



**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**

**LETTER OF INTEREST  
LETTRE D'INTÉRÊT**

**Comments - Commentaires**

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**

**Raison sociale et adresse du  
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**

**Special Projects/Projets Spéciaux**

**11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier**

**Place du Portage/, Phase III**

**Floor 10C1/Étage 10C1**

**Gatineau**

**Québec**

**K1A 0S5**

<b>Title - Sujet</b> AUTO FINGERPRINT ID SYSTEM SOLUTION	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> M7594-153234/D	<b>Date</b> 2016-06-27
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> M7594-153234	<b>GETS Ref. No. - N° de réf. de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZL-107-30313
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 107zl.M7594-153234	<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 2016-08-04</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Campbell, Jeff	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 107zl
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-1782 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-9235
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>  Specified Herein Précisé dans les présentes	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b> See Herein	<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>	



Destination Code - Code destinataire	Destination Address - Adresse de la destination	Invoice Code - Code bur.-comptable	Invoice Address - Adresse de facturation
D - 1	RCMP 1200 Vanier Parkway, CIO Bldg, Rm 109 Ottawa ON K1A 0R2 Attn: Ray Valvaori	I - 1	RCMP 1200 Vanier Parkway, CIO Bldg, Rm 112-2 Ottawa ON K1A 0R2 Attn: Julie Fairclough



Item Article	Description	Dest. Code Dest.	Inv. Code Fact.	Qty Qté	U. of I. U. de D.	Unit Price/Prix unitaire FOB/FAM		Plant/Usine	Delivery Req. Livraison Req.	Del. Offered Liv. offerte
4	Automated Fingerprint Identificati on System	D - 1	I - 1	1	Each	\$	\$		See Herein	

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
334	Appendix A - Statement of work	1.13 Warranty	Price and rates quoted in the Contractor response must be all inclusive ceiling (or firm) prices, subject to downward adjustment only, and must include but not limited to all labour and replacement parts for a one (1) year warranty period for all non-GFE and GFE modification. This one year warranty period will begin after final acceptance and approval by the RCMP.	Can the RCMP please define what constitutes a GFE modification?	This will be clarified in the final RFP. Essentially, the GFE is available as is; therefore, anything additional required by the Bidder's solution is the Bidder's responsibility (e.g. additional memory, different OS, different adapters, effort to complete any upgrade, etc.). Any exception will be noted in the final RFP (e.g. upgrade license for Windows 10 for workstations is already included in the RCMP's corporate license).
335	Letter of Interest & Annex H	APPENDIX B, BASIS OF PAYMENT - Table 5 : Total Bid Evaluation Value - 20	<p>The referenced section from the LOI 20 states: Optional Firm Markups, inclusive of all overheads and profit, for all hardware, software and commercial and sub-contracted services required for Task Authorization work throughout the existence of the contract that may result from this RFP.</p> <p>The referenced table row from the Annex H Table 5 states: Optional Firm Markups, inclusive of all overheads and profit, for all hardware, software and commercial and sub-contracted services required for Task Authorization work throughout the existence of the contract that may result from this RFP.</p>	<p>The amount of work and total price for a TA will vary per TA. As such, can the RCMP clarify if the Optional Firm Markup should be a percentage rate versus a fixed price value, i.e., n% of the Total TA value?</p> <p>If so, should the "Total Bid Evaluation Value" calculation be adjusted to include this % rate value x 100, instead of simply adding this value?</p>	This will be changed and clarified in the final RFP to ensure it is clear.

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
336	Appendix A - Statement of work	4.2 OVERALL APPROACH - 1-6	<p>The referenced paragraphs state:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are currently three test environments DEVTEST, QCS and MAINT and the production environment. This AFIS renewal must replace, upgrade or reuse every server/workstation/Transcoder in all environments that results in satisfying, all the requirements, in all environments according to this SOW and its accompanying documents.</li> <li>2. A separate RTID test environment will be established for the AFIS renewal solution which will be referred to herein as the AFIS-Renew environment. This AFIS-Renew environment will be used by the Contractor in the same manner that the MAINT environment is typically used. That is, the MAINT environment is typically the environment used by the Contractor to test their initial site installation of any new hardware and/or upgraded OS, software or DB to allow integration testing with RTID to be performed prior to delivery to the RCMP.</li> <li>3. This AFIS-Renew environment must be used by the Contractor to verify that all aspects of the AFIS renewal solution satisfy all functional, technical, interface and processing requirements for a test</li> </ol>	<p>As stated, the requirements dictate a specific implementation approach that must be undertaken by the Contractor. This approach eliminates the ability for a Bidder to offer alternative approaches, which may afford the RCMP lower cost and/or lower risk.</p> <p>If the intent of the requirements is to ensure the legacy AFIS solution is supported by a Test Environment during the transition period, the requirements should be revised to clearly state this, so GFE from the remaining test environments could be considered for reuse in a Bidder's proposed solution.</p> <p>As the Bidder's proposed Implementation approach is to be evaluated as a Rated Requirement; via the AFIS Renew Implementation Plan (ARIP), it is recommended that these requirements are updated to be less specific on the implementation approach and more specific on what is required to support the legacy AFIS solution during the system transition period. This approach provides the Bidder's with the flexibility to propose alternative implementation approaches for the</p>	<p>The RCMP does not believe that the requirements dictate a specific implementation approach. Section 4.2 Overall Approach identifies what environments are available and possible uses of the environments, without dictating a specific approach. The AFIS-Renew environment will be in addition to the existing three (3) test environments and the AFIS-Renew environment will have the NNS electronic sync filing capability that supports parallel AFIS operations. This provides flexibility for the Bidder's approach to use the normal release process with MAINT, QCS and then PROD; or an alternative approach that may include AFIS-Renew and/or parallel production AFIS renewal solution. The requirements do not dictate when or if a specific environment is used; however, instead the requirements state a release process that must be followed, to ensure the production quality of the AFIS renewal solution, while allowing existing RCMP RTID/AFIS operations to continue to be supported. Once the Bidder chooses an approach and which environments will be used and when; the Bidder is implicitly dictating how the environments will be used and then must ensure the required release process is followed using the environments. Please refer to the rewording in this section in the final RFP. The Bidder's approach is a rated requirement.</p> <p>Section 4.2 Paragraphs 2, 3 and 5 have been reworded to clarify that these are information items. The RCMP considers these to be important</p>

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
			<p>environment including support for the interface specifications and ICDs. The Site Acceptance Test Plan (SATP) and Site Acceptance Test Report (SATR) identify the minimum that must be provided by the Contractor to demonstrate that its AFIS renewal solution satisfies all the requirements stated in this SOW and its accompanying documents.</p> <p>4. Following verification by the Contractor that all aspects of the Entire AFIS renewal solution satisfies all RTID interface and processing requirements, the RCMP will start its site acceptance testing in the AFIS-Renew environment. This site acceptance testing by the RCMP will include testing all RTID functionality by the RTID test team.</p> <p>5. After RCMP approval of AFIS renewal solution in the AFIS-Renew environment, the AFIS renewal solution will follow the RTID release process or the RCMP agreed to adjustment to the release process in the Contractor's ARIP.</p> <p>6. To ensure maximum flexibility for the Contractor to use the GFE, system testing and QCS testing can be completed in the Contractor's parallel production environment configuration.</p>	<p>RCMP to evaluate on an equal basis.</p> <p>Question:</p> <p>Would the RCMP consider revising these requirements as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are currently three test environments DEVTEST, QCS and MAINT and one production environment; PROD. This AFIS renewal must replace, upgrade or reuse every server / workstation / Transcoder in all environments that results in satisfying, all the requirements, in all environments according to this SOW and its accompanying documents.</li> <li>Remove Item 2, 3,4,5,6 - replace with:</li> <li>2. To ensure maximum flexibility for the Contractor to use the GFE, the Contractor may use GFE from the test environments to configure and test their AFIS Renew solution, as long as the RCMP has an environment to support the existing legacy AFIS during the system transition period.</li> <li>3. The configuration used by the Contractor to test their AFIS renewal solution must ensure that</li> </ol>	<p>information items that allow potential Bidders to know that this separate AFIS-Renew environment will be available in addition to the normal test environments providing flexibility and a test environment within which electronic sync filing can be verified. Consequently, these paragraphs will not be removed.</p> <p>Paragraph 4 is a mandatory requirement, identifying that the Contractor must demonstrate that the AFIS renewal solution satisfies the requirements before RCMP starts their acceptance testing; therefore, it will remain.</p> <p>Paragraph 6 is a rated criteria that is based on the ARIP; therefore, it will remain.</p> <p>Paragraph 7 has been reword to clarify the concerns identified.</p> <p>The suggestion to change from support for existing 2016 volumes to 50% of 2019 volumes does not appear to consider that the Latent forward searches have very little change between 2016 and 2019; therefore, supporting only 50% of 2019 Latent forward searches would not be acceptable. The wording will be reviewed to determine if any adjustment would clarify the requirement.</p> <p>Other wording changes have been made throughout section 4.2, as well as other sections, to clarify the concerns identified.</p>

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
			<p>This allows the DEVTEST and QCS environments to remain as is until after final acceptance. The Contractor can use GFE from the test environments to configure the parallel production environment as long as the RCMP has an environment to support existing production until the cut-over to the AFIS/Transcoder/VSS renewal solution has been completed. Additionally, the Contractor can configure an initial production environment that partially supports the full production requirements, with at least fifty percent (50%) production capacity for 2019 volumes, and then reuse existing production servers after the cut-over to achieve one hundred percent (100%) capacity.</p>	<p>all functional, technical, interface and processing requirements (including support for the interface specifications and ICDs) can be validated. The Site Acceptance Test Plan (SATP) and Site Acceptance Test Report (SATR) identify the minimum that must be provided by the Contractor to demonstrate that its AFIS renewal solution satisfies all the requirements stated in this SOW and its accompanying documents.</p> <p>4. Following verification by the Contractor that all aspects of the entire AFIS renewal solution satisfies all RTID interface and processing requirements, the RCMP will start its site acceptance testing of the Contractor's AFIS-Renew solution. This site acceptance testing by the RCMP will include testing all RTID functionality by the RTID test team.</p> <p>5. After RCMP approval of the Contractor's AFIS renewal solution, the AFIS renewal solution will follow the RTID release process, or the RCMP agreed to adjustment to the release process documented in the Contractor's ARIP.</p>	

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
				6. Additionally, the Contractor can configure an initial production environment that partially supports the full production requirements, with at least fifty percent (50%) production capacity for 2019 volumes, and then reuse existing production servers after the cut-over to achieve one hundred percent (100%) capacity.	
337	Appendix A - Statement of work	13.6 DATA CONVERSION APPROACH - 4	The Contractor shall provide all of the equipment and personnel to conduct the necessary conversion operations.	Can the RCMP confirm the use of GFE is also permitted to support data conversion operations?	The GFE can be used for data conversion operations.
338	Annex H - Attachment 1 Benchmark Plan	1.3 SCOPE - 1-2	1. The RCMP will perform benchmark tests on the COTS technology proposed by those Bidders who have satisfactorily passed Stages 1 and 2 of the AFIS Renewal RFP evaluation process. In the context of the AFIS Renewal Evaluation Plan and Criteria, a benchmark test is defined as a test performed in an optimized, controlled environment to show a system's COTS functional capabilities (operational, user interface, and administrative), performance (reliability, accuracy, relative reliability and speed) and value of best practices relative to resource costs. Results from evaluations	<p>The stated objective of the Benchmark Test is "to show a system's COTS functional capabilities" where the "benchmark system will consist of a suite of the Bidder's COTS AFIS technology that is representative of the components offered in the respective Bidder's proposal".</p> <p>Moreover, it states that the "benchmark system is not expected to be a system with all of the functionality described in the Statement of Work (SOW)".</p> <p>These clearly stated objectives and expectations appear, however, to</p>	<p>There appears to be a misunderstanding. There is no customization required and no customization should be performed by the Bidder for the Benchmark. The RCMP prefers a solution that is as much COTS as possible and wants to benchmark the Bidder's COTS product. The RFI wording, while trying to provide additional information, may have led to some of this confusion. The NIST packets will be based on international standard with very few fields in the Type-2 record; therefore, it is expected any AFIS will be able to support processing the test NIST packet with minor configuration changes. For example, a unique identifier (e.g. DCN) must be included to uniquely identify a test NIST packet and a numerical value for file type is required to</p>



No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
			<p>conducted in this stage will form part of the overall technical score.</p> <p>2. The benchmark system will consist of a suite of the Bidder's COTS AFIS technology that is representative of the components offered in the respective Bidder's proposal for the RTID AFIS project. The benchmark system is not expected to be a system with all of the functionality described in the Statement of Work (SOW); however, it is expected: ...</p>	<p>be in conflict with the requirement to create customized RCMP ICD-specific transactions types. To comply with these requirements requires significant development by a bidder in time for the Benchmark Test and well prior to the vendor selection for the RCMP AFIS Renewal project.</p> <p>The references in Section 1.4, "Benchmark Phases" further illustrate this conflict.</p>	<p>more than one set of prints filed under the same subject for different file types.</p> <p>Please refer to the rewording in the final RFP.</p>
339	Annex H - Attachment 1 Benchmark Plan	1.3 SCOPE - 1-2	<p>1. The RCMP will perform benchmark tests on the COTS technology proposed by those Bidders who have satisfactorily passed Stages 1 and 2 of the AFIS Renewal RFP evaluation process. In the context of the AFIS Renewal Evaluation Plan and Criteria, a benchmark test is defined as a test performed in an optimized, controlled environment to show a system's COTS functional capabilities (operational, user interface, and administrative), performance (reliability, accuracy, relative reliability and speed) and value of best practices relative to resource costs. Results from evaluations conducted in this stage will form part of the overall technical score.</p>	<p>Given the importance of the integrated Latent Case Management Capability (LCMC) and Facial Recognition Capability (FRC) components within the lifecycle planning for the RTID AFIS Renewal, will the RCMP consider measuring (scoring) and weighting the bidder's performance of the LCMC and FRC demonstrations within the benchmark evaluation?</p>	<p>The requirements and the evaluation will reflect the RCMP requirements. LCMC has rated criteria. The COTS compliance will be something that can be demonstrated in the Benchmark.</p>

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
			<p>2. The benchmark system will consist of a suite of the Bidder's COTS AFIS technology that is representative of the components offered in the respective Bidder's proposal for the RTID AFIS project. The benchmark system is not expected to be a system with all of the functionality described in the Statement of Work (SOW); however, it is expected:</p>		
340	Annex H - Attachment 1 Benchmark Plan	1.3 SCOPE - 1-2	<p>1. The RCMP will perform benchmark tests on the COTS technology proposed by those Bidders who have satisfactorily passed Stages 1 and 2 of the AFIS Renewal RFP evaluation process. In the context of the AFIS Renewal Evaluation Plan and Criteria, a benchmark test is defined as a test performed in an optimized, controlled environment to show a system's COTS functional capabilities (operational, user interface, and administrative), performance (reliability, accuracy, relative reliability and speed) and value of best practices relative to resource costs. Results from evaluations conducted in this stage will form part of the overall technical score.</p> <p>2. The benchmark system will consist of a suite of the Bidder's COTS AFIS technology that is representative of the components offered in the respective</p>	<p>As the selection of an integrated facial recognition solution appears at present to be based largely on the merits of the AFIS solution evaluation, despite this being a very distinct technology and a proven crime-fighting/public safety tool, would the RCMP consider a more thorough evaluation of the available solutions, including a formal benchmark in association of the FRC requirement?</p>	<p>The requirements and the evaluation will reflect the RCMP requirements. No formal benchmark for FRC is expected to be required.</p>

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
			<p>Bidder's proposal for the RTID AFIS project. The benchmark system is not expected to be a system with all of the functionality described in the Statement of Work (SOW); however, it is expected:</p>		
341	Annex H - 1 Benchmark Plan	1.4 BENCHMARK PHASES - Table 1 : Benchmark Phases	<p>The benchmark tests will be run in three (3) phases at each location visited. The three (3) Phases are outlined below.</p> <p>Table 1: Benchmark Phases</p> <p>PHASE 1 OPERATIONAL TESTS</p> <p>A series of tests designed to demonstrate and evaluate capability to perform general AFIS operational and administrative functionality such as: ANSI/NIST compliance, repository management, user privilege management, and user interface evaluation. As well as to verify the mandatory requirements.</p> <p>Two of the demonstrations will be rated for ease of use and other user experience factors.</p>	<p>Specifically, the purpose of this test is to "demonstrate and evaluate capability to perform general AFIS operational and administrative functionality such as: ANSI/NIST compliance..."</p> <p>However, in tests B5, B7, and B10, the test calls for creation of TPRI, TPSEI, CARY, and IMM transactions, which are RCMP ICD-specific transactions types.</p>	<p>There appears to be a misunderstanding by the vendor. These are TPRI like packets. The text was attempting to provide context. B5, B7 &amp; B10 have been reworded to remove the potential confusion. The RCMP must provide NIST packets in order to perform the tests. There is no requirement for the vendor to validate the packet as a valid TPRI packet or any other type packet. The TPRI like packet is used for convenience; since it already has fields required to execute the test. For example, B10 has multiple sets of prints for the same individual. The Bidder needs to know if there are rolled, plain, palms or ID Flats, if a set of prints should be stored in a different repository and that the prints have a unique identifier (i.e. DCN). These fields must be in the NIST packet in order to have an effective test. Whatever packets get created by Bidder's solution will be viewed in the identified international recognized software tool "Aware". Whatever packets get created by the Bidder's solution are expected to meet basic international standards for NIST packets, since the purpose of the standard is for the exchange of fingerprint data.</p>

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
342	Annex H - Attachment 1 Benchmark Plan	1.4 BENCHMARK PHASES - Table 2: Phase 1 Test Groupings	Test Group D - Dump ANSI/NIST records from Test Group B to USB external drive for independent verification of ANSI/NIST records by RCMP using Aware NIST Pack software.	Test Group D requires a dump of ANSI/NIST records. Tests B5, B7, and B10 are, however, RCMP-specific record types.	There appears to be a misunderstanding by the vendor. Please refer to answer for the previous related comments. Aware will be used to open the packet to ensure it is a ANSI NIST packet and it has the fields included in the test that are expected to be in the packet. The record types are international standards, not RCMP specific.
343	Annex H - Attachment 1 Benchmark Plan	1.4 BENCHMARK PHASES - Table 3: Phase 2 & 3 Tests	Test F - Tenprint ID Flats to tenprint ID Flats (1 to 1) - Search file (30 Impressions) Background File (200 Impressions)	The 285,572 tenprint cards and 200 ID Flats will be received in ANSI/NIST format. Can RCMP state the EBTS version and the TOT used to format the type 1/2 data to allow the vendor to extract the proper identifiers and any relevant demographic data?	EBTS 1.2 / EFTS 7.1. A sample packet will be provided before benchmark testing.
344	Annex H - Attachment 1 Benchmark Plan	1.4 BENCHMARK PHASES - Table 3: Phase 2 & 3 Tests		The 21,404 palm impressions: a. Can the RCMP state the number of upper palms, lower palms, and writers' palms that comprise the data set? b. How is the vendor to know the RCMP identifiers for the TIFF files?	This type of information will be discussed at the Benchmark Bidder's conference. Since the purpose of the testing is to assess the Bidder's solution, there is no intention of providing details concerning the contents of the tests prior to the testing process.  The RCMP is not clear to what the Bidder is referring concerning RCMP identifiers for the TIFF images. If the Bidder can make a specific reference for which they are concerned, then the RCMP may be able to address issue. TIFF images are expected to be saved with a unique identifier that is part of normal processing by the Bidder's solution as well as a unique identifier assigned by

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
					the RCMP which will allow the RCMP to effectively identify their test data.
345	Annex H - Attachment 1 Benchmark Plan	1.4 BENCHMARK PHASES - Table 3: Phase 2 & 3 Tests		In the 2,000 ULF impressions, how is the vendor to know the RCMP identifiers for the TIFF files?	The RCMP is not sure what the vendor concern is. They are TIFF images. How would the Bidder process a TIFF image received by your AFIS? Refer to above answers concerning identifiers and the Benchmark Bidder's conference as well as the next response concerning sample packets.
346	Annex H - Attachment 1 Benchmark Plan	1.4 BENCHMARK PHASES - Table 3: Phase 2 & 3 Tests		Can the RCMP provide samples of card formats for the tenprint and latent cards to be scanned in test B5 and B6?	A sample packet will be provided before benchmark testing.
347	Annex H - Attachment 1 Benchmark Plan	1.5 OVERVIEW OF BENCHMARK WEEK		Would you please provide additional information as to the anticipated benchmark schedule? In particular, what is the total measurable elapsed time allocated for the benchmark?	Please refer to the SOW documentation, where the time per day and number of days are identified as well as the Bidder's Benchmark conference described. The Bidder's Benchmark plan must be provided before any discussion can occur about measurable elapsed time.
348	Annex H - Attachment 1 Benchmark Plan	1.5 OVERVIEW OF BENCHMARK WEEK		Are the demonstrations of Latent Case Management Capability (LCMC) and Facial Recognition Capability (FRC) considered to be within the total benchmark testing time allocation?	Yes.
349	Annex H - Attachment 1	2.1 OBJECTIVES - 1.a	1. The objective of the Phase 1 Tests will be to:	Phase 1 tests B5, B7, and B10 require customization of the COTS solution in order to comply, which in conflict with the aforementioned	No customization is required or expected. Minor configuration changes are expected such as turning off NIST packet validation. It is expected that any Bidder's solution can support processing

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
	Benchmark Plan		a. Evaluate the performance of the COTS AFIS operational and administrative capabilities.	objectives and expectations of the Benchmark Test.	NIST packets based on international standards that includes a minimal number of type-1 and type-2 data as well as internationally standard fingerprint/palmprint records based on international standards for the exchange of fingerprint data, with little or no configuration change for a COTS product. Providing NIST packets to be processed is the method for performing benchmarks; therefore, it is expected that any Bidder that has previously performed a benchmark can adjust their COTS product to support the RCMP provided NIST packets.  Please refer to answers for the previous related comments on B5, B7 & B10.
350	Annex H - Attachment 1 Benchmark Plan	3.4 PHASE 2 SCORING MATRIX		Test F "Calculated Value (CV)" reads $CVC=AS1*.8=S2*.2$ and should read $CVF=AS1*.8=S2*.2$	Corrected
351	Industry Day			Is the FRC an optional or future requirement?	FRC is a potential future requirement.
352	Industry Day			In its planning and analysis for the RTID AFIS Renewal, does the RCMP anticipate a specific reuse purpose for the 42 PCS workstations and, if so, what is it?	Some of the PCS workstation will be temporarily used in the Parallel AFIS environments (Test & Prod) as described in the final RFP. If the Bidder's solution requires additional workstations, beyond the workstations allocated for the existing production environment, then approximately 20 PCS workstations are available as GFE.

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
353	Industry Day			Can the RCMP please provide the specifications for the PCS workstations?	These will be included in the final RFP
354	Industry Day			What is the RCMP's anticipated duration of time between the commencement of "New AFIS Parallel Production" and the commencement of "New AFIS Increased Capacity to 100%"?	<p>There is no anticipated duration of time between parallel AFIS processing and 100% capacity. The criteria that must be met is the complete implementation within the time period specified in the RFP.</p> <p>The RCMP (NNS) will have the capability to send to electronic sync filing NIST packets in a parallel production AFIS environment. This capability is being developed by the RCMP because there is no paper sync filing and it is a significantly more effective manner in which to verify the performance and capacity of the new AFIS. With the previous AFIS renewal a PCS like paper sync filing method was used, which is not acceptable for the current volumes. This electronic sync filing capability compliments the option to use the parallel production environment approach and this sync filing capability has no practical time limit. It is the complete implementation within the time period specified in the RFP that creates the overall time limitation.</p>
355	Industry Day			Given the independently (NIST) tested and proven ability of all major vendors to perform Ten Print matching at statistically equivalent accuracy rates, is it not more appropriate and beneficial to the attainment of the RCMP's mission	A key part of RCMP's mission is "safe homes and safe communities". To ensure the AFIS Renewal requirements are understood, it is important for the vendor to recognize that Tenprint processing is critical to RCMP's commitment to safe homes and safe communities for all Canadians. Tenprint processing allows individuals attempting to enter

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
				<p>in respect to its overall mandate, as well as this RTID AFIS Renewal, to apply greater, not less, importance on poorer quality, i.e., latent print testing, during the benchmark?</p>	<p>Canada, with criminal intent, from ever getting an opportunity to commit crime, it prevents individuals with specific types of criminal records from gaining access to vulnerable sector organization to commit crime, it allows unknown individuals to be identified as having a criminal record to prevent crime, as well as providing many other benefits. Additionally, the value of a few tenths of a percentage point improvement in Tenprint matching has significant manpower implications for the RCMP. Better Tenprint matching capabilities allows automated matching to occur with confidence and significantly reduces the manpower requirements of the RCMP. The 2019 estimated daily volumes for TP submissions are approximately 35,000 and Forward Latent daily estimates are 330, which is less than 1% of TP submission volumes. Since TP submissions frequently results in 1:N and 1:1 searches this results in approximately 70,000 searches. Consequently, the Benchmark testing and scoring will be based on supporting RCMP requirements and importance of TP processing will be considered a valuable part of the Benchmark testing and scoring, as well as an important part of the overall evaluation process.</p>
356	Industry Day			<p>Given the critical nature of this solicitation/procurement and the priority given to demonstrated performance of technical (i.e., functionality, accuracy), is it not more appropriate and beneficial of</p>	<p>This was a typographical error in the Draft RFP (RFI) that was corrected. The intent and example values reflected 50% of the Technical Surplus.</p> <p>Please refer to the completed set of calculations to review the multiple methods in which the technical performance of a solution achieves high scores for</p>



No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
				<p>the RCMP's mission in respect to its overall mandate, as well as this RTID AFIS Renewal, to maintain the "Value Adjustment" within the "Adjusted Bid Evaluation Value" at 100% of "Technical Surplus", and not 50% of "Technical Surplus" as was indicated during the "Industry Day"?</p> <p>If not viewed as such, can the RCMP elaborate on the reason for this reduction in value placed on technical excellence?</p>	<p>the evaluation. The RCMP/PWGSC will determine the evaluation that provides the most effective/efficient solution for the cost that best satisfies RCMP requirements.</p>
357	Industry Day			<p>Given the critical nature of this solicitation/procurement and the priority given on compliance to mandatory requirement and adherence to rated requirements, what is the basis for the RCMP's reluctance to create Requirements Traceability Matrix, a tool that would greatly assist in ensuring comprehensive bid quality?</p>	<p>Providing an RTM has not been RCMP's practice; however, based on feedback it is expected that the RCMP will create an RTM that populates the example Mandatory/Rated/Information Submission and Evaluation Table with all requirements to assist the Bidders with their response.</p>
358	Industry Day			<p>Please elaborate on the statement made during "Industry Day" to the effect that 'a bidder's proposed RTID AFIS Renewal project schedule will be considered as part of that bidder's proposal quality'. Is</p>	<p>PWGSC/RCMP are examining this more closely. There is a significant cost to the RCMP to operate two AFIS solution; consequently, the delivery timeframe is an important consideration. There has not yet been a final determination on how this will be stated in the final RFP. Please refer to the final RFP for details.</p>

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
				the RCMP now anticipating this to be a rated item?	
359	Industry Day			Please define the meaning of a "black box" in the context of the RTID AFIS Renewal RFP.	<p>The RCMP believes this is articulated clearly in the RFI (Draft RFP). Please refer to "AFIS interfaces with NNS, NNS controls the overall flow and processing of NPS-NIST submissions. The AFIS ICD defines the interface between NNS and AFIS. Any AFIS that fully supports the AFIS ICD and supports the sequence of activities controlled by the NNS should be able to replace the existing AFIS for submissions processing. There are more AFIS requirements than submission processing; however, this explains the black box concept for the AFIS within the RTID architecture".</p> <p>From a submission processing perspective, especially automated processing, the NNS does not know or does not care what AFIS it is communicating with. The NNS is simply communicating with a black box application. The NNS is sending a NIST packet and expects one or more NIST packets back. The NNS does not know how the AFIS is determining whether a set of prints match another set of prints, the NNS only knows the result. To further explain this, the NNS has an AFIS simulator created by NNS staff, that completely replaces the existing test AFIS, allowing the NNS to be tested for specific scenarios difficult to replicate through normal NNS/AFIS processing, to complete performance testing for the NNS where the black box AFIS simulator generates high volume responses and several other uses. This clearly demonstrates the</p>

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
					<p>black box AFIS concept since the NNS does not know it is communicating with an AFIS simulator that has replaced the normal test AFIS.</p> <p>Clearly there is an entire set of capabilities that are beyond this black box concept for submission processing such as a comprehensive AFIS user interface, user management, reporting, etc.</p>
360	Industry Day			<p>The draft RFP currently provides for an implementation timeline of 6 months. We consider the transition time in the previous RFP in 2005 to be an important comparative standard: the implementation timeline was originally set at 12 months and ended up being much longer. While a shortened implementation time is typically a competitive advantage for the incumbent, our analysis has determined that 12-18 months will be required for any bidder to comply with the required customization, which is significantly more than in the 2005 requirements. As such, an implementation timeline of 6 months will be a determining factor that may cause the RCMP to receive no bids.</p>	<p>The implementation timeline has been changed. This was addressed in the posted questions and answers arising from the Industry Day held December 14, 2015 and posted March 15, 2016. Item 246 indicated that the timeline had been increased from 6 to 12 months. It further explained the rationale for not requiring more than 12 months. For convenience, the answer is repeated below. The overall timeframe for the previous AFIS renewal is not considered relevant. The previous AFIS renewal did not have an operational NNS and the ICDs were not properly defined when the AFIS renewal contract was signed. The actual AFIS renewal from the 2005 contract was fully implemented supporting all available NNS capabilities, including Paper Conversion Subsystem (PCS) in approximately fourteen (14) months. This was accomplished despite the changing ICDs. Additionally, PCS was developed specifically for RCMP processing requirements which consumed a significant portion of time. There</p>

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
				<p>Recognizing the significance and importance of this AFIS renewal solution to the RCMP and Government of Canada/Public Safety Canada, respectively, in terms of being able to reasonably select from all solution providers and the associated capital expenditure, please explain</p>	<p>is no PCS in this AFIS Renewal RFP. Consequently, it is expected that this AFIS Renewal solution should be significantly more efficient than 2005, with an expectation to easily exceed the 2005 AFIS renewal fourteen (14) month implementation. The existing RTID environment is mature with very well defined interfaces. The AFIS, VSS and Transcoder are black box capabilities based on the very well defined ICDs. The LCMC is preferred to be a solution integrated with AFIS; therefore, it is expected to support the requirements without too much effort especially since it is expected to use the existing AFIS interface and that almost all the data required is already defined in the AFIS ICD. Please note that the selection of the solution provider is not included in this timeframe. The time only starts after contract award.</p>
361	Industry Day			<p>The customization requirements for the benchmark testing are also more prescriptive and in greater number than in 2005. The first 90 of the 135 benchmark requirements are substantively similar to 2005. However, an additional 45 have been added, which require</p>	<p>The RCMP is of the understanding that there should be no customization for the benchmark system as this is intended to be a commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) solution. Having said that, there were also several responses related to the benchmark testing (168, 199, 202, 219, 232, and 249) that were also published on March 15, 2016 that clarified that</p>

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
				<p>significant customization. Our analysis is that more than 1,200 hours of customization will be necessary in order to comply with the benchmark testing requirements. If other companies are following the same process, no bidders will be able to complete the customization required in time and the RCMP may not receive any compliant bids.</p> <p>customize data models at the time of benchmark testing jeopardize the ability for any bidder to deliver any system and should only be part of the eventual contract work.</p>	<p>there is no requirement to meet the mandatory requirements for the benchmark testing. As expressed in the answer to comment 219, the intent of the RFI statement concerning the mandatory requirements that will be reviewed during the benchmark testing is to ensure Bidders accurately identify the capabilities of their AFIS Renewal solution in the written proposal. For example, a Bidder could exaggerate their COTS percentage which would be identified during the benchmark testing and potentially result in a non-compliant bid. If the Bidder indicates that specific functionality is part of its COTS product and the functionality is not present in the Benchmark COTS product then it may suggest that the requirement was not correctly represented in the Bidder's written proposal. Configuration changes would be expected to support the benchmark testing; however, it is expected that these configuration changes should be part of the COTS solution such as, threshold settings for system declared identification, threshold settings for non-identifications, removed NIST packet validation so the NIST packets do not have to conform to any requirement, generate a report from existing log file data to show the results of the test, etc. The previous benchmark participants had no known issues with</p>

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
					supporting the benchmark and 90% of the benchmark is the same process with different data.
362	Industry Day			There are additional concerns around the need to show specific reports and integrate RCMP specific alphanumerical data at the time of benchmark trials. Requirements to customize data models at the time of benchmark testing jeopardize the ability for any bidder to deliver any system and should only be part of the eventual contract work.	It is RCMP's understanding that there is no requirements to customize data models at the time of benchmark. As well, no alphanumerical data is intended to be part of the benchmark, with the assumption that the standard international NIST packet fields such as the Type-1 record field 1.004 may contain alphanumerical data. The benchmark includes generic NIST packets which will be defined more clearly in the final RFP. These NIST packets only have basic data that should be supported by any AFIS that support the international exchange of fingerprint data. It has the minimal data required to create a valid NIST packet and a few fields in the Type-2 record to uniquely identify a specific test records (e.g. unique identifier, file type which is a number that distinguishes a set of prints as a criminal or refugee, immigration) The benchmark reporting requirements are minimal and are based on whatever data the Bidder's COTS supports. The following are examples of the required reports and an explanation that very little effort is required to provide these reports.

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
					<p>a. Match report, with whatever format the Bidder has, to show the results of a search. It is RCMP's understanding that no AFIS can operate without match reports;</p> <p>b. The search results reports are based on whatever the Bidder has as part of their solution. It is expected that any AFIS capable of supporting a national fingerprint system will have an audit log and record basic information such as what time a fingerprint process started, what time the processed ended or the next step started, the search score, the order of candidates and other basic data that allows the RCMP to see the results of the processing. No AFIS can operate without identifying the candidates that result from a search and the score or similar method it used to determine the order of the candidates. The only way RCMP can assess the</p>

No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
					<p>reliability and accuracy of the system is to see the results in a report. Since the Bidder is simply being asked to generate reports from existing data and log files, this is expected to require only a relatively small amount of effort;</p> <p>c. The User Manager database reports simply show that the user was added with whatever privileges and other attributes, with the Bidder expected to demonstrate as much as possible the capabilities that supports the RCMP requirements. Again, this is rated criteria; therefore, the only minimum is that the Bidder's AFIS supports managing users. Since no AFIS (or any system) can operate without users and user profiles, there is no effort required by the Bidder to show the user management data properly recorded; and</p> <p>d. Viewing NIST packets is a basic capability of any AFIS. Since NIST packets are based on</p>



No.	Document Reference	Section Reference	From the Document	Comment/Question	RCMP Response
					international standards that any AFIS must support, there is no effort expected from the Bidder to be able to provide these, except to copy the NIST packets to a USB memory stick.