



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. 009
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20131350	Date 2016-06-02
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	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
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: 009****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: 30**

At Attachment 2 to Part 4 - Technical Evaluation, under criteria R5.4 of section 4. Point-Rated Criteria,

DELETE: (a) provides logical/physical data segregation management; and

INSERT: (a) provides logical or physical data segregation management; and

CHANGE: 31

At Annex 1 – Statement of Work, for section 3.9.1 *Overview*, delete point e) in its entirety and replace with:

e) **Supplier's self-registration:** EPS must provide functionality to allow the Supplier to self-register and securely manage their own profile online. EPS must also allow for GC stakeholders (e.g. Industry Canada, CRA, PWGSC, INAC) to validate profile information against other GC systems via the Enterprise Service Bus. As part of the self-registration process, Suppliers to the GC must be able to store, in the EPS, corporate information and documents such as, but not limited to, applicable licenses, certifications, insurance certificates and security clearances.

CHANGE: 32

At Annex 1 – Statement of Work, delete section 4.5.1.2 *Group 2: Non-GC users* in its entirety and replace with:

4.5.1.2 Group 2: Non-GC users

There is a corresponding external credential that is available to Non-GC users which is called "GCKey". GCKey is a Government of Canada-Branded secure credential service supported by Shared Services Canada. GCKey or a Contractor-supplied equivalent must be used for secure access to EPS by all non-GC Users (e.g. Suppliers including international Suppliers and the Broader Public Sector when required). Canada maintains the option to choose either the GCKey or the Contractor-supplied equivalent, if available, to be used for secure access to EPS by all non-GC Users under the Contract.

CHANGE: 33

At Annex 1 – Statement of Work, under section 6.7.4 *Training Delivery*,

INSERT:

h) Provide the training environment to reflect updates and upgrades to the production environment. The training environment must include all GC workflows and must interoperate with a GC managed DFMS training environment.

CHANGE: 34

At Annex 1 – Statement of Work, for section 5.6.4.1 *General*, delete point d) in its entirety and replace with:

d) The Service Desk support, when interacting with EPS users, must be in both official languages. The elements in which Service Desk support does not interact with EPS users does not have to be in both official languages.

CHANGE: 35

At Annex 1 – Statement of Work, for section 5.6.4.3 *Delivery Channels*,

DELETE: Users must have the option of speaking to service desk support at any point during the operating hours.

INSERT: Users must have the option of speaking to service desk support at any point during Tier 2 operating hours.

(B) QUESTIONS**QUESTION: 80**

Clarification is required with respect to PWGSC's desire for a SaaS versus an on premise managed service solution. It appears from the requirements of the EPS RFP that the Crown is requesting a fully customizable solution as SaaS models are inherently configurable, not customizable. Further, Amendment 6, Change: 21 requires a logical/physical data segregation management which indicates that an on premise managed service solution is the only option as SaaS providers cannot offer physical separation within a multi-tenant environment.

Please confirm that an on premise managed service solution is PWGSC's preferred approach. If this is not the case, is PWGSC willing to revise Annex 1 - SoW and Annex 2-Security & Privacy to reflect a SaaS solution which contain industry best practices?

ANSWER: 80

In accordance with section 1.1 Requirement or Annex 1 - Statement of Work, Canada is requesting a SaaS e-Procurement Solution. To clarify change #21 from Amendment 006, the language should read:

*"(a) provides logical **or** physical data segregation management"*

See the Changes section of this RFP amendment for corrected wording.

Should there be additional criteria or requirements that prevent Bidders from proposing a SaaS EPS, please highlight these specific criteria as per the section 2.3 *Enquiries - Bid Solicitation* of this RFP.

QUESTION: 81

For 3.9 Section H – Supplier Relationship Management, sub-item e) Supplier's self-registration, could PWGSC define the self-registration process (especially around the requirement for information to be verified by GC stakeholders) and clearly identify the interfaces, if any, that the EPS system is expected to provide? Also, is this registration distinct from the GCKey registration?

ANSWER: 81

The requirements associated with the supplier self-registration process described in section 3.9.1 e) are articulated in 3.9.2 Requirements, subsection H-01 Supplier Profile Management. In accordance with H-01.15 the EPS must provide the functionality to pull, share and validate Supplier information and data in Near Real-Time from and against equivalent information in third party content providers and systems (e.g. with Canada Revenue Agency to validate their Business Number) and in accordance with H-01.04 workflow process for the approval of Supplier registration in the EPS and submitted credentials and certifications.

The supplier registration in the EPS is distinct from the GCKey registration. GCKey or equivalent will be used to authenticate suppliers to EPS. If GCKey is used, the registration for GCKey is provided by SSC. Section 4.5.1.2 of Annex 1 specifies that GCKey will be used for non-GC users, or the Contractor can propose their own ICAM solution which meets the security requirements specified in this RFP. Information validation requirements during the supplier registration process are identified in Annex 1 section 4.3.2.5. Requirements for the EPS interfaces.

QUESTION: 82

In Section 4.3.2.5 Requirements for the EPS Interfaces, SOW Num Int.14, could PWGSC please provide more details on the following:

- a. How many Legacy systems would be required to interface with EPS?
- b. Please identify the type of legacy system for each system identified in a.? Eg. Mainframe, AS/400.
- c. For each Legacy system requiring interfacing with EPS, please provide what type of data exchange will be required (eg. Supplier, Commodity, contracts, standing offers, temp labour). In addition:
 1. Is data exchange with Legacy systems going to be permanent (similar to the SAP Connectivity or external system connectivity) or will there be a cutoff period (Cutoff is a point in time when the interfacing between EPS and Legacy stops and no more data is being exchanged)?
 2. ii. If there is a cutoff period, at what point in the contract will the cutoff occur?
3. Please provide details of how many legacy systems may be permanent and how many would be cutoff.
- d. Is the Legacy interface needed for near real time or batch data loads? Please provide details on which type of data & legacy system are required for in near real time and which are required by batch?
- e. How long will the interfaces between EPS and Legacy systems expected to be required and maintained?
- f. Is there any Spend Analytics data from Legacy systems that will need to be populated into EPS? If yes, how many prior years and volume of data need to be populated into EPS?
- g. Do all legacy systems reside in one GC network or are they dispersed?
- h. Do the legacy systems that require EPS interfacing contain duplicate data between the systems? For example, could data such as Supplier data between SAP and Legacy be the same?
If answer to above question (h) is yes, could PWGSC provide the following:
 1. What type of data would be duplicate?
 2. In which systems is the duplicate data?
 3. What type of data cleansing requirements are there for each data?
- i. During the course of the contract, at what stage is the Interfacing with Legacy systems required?
- j. The Option Defined Work section 7.2.2 refers to some optional legacy work being done through a Task Authorization. Please clarify which of the above work would be part of the Contract and which tasks are expected to be conducted/requested via Task Authorization?
- k. Can PWGSC specify the direction of the data that is expected to be exchanged between EPS and the Legacy systems for each Legacy system that will be interfacing?
 1. How many legacy systems from Legacy to EPS only?
 2. From EPS to Legacy only, how many Legacy systems?
 3. Bi-directional between EPS and Legacy, how many Legacy systems?

ANSWER: 82

- a. No legacy system is required to interface with EPS. The systems required to interface with EPS are articulated in section 4.3.2 Solution Vision. Interfaces with other legacy system, if requested, will be initiated through the Task Authorization Process.
- b. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.
- c. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.
 1. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.
 2. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.
 3. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.
- d. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.
- e. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.
- f. At this time, no Spend Analytics data from legacy systems has been identified for population in EPS though Spend Analytics data from legacy systems could be required by Canada to be populated into EPS as optional work.
- g. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.
- h. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.
 1. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.
 2. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.
 3. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.
- i. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.
- j. All work described in section 7.2.2 of Annex 1 - Statement of Work (legacy data migration services and delivery, enablement and support of data migration from existing GC legacy systems and transitional data feeds not already articulated in the Statement of Work), if requested by Canada, would be conducted via the Task Authorization process and be eligible for the Professional Services fees.
- k. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.
 1. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.
 2. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.
 3. Based on answer to question a., this is not applicable.

QUESTION: 83

Regarding the requirement for the Contractor to have a Project Management Office (PMO) established within 10 business days of Contract Award (as per Section 6.2.3 of Annex 1 – Statement of Work), since the Contractor is expected to handle and process Protected B data during the execution of the Contract, it is our understanding that this office space is expected to be established to meet Protected B requirements. Can PWGSC please confirm our understanding or provide further clarification on the level of security for the PMO?

ANSWER: 83

The Contractor must meet all requirements of the Security Requirements Check List (SRCL) and the security requirements described in section 7.5, which includes the PMO being established to meet Protected B requirements.

QUESTION: 84

With regards to sub-item b) of Section 6.7.4 Training Delivery, where it states “Conduct Authorized Administrator training, including training for GC retained technical staff for the express purpose of exploiting the functions and features of the GC computing environment”, the requirement for the training to simulate the exploitation of the functions and features of the GC computing environment can be translated in a requirement for the training to connect to a non-production equivalent of the GC backend systems. We therefore have the following questions:

1. Is it PWGSC intention to have all functionalities available at all time in the training environment or schedule specific training for selected group that will only need a partial backend simulation?
2. Is the requirement for the training for a single system that includes all the workflows from PWGSC and other Departments or multiple instances for each Department?
3. Will PWGSC provide non-production backend systems to support training?

ANSWER: 84

1. The Contractor must have the full training environment available at all times.
2. The requirement for training would be a single system that includes all the workflows for each department.
3. Yes PWGSC will have a learning management system to support online training.

See Changes section of this RFP amendment for changes to section 6.7.4 *Training Delivery*.

QUESTION: 85

With regard to sub-item d) of Section 6.10.4 Milestone #4 – Contract Management for the Acquisitions Program, where it states “100 Contracts have been sourced and awarded using the EPS”, would PWGSC consider removing item d) since this is out of the contractor’s control?

ANSWER: 85

It is not sufficient for the Contractor to simply deliver capability in order for Milestone #4 to be considered accepted. The capability must be functional in operations prior to acceptance by Canada. 100 Contracts (representing an operational volume of less than 1%) is considered a fair and reasonable requirement for Milestone #4. This requirement reflects the results-based performance that Canada desires and as such, item d) remains a requirement.

QUESTION: 86

Section 6.10 of Annex 1, Statement of Work (SOW), sets out the Milestones for the implementation of the EPS along with the deliverable acceptance criteria for each of these Milestones. These acceptance criteria include the following: Milestone # 3 - 1,000 suppliers have self-registered in the EPS; Milestone # 4 – 100 contracts have been sourced and awarded using the EPS; Milestone # 5 – 1,000 orders have been processed by users using the EPS; and Milestone # 6 – 100 SOW based services procurement contracts/orders have been awarded using the EPS. In Bidder's experience, acceptance criteria upon which payment is dependent must be items that are within the Bidder's control. Bidder believes that the acceptance criteria enumerated above are beyond the Bidder's ability to control and will be impacted by adoption as well as process, approval and other factors which are solely within PSPC control.

As such, we request that the enumerated acceptance criteria be removed from the requirements. Bidder has no objection to the inclusion of acceptance criteria within our ability to deliver and control and, accordingly, proposes the following amendment to the acceptance criteria:

- 6.10.3(d) –Delete and replace with "A supplier self-registration tool is live in the EPS"
- 6.10.4 (d) – Delete and replace with "A sourcing and contract award capability is live in the EPS"
- 6.10.5(d) – Delete and replace with "An order processing capability is live in the EPS"
- 6.10.6 (c) - Delete and replace with "A service procurement contracts/order award capability is live within the EPS"

ANSWER: 86

Please refer to answers #38, #39, #40 & #85.

QUESTION: 87

PWGSC has identified myKEY and GCKey as the authentication mechanism for users accessing the EPS. Since both services are provided by SSC and are cost recovered services, are these costs the responsibility of the EPS provider or PWGSC? If these costs are the responsibility of the EPS provider, can PWGSC provide the costs items associated with these services (one time costs for integration, on-going costs per certificate, etc.?)

ANSWER: 87

It is up to the Contractor to propose a solution using GCKey or the Contractor may propose a solution using their own ICAM service for Group 2 users as stated in Section 4.5.1.2 of Annex 1. It is at Canada's discretion whether to accept the Contractor's proposed ICAM service, if it meets the required Level of Assurance, or to request the use of GCKey for the EPS. The Contractor's costs related to the use of the Contractor's proposed ICAM service, if available, and the Contractor's cost related to the setup and interface of the EPS with GCKey should both be included as part of the EPS Transition-In Fee and/or the EPS Operational Fee. Shared Services Canada's (SSC) fee for using GCKey will be paid by Canada.

See the Changes section of this RFP amendment for changes to section 4.5.1.2.

QUESTION: 88

Service Desk Language of Service: Part 5; section 5; The RFP has stated that the requirement is for service desk support in both official languages. Please confirm that this only applies to Tier 1 and the Tier 2 services involving direct user contact. That is, if the service desk personnel are doing pure systems work (no direct user interaction) - are they required to be able to communicate within the GC in both languages.

ANSWER: 88

For the work described in Annex 1 – Statement of Work, Part 5, Section 5.6.4.1 General Requirements, the Service Desk support, when interacting with EPS users, must be in both official languages. The elements in which Service Desk support does not interact with EPS users does not have to be in both official languages.

See the Changes section of this RFP amendment for changes to section 5.6.4.1 *General*.

QUESTION: 89

Hours of Operation for Automated Attendant: The Government has stated that the Automated Attendant should route to a service desk agent within operating hours. Per Table 18, please confirm if the operating hours referred to are the Tier 1 or Tier 2 Operating Hours.

ANSWER: 89

For the work described in Annex 1 – Statement of Work, Part 5, Table 18 - Service Desk Tiers and Response Levels, Canada confirms that the operating hours are under Tier 2 (Business and/or Technical related incidents).

See the Changes section of this RFP amendment for changes to section 5.6.4.3 *Delivery Channels*.

QUESTION: 90

For Integration work related to potential external data sources (Open data, CPI, Exchange Rates, Security Profile, Corporate Rating, Business Number, CRA for business name validation/checks), will Canada:

- a) Provide a Point of Contact who will act as the interface with the technical/business contacts between the External sources systems and the winning vendor's contact?
- b) Facilitate or provide information on connectivity to all environments (Production and non-Production)?
- c) Be involved in the testing phases of transactions with the external data sources?
- d) Make arrangements with External data source organizations in order for their test environments to be up for certain periods of time so that time is not lost in configuration/development, integration and testing?
- e) Coordinate with External data source organizations such that a calendar of maintenance/outages is provided for their environments?
- f) Coordinate with External data source organizations in order for their functional/technical contacts to be available to interface with the EPS project's functional/technical contacts for design and deployment?
- g) Coordinate with External data source organizations in order for their network/security contacts to be available to interface with the EPS project's network/security contacts for connectivity integration?
- h) Coordinate with External data source organizations in order for the EPS team to receive test data (eg. CSV, xml files) should their test environments not be integrated with EPS' test & prod environments?
- i) Specify the SLAs so the dependencies on external systems (not controlled by the contractor) are excluded from EPS SLA measurements?

ANSWER: 90

For all points with the exception of i), Canada will provide a point of contact, when requested by the Contractor and during the Term of the Contract, to coordinate requests, facilitate communications and support activities required within internal GC systems and data source organizations.

For point i), Canada will not include dependencies on external systems (not controlled by the Contractor) as part of the EPS SLA measurements.

QUESTION: 91

In Section 3.3.2 of Annex 1 - Government Electronic Tendering Services (GETS), although it is stated that the GETS platform will replace the BuyandSell.gc.ca/tenders GETS platform, there are no stated requirements around data migration and/or conversion from the BuyandSell.gc.ca/tenders GETS platform to the EPS/GETS platform. Could PWGSC please provide more details on the following:

- A. Is there a requirement to migrate and/or convert data from BuyandSell.gc.ca/tenders GETS platform to the EPS/GETS platform?
- B. If there is a requirement to migrate and/or convert data, how many months/years would need to be migrated?
- C. If there is a requirement to migrate and/or convert data, would that include the tender documents (Original Tender Notices, Amended Tender Notices, Original Award Notices, Amended Award Notices, Documents, Attachments, Drawing and Specifications Packages)?

ANSWER: 91

- A. There is no requirement to migrate / convert data from BuyandSell.gc.ca/tenders GETS platform to the EPS/GETS platform.
- B. Based on answer to question A, this is not applicable.
- C. Based on answer to question A, this is not applicable.

QUESTION: 92

Regarding Answer to Question 17 from amendment 004 dated 2016-05-11 where it states that "...there is also the potential for Group 2: Non-GC users to use a Contractor provided ICAM service...", can PWGSC confirm that it is up to the Contractor to decide whether or not this option is to be included in its overall solution.

ANSWER: 92

Canada confirms that it is up to the Contractor to propose a solution using GCKey or the Contractor may propose a solution using their own ICAM service for Group 2 users as stated in Section 4.5.1.2 of Annex 1. It is at Canada's discretion whether to accept the Contractor's proposed ICAM service, if it meets the required Level of Assurance, or to request the use of GCKey for the EPS. The Contractor's costs related to the use of the Contractor's proposed ICAM service, if available, and the Contractor's cost related to the setup and interface of the EPS with GCKey should both be included as part of the EPS Transition-In Fee and/or the EPS Operational Fee. Shared Services Canada's (SSC) fee for using GCKey will be paid by Canada.

See the Changes section of this RFP amendment for changes to section 4.5.1.2.

QUESTION: 93

Regarding Canada's response for Question and Answer #5 in Amendment 003 (dated 2016-04-28), could Canada please clarify 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 as per Annex 3?

ANSWER: 93

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 was amended in the "change" section of RFP amendment 008.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME