Within Section 7.10.9 of the RFP – Service Level Failure, Credits and Earn-backs, Canada sets out the following provisions for earnbacks: “Following any service level failure, Canada may allow the Contractor the opportunity to earn- back the payment credits charged in one or more measurement period (measured monthly). If all the service levels for the relevant service and any others that Canada determines to be associated with that service are met, or exceeded, during each of the three monthly measurement periods following the service level failure (or period otherwise agreed to by Canada), Canada may, at its sole discretion, return half of the payment credits incurred by the Contractor. Canada reserves right to not return payment credits although Vendor is meeting the conditions for their return...”

Our experience is that the more effective and commercially reasonable service credit and earn- back frameworks penalize poor performance and reward good performance in a balanced manner. For this reason, these frameworks allow the Bidder to earn-back the service credits if it exceeds the service levels for the agreed upon period automatically and this right is not subject to subjective criteria or discretion. Moreover, these frameworks typically apply service credits and earn-back rights on a service level by service level basis rather than at an aggregate level across all service levels so that performance across each is measured and managed. Lastly, these frameworks typically enable the Bidder recover the full amount (100%) of any service credits that the Bidder may have been assessed on an earlier SLR miss. In Bidder’s experience, the current clause is ineffective and punitive, as it does not reward performance that exceeds the SLR (it is discretionary) and imposes significant financial penalties even if the Bidder addresses the issue and exceeds the SLR for the agreed upon period (i.e. it cannot recover the full amount of the service credits. Will the Crown please:

1. Amend the Section to clarify that the payment credits and earn-backs apply on a service level by service level basis and not at an aggregate basis such that Bidder can earnback payment credits it was assessed on an SLR by exceeding the SLR for the three (3) month period;
2. Amend the Section to delete the words “at its sole discretion” such that the earn-back is automatic if the Bidder exceeds the SLR’s during the three (3) month period and the right to earn-back is not subject to the Crown’s discretion;
3. Amend the Section to enable Bidder to recover all (100%) of any Service Credits it has been assessed if it exceeds the SLR during the three (3) month period set out in the clause.

ANSWER: 67

1. Please see the amendment to RFP Part 7, Section 7.10.9 in which earn backs apply on a service level by service level basis.
2. Please see the amendment to RFP Part 7, Section 7.10.9 in which “at its sole direction” has been deleted.
3. Please see the amendment to RFP Part 7, Section 7.10.9 in which the recovery amount has been revised.

QUESTION: 68

Under the SCSi provisions in Section 3 of the RFP, the Bidder is not permitted to change the Technical or Financial bid as a result of a change to the SCSi. The Bidder recognizes that there could be modifications required to the Solution to adjust to changes initiated by Canada over the life of a contract that runs for a 12-year term. These changes and their cost impact to the Bidder are unknown at this time and thus impossible to estimate and include with Bidder’s pricing response. Within the basis of payment, the service is to be provided on a flat monthly fee basis that can only be raised through a COLA mechanism. There is currently no provisions within the contract structure to address the cost of modifications to the EPS solution initiated by Canada as a result of an SCSi concern, and this presents a significant, financial risk and liability to the Bidder.

Bidder accordingly requests that Canada amend the SCSi provisions to allow Bidders to modify their bid (including their price) after submission and prior to award if SCSi Requirements change, to account for any increase in cost resulting from the SCSi provisions. Bidder further requests that, in the event that an SCSi assessment post award results in the Crown requiring changes to the Bidder’s EPS solution, that the Change Request Process be utilized to price and approve any changes to the Bidder’s EPS solution required to meet the SCSi.

ANSWER: 68

Canada will not amend the SCSi process to allow Bidders to modify their financial bid after submission nor will it reimburse the Contractor for changes due to the SCSi process during the Term of the Contract.

QUESTION: 69

Within the Service Standards in Section 6.13.3 of Annex 1 – Statement of Work (SOW) to the RFP, there are references to "Severity 1-2-3-4" incidents. Currently, the prioritization and the definition of the term severity are missing from the Glossary that appears in Annex 5. These are important definitions for the Bidders to understand how the Crown will measure and address service levels, and for understanding the impacts of service level penalties. Would the Crown please provide the severity definitions it is using for the EPS solution?

ANSWER: 69

Please see the amendment to Annex 1 Statement of work, Part 6, Section 6.13 Service Level Requirements. Severity has been revised to Priority and the priority levels are described in Annex 1 Statement of Work, Part 5, section 5.6.4.5 Priority Levels.

QUESTION: 70

Within Section 6.13 of Annex 1, Statement of Work (SOW), Service Level Requirements, the language is unclear when the SLAs become effective. Bidder's experience is that standard industry practice is to provide for a reasonable stabilization period following Go- Live, where SLAs are measured but do not trigger payment credits.

Would Canada please clarify that there will be a stabilization period of six (6) months after Go- Live, during which payment credits will not apply?

ANSWER: 70

Canada will allow a stabilization period in which payment credits will not apply. This will be for a period of 6 months following the completion of milestone #4.

QUESTION: 71

In section 7.3 (b) of the Resulting Contract Clause of the RFP, Canada reserves the right, at any time, to acquire the requested Work by other means including to select other suppliers. For example, Canada may decide to acquire the requested Work by other means when the Contractor provides a written proposal that has been rejected by Canada. We are unclear as to the rationale for this requirement, particularly in a case where Canada is requesting an "as a service" model where the Prime Vendor assumes overall accountability for the solution and the Crown has acquired the EPS solution through a competitive bid process. The Bidder will be responsible for delivering EPS "as a service" to Canada, which implies that the Bidder will provide all of the EPS services to Canada and is subject to penalties if the Bidder is unable to meet the terms and conditions of the contract. Bidder's experience is that to introduce another supplier to deliver all or part of the service to be delivered by Bidder as part of the EPS solution introduces delivery and performance risk that would be unacceptable to any Bidder (e.g. requiring that Bidder use a competitor to provide the infrastructure to support the EPS solution).

Given this, Bidder requests that the ability for Canada to acquire work by other means be removed and that this provision be deleted from the RFP?

ANSWER: 71

Canada will not remove this provision from the Contract. Bidders should note that section 7.3 J. b. only applies to the portion of the Work requested via a Task Authorization. This is a standard provision used by PWGSC in its Contracts with Task Authorizations.

QUESTION: 72

Annex 4 Security Requirements and RFP Section 7.5A states that all personnel from a Canadian supplier are required to have Enhanced Reliability security clearance, based on level of required access as defined in the Annex 4. Section 7.5B states that personnel working for foreign suppliers who meet the necessary trade agreement constraints (e.g. EU, NATO, CSP), can be staffed on the project if they meet the conditions described in 7.5.B.f and successfully meets the conditions defined in E2.172. Can you please confirm that employees of Canadian Suppliers who are not able to obtain an Enhanced Reliability clearance but who are able to meet the conditions defined in 7.5.B.f and E2.172, can be staff on this project?

ANSWER: 72

No, Canadian suppliers must meet the Canadian requirements defined in 7.5.A; 7.5.B only applies to foreign contractors. Canadian personnel who cannot obtain a Reliability clearance, cannot perform Work under this Contract.

QUESTION: 73

What is the Current GC Departmental Financial Management Systems (DFMS) landscape and which DFMSs must the EPS interoperate with?

ANSWER: 73

The current GC Departmental Financial Management landscape is comprised of 17 SAP instances (representing 43 departments and agencies – see table below), 5 Oracle instances (Transport Canada, Environment Canada, Correctional Services, Fisheries and Oceans, and the National Film Board) and multiple legacy ERP systems including CDFS, FreeBalance and G/X.

Canada anticipates that over the next 2-3 years, the legacy ERP systems, representing approximately 45 departments and agencies, will be transitioning to an upcoming SAP S/4HANA solution under the Financial Management Transformation (FMT) initiative. This would result in a landscape comprised of 17 existing SAP R3 instances, 1 SAP S/4HANA instance, and 2 Oracle instances (Transport Canada and Fisheries and Oceans).

As such, in accordance with section 4.3.2 *Solution Vision* of Annex 1 – Statement of Work (SOW), the EPS will be required to interoperate with the existing SAP instances as well as the new SAP S/4HANA instance. While the interoperability between the EPS and the DFMS will be through the GC ESB solution, Canada, at its own discretion and if it sees fit, may instead evaluate other potential GC solutions (i.e. the Process Orchestration [PO]) within SAP to be used, at that time. The Contractor must develop the integration solution between EPS and the DFMS SAP instances. Furthermore, the connectivity between the SAP instances and the GC ESB will be a GC responsibility. Should GC ESB interoperability be required with the remaining 2 DFMS Oracle instances (Transport Canada and Fisheries and Oceans), Canada will use the Task Authorization process, using Professional Services categories, to request the new requirements.

| Current SAP R3 Instance | Participating Departments and Agencies |
|--|---|
| Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC) | Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada |
| | Canadian Pari-Mutual Agency |
| | Canadian Food Inspection Agency |
| | Canadian Dairy Commission |
| | Natural Resources Canada |
| | Environment Canada |
| Canadian Border Services Agency (CBSA) | Canadian Border Services Agency |
| Canadian Heritage (CH) | Canadian Heritage |
| | Parks Canada |
| Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) | Canada Revenue Agency |
| | Canada Revenue Agency - Revenue Ledger |
| Canadian Space Agency (CSA) | Canadian Space Agency |
| Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC) | Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada |
| | Passport Canada |
| Global Affairs Canada (GAC) | Global Affairs Canada |
| | Canadian International Trade Tribunal |
| | Export Development Corporation |
| Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC) | Employment and Social Development Canada |
| Health Canada (HC) | Health Canada |
| | Hazardous Material Information Review Commission |
| | Patented Medicine Prices Review Board |
| | Assisted Human Reproductive Agency of Canada |
| | Public Health Agency of Canada |
| | Aboriginal Affairs & Northern Development |
| Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED) | Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada |
| | Canadian Intellectual Property Office |
| | Office of Infrastructure Canada |
| | Copyright Board |
| Department of Justice (DoJ) | Department of Justice |
| | Public Prosecution Service of Canada |
| National Research Council (NRC) | National Research Council |

| | |
|---|---|
| Department of National Defence (DND) | Department of National Defence |
| Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) | Public Services and Procurement Canada |
| | Shared Services Canada |
| Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) | Royal Canadian Mounted Police |
| | Public Safety & Emergency Preparedness Canada |
| Treasury Board EMC | Treasury Board EMC |
| Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) | Treasury Board Secretariat |
| | Finance Canada |
| | Public Appointments Commission Secretariat |
| | Privy Council Office |
| | Security Intelligence Review Committee |
| | Canada School of Public Service |
| | Canadian Transport Agency |
| | Office Superintendent Financial Institutions Canada |

QUESTION: 74

Can data be duplicated between DFMS and EPS?

ANSWER: 74

The Contractor should ensure that the EPS does not result in a duplication of data and it must ensure data is obtained from the appropriate system of record. For financial transactions, the system of records is the DFMS and for contracting related information, the EPS will be the system of record. Additionally, the EPS should not perform redundant validations and must enforce compliance with embedded controls.

QUESTION: 75

Can functionalities be duplicated between DFMS and EPS?

ANSWER: 75

In accordance with *Section 6.8.1.2 Transition-In Delivery (or execution)* the Contractor must facilitate workshops (expected outputs: Business Model/Capability Model and Data Modeling) with the GC and propose optimization (following "lean management" principles, integrated, end-to-end workflow) and re-engineering of existing processes. This includes proposing which systems are used for each step in the procurement process. During these workshops, common functionality that exists in both the EPS and DFMS will be examined by the GC and assessed based on criterion established to determine the system of record for key data elements while ensuring each system can perform its intended functions and reporting. The Contractor must work with the GC to determine which business process step will happen in which system in order to insure no duplication of functionality across the GC's procurement process.

QUESTION: 76

Do current GC DFMS support Open Catalogue Interface (OCI) protocol?

ANSWER: 76

Yes. All GC instances of SAP use native out-of-the-box Open Catalogue Interface (OCI) and all instances of Oracle use its native Extensible Markup Language (XML) interface. That is, both SAP and Oracle Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems have built in capabilities to connect and retrieve items from e-catalogues.

QUESTION: 77

Are there any government-wide initiatives that will impact the GC DFMS landscape in the coming years?

ANSWER: 77

There are several government-wide initiatives that may have an impact on the GC DFMS landscape in the coming years:

- Financial Management Transformation (FMT) initiative: The Office of the Comptroller General of Canada (OCG) is transforming and modernizing the financial management function across the GC. The objective is to improve operational efficiency, business support effectiveness, and ability to provide increased value to the business decision makers and Canadians. Over time, Canada anticipates there will be a migration of current SAP DFMSs to the upcoming SAP S/4HANA Solution and a reduction of the number of SAP instances. This should impact business processes, connectivity and integration

with the Procure to Pay (P2P) functionalities.

- Back Office Transformation (BOT) initiative: GC departments and agencies currently have their own human resources management, financial management and information management platforms. This myriad of platforms makes it difficult to assemble enterprise-wide data for Canadians, and to achieve value for money through back office efficiencies. Budget 2016 proposes funding to support the replacement of these platforms with Government-wide systems. Once completed, the BOT initiative is expected to result in significantly lower annual costs to operate and maintain these functions, and should help deliver better services to Canadians. The EPS must be aligned with the following BOT principles: reduction of administrative burden, reduction of cost of operation, reduction of duplication, disclosure/transparency.
- SAP S/4HANA Solution: The upcoming solution is a completely new business design of an SAP S/4HANA instance for financial management in the GC. It is anticipated that the initial focus will be on departments and agencies with less complex financial and material management needs. This responds directly to a long-standing commitment to establish a scalable, robust solution for financial systems and services that will begin to optimize the GC's SAP platform.
- Directive on Open Government: The objective of the directive is to maximize the release of government information and data of business value to support transparency, accountability, citizen engagement, and socio-economic benefits through reuse, subject to applicable restrictions associated with privacy, confidentiality, and security. The expected results of this directive are that Canadians are able to find and use GC information and data to support accountability, to facilitate value-added analysis, to drive socio-economic benefits through reuse, and to support meaningful engagement with their government.
- Canada's Action Plan on Open Government 2014-16, Open Contracting Commitments: Canada committed to release data on all contracts over \$10,000 via a centralized, machine-readable database available to the public; as well as increase the level of detail disclosed on these.

QUESTION: 78

Do we need to take into consideration the TBS Standard on Enterprise Resource Planning Systems?

ANSWER: 78

Yes. In accordance with *Part 2 – Legislative, Regulatory and Policy Requirements* of the SOW, the EPS must enable GC's compliance with all its acts, regulations, guidelines and policies. This includes the TBS Standard on Enterprise Resource Planning Systems that took effect on May 1st, 2012 and the TBS Policy on the Stewardship of Financial Management Systems and TBS Directive on Stewardship of Financial Management Systems, both of which took effect on January 1st, 2010.

An amendment will be made to include these policies and directives to the list in *Part 2 – Legislative, Regulatory and Policy Requirements of Annex 1 - Statement of Work*.

QUESTION: 79

Do we need to take into consideration the *TB Data Standard on Classification of Procurement Items and the TB Standard on Vendor Record*?

ANSWER: 79

Yes. In accordance with *Part 2 – Legislative, Regulatory and Policy Requirements* of the SOW, the EPS must enable GC's compliance with the *TBS Data Standard on Classification of Procurement Items* and the *TBS Standard on Vendor Record*.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME