



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. 013
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20131350	Date 2016-07-06
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 2016-08-10	
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: 013****Purpose:**

The purpose of this amendment is to amend the Request for Proposals (RFP), including revising some of the milestones related to the roll out of EPS to Other Government Departments (OGDs) and the associated implementation approach, and provide answers to questions received with regards to this RFP.

(A) CHANGES**CHANGE: 60**

At *Annex 1 - Statement of Work*, delete section *6.10 Milestones* in its entirety and replace with:

6.10 MILESTONES

The dates specified herein are target dates which the Contractor is required to achieve. However, the GC recognizes the dates may change following the consultation and planning phases with the Contractor after Contract Award. As such, at the sole discretion of the GC and in consultation with the Contractor, the dates may be adjusted following Contract Award.

6.10.1 Milestone #1 – Operational Planning

The Contractor must complete Milestone #1 within 4 months of Contract Award. This milestone will be considered to be achieved when the following work is accepted by the Project Authority:

- a) Preliminary Project Plan as described in section 6.3.1 of the SoW;
- b) Project Management Methodology and Plan as described in section 6.3.2 of the SoW;
- c) Relationship Management Plan as described in section 6.3.3 of the SoW;
- d) Privacy Management Plan as described in section 6.4.1 of the SoW;
- e) IT Security Plan as described in section 6.5.2 of the SoW;
- f) IT Service Continuity Plan as described in section 6.5.3 of the SoW;
- g) Organizational Change Management Strategy as described in section 6.7.1 of the SoW;
- h) Change Management Plan as described in section 6.7.2 of the SoW;
- i) Product and Solution Roadmap as described in section 6.8.1.7 of the SoW;
- j) Training Plan as described in section 6.7.3 of the SoW;
- k) Communications Plan as described in section 5.5.1 of the SoW; and
- l) Transition-In Plan as described in section 6.8.1.1 of the SoW.

6.10.2 Milestone #2 – Solution Environment

The Contractor must complete Milestone #2 within 4 months of Contract Award. This milestone will be considered to be achieved when the following work is accepted by the Project Authority:

- a) The Contractor has delivered the EPS environment ready for configuration, integration and testing in both official languages;
- b) The Contractor has delivered the work and objectives described in *Part 5 Non-Functional Requirements*; and

- c) The Contractor has delivered the elements as detailed in the Project Management Plan, Organizational Change Management Strategy, Change Management Plan, Training Plan, Training Delivery, Transition-In Plan and the Transition-In Delivery.

6.10.3 Milestone #3 – Supplier Enablement

The Contractor must complete Milestone #3 within 12 months of Contract Award. This milestone will be considered to be achieved when the following work is accepted by the Project Authority:

- a) The functionalities described in *Section 3.2 General Requirements, Section 3.2.1 Workflow Requirements, Section 3.3.3 Portal Requirements (excluding section B-5.00), Section 3.9 Supplier Relationship Management, Section 3.10 Data and Information Management*, and *Section 3.11 User Management* have been, in accordance with the Statement of Work, configured, tested, completed the SA&A process for the release, deployed into production in both official languages, and piloted;
- b) The Contractor has delivered the Supplier Enablement Plan; and
- c) The Contractor has delivered the elements of the project management plan, Organizational Change Management Strategy, Supplier Enablement Plan, Change Management Plan Training Plan, Training Delivery, Transition-In Plan and the Transition-In Delivery applicable to the delivery of the functionalities described in *Section 3.2 General Requirements, Section 3.2.1 Workflow Requirements, Section 3.3.3 Portal Requirements (excluding section B-5.00), Section 3.9 Supplier Relationship Management, Section 3.10 Data and Information Management*, and *Section 3.11 User Management*;

6.10.4 Milestone #4 – Contract Management

The Contractor must complete Milestone #4 within 18 months of Contract Award. This milestone will be considered to be achieved when the following work is accepted by the Project Authority:

- a) The functionalities described in *Section 3.2.2 Workload Requirement, 3.4 Sourcing and Contract Management, and 3.8 Business Intelligence* have been, in accordance with the Statement of Work, configured, tested, completed the SA&A process for the release, deployed into production in both official languages, and piloted;
- b) The Contractor has delivered the elements of the project management plan, Organizational Change Management Strategy, Supplier Enablement Plan, Change Management Plan, Training Plan, Training Delivery, Transition-In Plan and the Transition-In Delivery applicable to the delivery of the functionalities described in *Section 3.2.2 Workload Requirements, 3.4 Sourcing and Contract Management, and 3.8 Business Intelligence*; and
- c) 100 Contracts (excluding Orders and call-ups) have been sourced and awarded using the EPS.

6.10.5 Milestone #5 – Procurement Management

The Contractor must complete Milestone #5 within 18 months of Contract Award. This milestone will be considered to be achieved when the following work is accepted by the Project Authority:

- a) The functionalities described in *Section 3.5 Procurement Management* have been, in accordance with the Statement of Work, configured, tested, completed the SA&A process for the release, deployed into production in both official languages, and piloted;
- b) The Contractor has delivered the elements of the project management plan, Organizational Change Management Strategy, Supplier Enablement Plan, Change Management Plan Training Plan, Training Delivery, Transition-In Plan and the Transition-In Delivery applicable to the delivery within PWGSC of the functionalities described in *Section 3.5 Procurement Management*;

- c) EPS is interoperating with PWGSC's DFMS; and
- d) 100 Orders have been processed by Users using the EPS.

6.10.6 Milestone #6 – Service Procurement Management

The Contractor must complete Milestone #6 within 24 months of Contract Award. This milestone will be considered to be achieved when the following work is accepted by the Project Authority:

- a) The functionality described in *Section 3.6 Service Procurement Management* have been, in accordance with the Statement of Work, configured, tested, completed the SA&A process for the release, deployed into production in both official languages, and piloted;
- b) The Contractor has delivered the elements of the project management plan, Organizational Change Management Strategy, Supplier Enablement Plan, Change Management Plan Training Plan, Training Delivery, Transition-In Plan and the Transition-In Delivery applicable to the delivery within PWGSC of the functionalities described in *Section 3.6 Service Procurement Management*; and
- c) 100 SOW Based Services Procurement Contracts / Orders have been awarded using the EPS.

6.10.7 Milestone #7 – Fully Operational Baseline

The Contractor must complete Milestone #7 within 24 months of Contract Award. This milestone is considered to be achieved when PWGSC has been fully transitioned onto the functionality and the Contractor has delivered all the Work described in the SOW, with the exception of Transition-Out Services as defined in section 6.8.3 *Transition-Out Services*, the Work described in Part 7.0 Optional Services, the Work described in Milestone #8 – GETS, and the Contractor has submitted a report substantiating that the Work, inclusive of the report, has been complete, and the Work has been accepted by the Project Authority.

6.10.8 Milestone #8 – Government Electronic Tendering Service (GETS)

The Contractor must complete Milestone #8 within 36 months of Contract Award. This milestone will be considered to be achieved when the following work is accepted by the Project Authority:

- a) The functionalities described in *Section 3.3.2 Government Electronic Tendering Service and section B-5.00 in Section 3.3.3 Portal Requirements* have been, in accordance with the Statement of Work, configured, tested, completed the SA&A process for the release, deployed into production in both official languages, and piloted;
- b) The Contractor has delivered the elements of the project management plan, Organizational Change Management Strategy, Supplier Enablement Plan, Change Management Plan, Training Plan, Training Delivery, Transition-In Plan and the Transition-In Delivery applicable to the delivery of the functionalities described in *Section 3.3.2 Government Electronic Tendering Service and section B-5.00 in Section 3.3.3 Portal Requirements*;
- c) All GC departments and agencies have been on boarded onto the new GETS;
- d) All public GC tender notices are being posted and managed using the new GETS; and
- e) The Contractor has submitted a report substantiating that the Work, inclusive of the report, has been complete, and the Work has been accepted by the Project Authority.

CHANGE: 61

At Annex 1, section 7.2 *OPTIONAL DEFINED WORK*,

INSERT:

7.2.7 Government Wide Deployment - DFMS Instance Transition-In

On an as and when requested basis for each instance, the Contractor must,

- a) configure;
- b) test;
- c) complete the SA&A process for the release;
- d) pilot and deploy EPS to the portfolio of departments associated with a DFMS instance as described in the table of section 1.3 *Volumetric Data*, sub-section *k) Departmental Financial Management System (DFMS) Instances*;
- e) deliver, enable and support the interoperability of EPS with the DFMS instance;
- f) deliver the elements of the project management plan, Organizational Change Management Strategy, Supplier Enablement Plan, Change Management Plan Training Plan, Training Delivery, Transition-In Plan and the Transition-In Delivery applicable to the full deployment of the EPS to a department; and
- g) ensure the portfolio of departments associated with the DFMS instance has been fully transitioned onto the EPS.

7.2.8 Government Wide Deployment - DFMS Instance Operational

For the applicable DFMS instance requested, the above elements must be completed within twelve months of Canada's request. Canada may request deployment of more than one DFMS instance to be in the same request and Canada may request deployment of some instances at later dates during the period of the Contract.

CHANGE: 62

Delete 3.7 *SECTION F - FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT* of Annex 1 - *Statement of Work* in its entirety and replace with:

3.7 SECTION F – FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT is included as an optional service under section 7.2.6 of this Statement of Work.

CHANGE: 63

At Annex 1, section 7.2 *OPTIONAL DEFINED WORK*,

INSERT:

7.2.6 Functional Requirements: SECTION F - FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

On an as requested basis, the Contractor must configure, test, pilot and deploy the functionalities listed in Table 9 – Financial Management Requirements into production.

7.2.6.1 Objectives

The overall objective of this section is to describe the requirements for the financial management functionalities within the EPS, including goods receipt and invoice management.

7.2.6.2 General

The General subsection describes the functionalities that the Contractor must provide to permit specific Users to view, accept, and reject invoices and goods receipts, and provide Users the flexibility to add comments and attachments electronically.

7.2.6.3 Goods Receipt Management

The Goods Receipt Management subsection describe the functionalities that the Contractor must provide to allow for the configurability of partial and multiple receipts of Goods and Services to be handled within the EPS.

7.2.6.4 Invoice Management

The Invoice Management subsection includes requirements that the Contractor must provide with regards to the receipt,

management, and acceptance of invoices, while ensuring that the invoices are assigned to its corresponding Order and those elements of the invoice can be completed electronically.

7.2.6.5 Requirements

Table 9 - Financial Management Requirements

SOW NUM	Requirement
F-01.00	General The Contractor must deliver a solution that provides the functionality:
F-01.01	to allow User to reject, accept and provide comments against invoices and goods receipt as part of a two, three or four-way matching.
F-01.02	to allow a User to add attachments (e.g. expense receipt) to an invoice.
F-01.03	to browse, search, sort and filter invoice and goods receipt details.
F-01.04	to provide ongoing status updates to the end User upon receipt of invoice until completion of the Order.
F-01.05	to configure either percentage and dollar amount tolerance levels between item quantities, price elements on the contracts and/or Orders, invoices and goods receipt to support two, three and four way matching and perform specific actions (e.g. dispatch and receipt advice, invoice and actual goods received).
F-01.06	to send the calculated discount adjustment and the early payment date information to the User which will be tied to two/three/four way matches.
F-01.07	to configure notifications for Users (e.g. status of invoice/good receipt, credit memo, payment refusal, Order details, status notifications, back Order).
F-01.08	to configure a notification period based on contractual payment terms (e.g. payment period).
F-01.09	to integrate scanning devices/software to input goods receipt information into the EPS and connect to the applicable Order (e.g. warehouse loading dock receipt process).
F-01.10	to load ERP non-catalogue spend data on an as and when required basis.
F-02.00	Goods Receipt Management The Contractor must deliver a solution that provides the functionality:
F-02.01	to allow partial receipts and multiple receipts for single or multiple Order items.
F-02.02	to configure workflows to allow goods receipt approval on behalf of multiple or single cost centers.
F-02.03	for an Authorized Administrator to configure the movement types for the receipt of goods or services in accordance with DFMS (e.g. goods received, damaged).
F-02.04	to allow a User to reject a goods receipt.
F-03.00	Invoice Management The Contractor must deliver a solution that provides the functionality:
F-03.01	to allow Suppliers to view rejected and/or accepted invoice comments and resubmit rejected invoices.
F-03.02	to track and record the return of goods to a Supplier (e.g. damaged goods, incorrect quantity/quality, incorrect goods).
F-03.03	to apply credit notes to any invoice for a Supplier.
F-03.04	to configure and compare the invoice, Order and receipt details and perform quality control to determine manual and automatic actions required (e.g. two, three, and four way matches).
F-03.05	to submit invoices in the currency of the contract.

SOW NUM	Requirement
F-03.06	to allow Suppliers to submit invoices and credit memos in multiple currencies in at least the following methods: i. Manual input: Data is inputted into a standard form with required and optional fields. ii. Uploaded file: Data are uploaded in a structured file format (e.g. XML, UBL). iii. Machine-to-machine: Suppliers can set their financial systems to automatically and directly transmit information using EDI or web services.
F-03.07	to allow Supplier to submit an invoice based on Electronic Document Interface (e.g. goods receipt, trade discounts) and via web services.
F-03.08	to configure a self-invoice (prefix/suffix) number that can be tied to the Order number.
F-03.09	to generate an invoice/goods receipt with the Order details (e.g. flip an Order into an invoice).
F-03.10	to prevent a Supplier from invoicing line items, depending on the basis of payment (e.g. milestone, lump sum) for more than a configurable percentage of their estimated cost.
F-03.11	for Suppliers can override dynamic discounting preference (e.g. discount terms) for a specific invoice.
F-03.12	to automatically apply the trade discount terms for all Invoices against the applicable Contract/Order.
F-03.13	to offer Suppliers the option of receiving early payment through dynamic discounting.
F-03.14	to allow a User to configure a manual invoice template that will contain Order details (e.g. trade discounts).
F-03.15	to send line level invoice and goods receipt information to the DFMS in order to initiate the payment.

CHANGE: 64

Under subsection (iii) *Optional Services* of section 7.10.1 *Basis of Payment*,

DELETE:**a. Professional Services provided under a Task Authorization**

Using a Task Authorization (TA), for the Work described in *subsection 7.1 – Optional Professional Services* and *7.2 Optional Defined Work*, with the exception of *7.2.4 Tender Feeds*, of the Statement of Work in Annex 1, and only where the Work is not otherwise covered by another section of the SOW, and for additional Work that may be added by Canada to Annex 1 – SOW and Annex 2 – Security and Privacy:

INSERT:**a. Professional Services provided under a Task Authorization**

Using a Task Authorization (TA), for the Work described in *subsection 7.1 – Optional Professional Services* and *7.2 Optional Defined Work*, with the exception of *7.2.4 Tender Feeds* and *7.2.6 Functional Requirements: Section F – Financial Management*, of the Statement of Work in Annex 1, and only where the Work is not otherwise covered by another section of the SOW, and for additional Work that may be added by Canada to Annex 1 – SOW and Annex 2 – Security and Privacy:

CHANGE: 65

Under subsection (iii) *Optional Services* of section 7.10.1 *Basis of Payment*,

DELETE:

c. Option for the Other Public Sector Entities

(i) For the Work described in *subsection 7.3.1 – Extending Access to Other Canadian Broader Public Sector Entities* of the Statement of Work in Annex 1:

In consideration of the Contractor satisfactorily completing all of its obligations under the authorized Task Authorization (TA), Canada will pay the Contractor the agreed upon negotiated price, as specified in the authorized TA. Canada reserves the right to apply the PWGSC Contract Cost Principles 1031-2 as a basis for establishing the price of this Optional Work.

(ii) For the Work described in *subsection 7.3.2 – Option for Other Canadian Broader Public Sector Entities to acquire a EPS* of the Statement of Work in Annex 1:

In consideration of the Contractor satisfactorily completing all of its obligations under the authorized Task Authorization (TA), Canada will pay the Contractor the agreed upon negotiated price, as specified in the authorized TA. Canada reserves the right to apply the PWGSC Contract Cost Principles 1031-2 as a basis for establishing the price of this Optional Work.

INSERT:

c. Option for Section F - Financial Management

For the Work described in *subsection 7.2.6 – Functional Requirements: Section F – Financial Management* of the Statement of Work in Annex 1:

As consideration to the Contractor for satisfactorily completing all of its obligations under the authorized Task Authorization (TA), Canada will pay the Contractor a Firm Monthly Lot Price for all the services of section 7.2.6. *Functional Requirements: Section F - Financial Management in accordance with Annex 3 – Price Schedule*, as specified in the authorized TA, customs duties included and Applicable Taxes extra.

The Optional Work can be requested at any time by Canada during the entire Term of the Contract.

d. Option for the Other Public Sector Entities

(i) For the Work described in *subsection 7.3.1 – Extending Access to Other Canadian Broader Public Sector Entities* of the Statement of Work in Annex 1:

In consideration of the Contractor satisfactorily completing all of its obligations under the authorized Task Authorization (TA), Canada will pay the Contractor the agreed upon negotiated price, as specified in the authorized TA. Canada reserves the right to apply the PWGSC Contract Cost Principles 1031-2 as a basis for establishing the price of this Optional Work.

(ii) For the Work described in *subsection 7.3.2 – Option for Other Canadian Broader Public Sector Entities to acquire an EPS* of the Statement of Work in Annex 1:

In consideration of the Contractor satisfactorily completing all of its obligations under the authorized Task Authorization (TA), Canada will pay the Contractor the agreed upon negotiated price, as specified in the authorized TA. Canada reserves the right to apply the PWGSC Contract Cost Principles 1031-2 as a basis for establishing the price of this Optional Work.

CHANGE: 66

At section 7.10.1 *Basis of Payment*,

INSERT:

(iv) DFMS Instance e-Procurement Solution Transition-In

For the entirety of the Work in the Statement of Work in Annex 1 relating to the Transition-in of a DFMS instance, including Annex 1 section 7.2.7, Government Wide Deployment, and the entirety of the Work in Annex 2 – Security and Privacy applicable to the interoperability with a DFMS instance, as consideration to the Contractor satisfactorily completing its obligations under the Contract, Canada will pay the Contractor the applicable DFMS Instance EPS Transition-In Firm Lot Price detailed in Annex 3 – Price Schedule, customs duties included and Applicable Taxes extra. Each DFMS Instance EPS Transition-In amount is payable only after successful completion and acceptance by Canada of all the Work related to that DFMS instance.

Where Canada requests more than one DFMS instance to be deployed in the same request, the DFMS Instance EPS Transition Firm Lot Price applicable in the request shall be discounted as follows:

Number of DFMS Instances included in the request	Discount (reduction) applicable to each DFMS Instance EPS Firm Lot Price in the request
1	X%
2	X%
3	X%
4	X%
5-9	X%
10-15	X%
16 or more	X%

(v) DFMS Instance e-Procurement Solution Operational

The DFMS Instance EPS Operational Firm Lot Monthly Price is consideration for all authorized Work related to the DFMS Instance Operational Services, in accordance with all sections of the Statement of Work applicable to the ongoing operational services for a DFMS instance, with the exception of the Work covered under paragraph (iv) above and Part 7 of the Statement of Work in Annex 1. The DFMS Instance EPS Operational Firm Lot Monthly Price is payable monthly and begins in the month subsequent to the successful completion (and Canada's acceptance) of the Work described in section 7.2.7 Government Wide Deployment – DFMS Instance Transition-In of Annex 1 – Statement of Work for the requested DFMS instance.

Each DFMS Instance EPS Operational Firm Lot Monthly Price is listed in Annex 3 – Price Schedule.

The DFMS Instance EPS Operational Firm Lot Monthly Price is cumulative, in that Canada will pay the sum of the applicable Firm Lot Monthly Price for those DFMS Instance Operational Firm Lot Monthly Price for which services are satisfactorily rendered.

Where multiple DFMS Instance EPS Operational Firm Lot Monthly Prices are payable in a given month, the sum of the DFMS Instance e-Procurement Solution Transition Firm Lot Price that are payable shall be discounted as follows:

Number of DFMS Instance Operational Firm Lot Monthly Prices are payable in a given month	Discount (reduction) applicable to the sum of the DFMS Instance Operational Firm Lot Monthly Price in the given month
1	X%
2 – 4	X%
5 – 9	X%
11 – 15	X%
16 or more	X%

CHANGE: 67

At section 7.10 *Terms of Payment*,

INSERT (and renumber section 7.10 accordingly):

7.10.6 Method of Payment – DFMS Instance e-Procurement Solution Transition-In

Canada will pay the Contractor upon completion and delivery of the Work in accordance with Annex 3 – Price Schedule and the payment provisions of the Contract if:

- a. an accurate and complete invoice and any other documents requested by the Contracting Authority have been submitted in accordance with the invoicing instructions provided in the Contract;
- b. all such documents have been verified by Canada; and
- c. the Work has been delivered and accepted by Canada.

7.10.7 Method of Payment – DFMS Instance e-Procurement Solution Operational

Canada will pay the Contractor, in arrears on a monthly basis as detailed in Annex 3 – Price Schedule, for the Work covered by the DFMS Instance EPS Operational Firm Lot Monthly Price, if:

- a. an accurate and complete invoice and any other documents requested by the Contracting Authority have been submitted in accordance with the invoicing instructions provided in the Contract;
- b. all such documents have been verified by Canada; and
- c. the Work has been delivered and accepted by Canada.

CHANGE: 68

Delete *Annex 3 - Price Schedule* in its entirety and replace with the attached *Annex 3 - Price Schedule, version 2.0*.

CHANGE: 69

At section 7.10.1.1 *Competitive Award* of the RFP,

INSERT:

The Contractor further acknowledges that, due to the reporting limitations of the legacy systems currently in place, the volumetric data in this Contract is based on limited statistical information and are provided for information purposes only. The data is not to be considered as a contractual guarantee and may change during the Term of the Contract. No additional charges to the prices and rates specified in Annex 3 - Price Schedule will be allowed to compensate for volumetric changes unless expressly provided for in the Contract.

CHANGE: 70

At section 4.2 *Bid Evaluation* of the RFP,

INSERT:

4.2.10 Bidders will not be allowed to change the composition of the Bidder's team (i.e. a Bidder cannot add or withdraw any team members, including subcontractors, when submitting revised information). Any change to the composition of the Bidder will result in the bid being declared non-responsive.

CHANGE: 71

At Annex 1, section 1.3 *Volumetric Data*, delete g) in its entirety and replace with:

g) **User Base within the GC:** There are currently approximately 3,100 employees responsible for sourcing and contracting activities in the GC. PWGSC and Shared Services Canada (SSC) are the largest employer (40%), followed by Department of National Defence (DND) (25%) and all other Departments and Agencies (35%). In addition, there are currently over 60,000 users providing administrative services within the GC Order goods and services off PWGSC Framework Agreements and initiate unique procurements. The EPS will also potentially be used by others, such as the general public, and must not be restricted to a limited number of Users or to a specific group of Users.

CHANGE: 72At Annex 1, section 1.3 *Volumetric Data*,

INSERT:

j) **Population of Purchasing Group Employees** – Employees within the purchasing group (PG) classification within the GC are the primary federal employees responsible for sourcing and contracting activities in the GC. A breakdown of the current population of PG employees is provided in the table below. It must be noted that sourcing and contracting activities may be performed by employees in other classifications and this list is not inclusive of all potential users of the sourcing and contracting functionality in EPS.

Department	Current Count of Purchasing Group Employees
Administrative Tribunals Support Service of Canada	4
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	64
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	8
Canada Border Services Agency	42
Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions	2
Canada School of Public Service	13
Canadian Grain Commission	6
Canadian Human Rights Commission	2
Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission	1
Canadian Space Agency	8
Canadian Transportation Agency	1
Canadian Heritage	13
Correctional Services Canada	58
Courts Administration Service	4
Department of National Defence	790
Elections Canada	10
Employment and Social Development Canada	32
Environment and Climate Change Canada	49
Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario	1
Finance Canada	8
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	86
Global Affairs Canada	108
Health Canada	46
Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada	2
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada	32
Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada	28
Infrastructure Canada	3
Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada	37
Justice Canada	30
Library and Archives Canada	6
Natural Resources Canada	30
Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages	2
Office of the Information Commissioner of Canada	1

Office of the Secretary to the Governor General	5
Parole Board of Canada	1
Privy Council Office	11
Public Health Agency of Canada	7
Public Prosecution Service of Canada	5
Public Safety Canada	5
Public Service Commission	4
Public Works and Government Services Canada	1295
Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada	2
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	81
Shared Services Canada	99
Statistics Canada	18
Transport Canada	30
Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	19
Veterans Affairs Canada	12
Western Economic Diversification Canada	1
Total	3122

k) **Departmental Financial Management System (DFMS) Instances** - DFMS instances are installations of particular configurations and applications that form a given Departmental Financial Management System (DFMS) on a given server, supporting a given department or set of departments. The below table describes the GC's DFMS Instances, the software platform, and the departments supported by the given instance.

Software Platform	DFMS Instance	Participating Departments per specific DFMS Instance
SAP R3	Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	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	Canadian Border Services Agency
	Canadian Heritage	Canadian Heritage Parks Canada
	Canada Revenue Agency	Canada Revenue Agency Canada Revenue Agency - Revenue Ledger
	Canadian Space Agency	Canadian Space Agency
	Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada	Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada Passport Canada
	Global Affairs Canada	Global Affairs Canada Canadian International Trade Tribunal Export Development Corporation
	Employment and Social Development Canada	Employment and Social Development Canada
	Health Canada	Health Canada Hazardous Material Information Review Commission

		Patented Medicine Prices Review Board Assisted Human Reproductive Agency of Canada Public Health Agency of Canada Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada
	Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada	Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada Canadian Intellectual Property Office Office of Infrastructure Canada Copyright Board
	Department of Justice	Department of Justice Public Prosecution Service of Canada
	National Research Council	National Research Council
	Department of National Defence	Department of National Defence
	Public Works and Government Services Canada	Public Works and Government Services Canada Shared Services Canada
	Royal Canadian Mounted Police	Royal Canadian Mounted Police Public Safety & Emergency Preparedness Canada
	Treasury Board Secretariat	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
Oracle	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
	Correctional Services Canada	Correctional Services Canada
	Transport Canada	Transport Canada
SAP S4/Hana	GC Financial Management (GCFM)	Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency Canadian Human Rights Commission Canadian Intergovernmental Conference Secretariat Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board (o/a Transportation Safety Board of Canada) International Joint Commission Office of the Auditor General of Canada Office of the Commissioner of Lobbying Office of the Information Commission Office of the Privacy Commission Office of the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner* Western Economic Diversification Canadian Institutes of Health Research Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission

		Courts Administration Service Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre of Canada Library and Archives Canada Library of Parliament Public Service Commission National Energy Board Natural Science and Engineering Research Council Office of the Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs Office of the Chief Electoral Officer Office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner Office of the Co-ordinator - Status of Women Parole Board of Canada Office of the Governor General's Secretary PPP Canada (Public Infrastructure, Public Transit, Public Private Partnership) Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada Senate Ethics Officer The Senate Veterans Affairs Canada Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety Canadian High Arctic Research Station Military Grievances External Review Committee Military Police Complaints Commission of Canada Office of the Communications Security Establishment Commissioner Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages The National Battlefield Commission Statistics Canada
--	--	--

CHANGE: 73

At Annex 1, section 1.3 e) *Population of the Federal Public Service*,

INSERT:

Historical information regarding the population of the Federal Public Service is also available as an open data set at the following link: <http://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/933f8f6e-dae4-4368-a7dc-4eadc8b5ecfa>

CHANGE: 74

At Annex 1, section 3.9 *SECTION H - SUPPLIER RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT*, sub section 3.9.2 *Requirements*, delete requirement H-01.15 in its entirety and replace with:

To pull and share Supplier information and data in Near Real-Time from third party content providers and systems (e.g. CRA) such as but not limited to supplier legal name and CRA business number.

CHANGE: 75

At Annex 1, section 3.10 *SECTION I - DATA AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT*, sub section 3.10.2 *Requirements*, delete requirement I-06.13 in its entirety.

CHANGE: 76

At Annex 1, section 6.8.1.2 *Transition-In Delivery (or execution)*,

DELETE:

- a) Execute the Transition-In Plan;
- b) Identify high risk Transition areas and impact, develop mitigation strategies, and recommended mitigation actions and report results to GC;
- c) Document baseline including high-level process maps, standard operating procedures and baseline user service levels and operational activities for use in Transition planning, readiness, cutover and stabilization activities;
- d) Facilitate workshops to discuss, analyze and validate baseline business process documentation and identify changes to processes based on configuration environment;
- e) Facilitate workshops to discuss, analyze and propose to GC procurement process optimization and re-engineering;

INSERT:

- a) Execute the Transition-In Plan;
- b) Identify high risk Transition areas and impact, develop mitigation strategies, and recommended mitigation actions and report results to GC;
- c) Review and document current state PWGSC and generic GC processes (based on existing business process documentation and by facilitating workshops) and document gaps between current state and the COTS-provided processes;
- d) Make suggestions related to the improvement and re-engineering of existing end-to-end GC-wide processes including a proposed business model (or capability model) and a data model.
- e) Facilitate workshops to socialize the processes within the COTS solution and discuss and analyze the proposed GC procurement process optimization and re-engineering;

CHANGE: 77

Delete *Table 22 - Client Satisfaction of Annex 1 - Statement of Work* in its entirety and replace with:

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	60% (3 on a scale of 5.0)
Periodic Sample Satisfaction of GC Users	GC Satisfaction Rate	GC Users surveyed should be very satisfied or satisfied	60% (3 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	

CHANGE: 78

Delete *Table 26 - Call Abandonment Rate of Annex 1 - Statement of Work* in its entirety and replace with:

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 minus number of calls abandoned within 10 seconds of entering queue] 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	

CHANGE: 79

At *Annex 2 – Security and Privacy*, delete i) in the description of security requirement E2.13 in its entirety and replace with:

i) Contractor must keep and maintain an inventory of all mobile devices used by the Contractor to store and access PWGSC e-Procurement Solution data.

CHANGE: 80

At *Annex 2 – Security and Privacy*, delete security requirement E2.51 in its entirety.

CHANGE: 81

At *Annex 2 – Security and Privacy*, delete the description of security requirement E2.36 in its entirety and replace with:

The Contractor must configure the PWGSC EPS to provide only essential capabilities and specifically prohibits or restricts the use of functions, ports, protocols, or services as approved by PWGSC."

CHANGE: 82

At *Annex 2 – Security and Privacy*, delete b) in the description of security requirement E2.78 in its entirety and replace with:

b) acknowledge receipt of e-mails received from e-Procurement addresses authorized by PWGSC, within 15 minutes of receiving the e-mails 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, and 365 days per year;

CHANGE: 83

At *Annex 2 – Security and Privacy*, delete the description of security requirement E2.123 in its entirety and replace with:

The PWGSC EPS must include controls to manage Denial of Service (DoS) attacks, in a manner that is consistent with leading industry practices, as agreed to by both PWGSC and the Contractor, via the Security Assessment & Authorization (SA&A) process."

CHANGE: 84

At *Attachment 2 to Part 4 - Technical Evaluation*, in column "Evaluation Criteria" of evaluation criteria R1.1 of section 4. *Point-Rated Criteria*,

DELETE: For Section B, the projects will be evaluated in accordance with Scale 1.

INSERT: For Section B, the projects will be evaluated in accordance with Scale 1. The final score for Section B will be determined by giving a single score for all of the projects combined.

CHANGE: 85

At Attachment 1 to Part 4 - Evaluation and Selection Methodology, under section 7.1 Mandatory Financial Criteria,

DELETE:

MFC 8	The Bidder's All Inclusive Daily Fixed Rate for the lowest priced level 3 (senior) (of all professional service categories bid by the Bidder) must not be less than 50% of the Bidder's All Inclusive Daily Fixed Rate for the highest priced level 3 (senior) (of all professional services categories bid by the Bidder).
-------	---

INSERT:

MFC 8	For each grouping, the Bidder's All Inclusive Daily Fixed Rate for the lowest priced level 3 (senior) (of all professional service categories bid by the Bidder) must not be less than 50% of the Bidder's All Inclusive Daily Fixed Rate for the highest priced level 3 (senior) (of all professional services categories bid by the Bidder).
-------	--

(B) QUESTIONS**QUESTION: 198**

Regarding Optional Services, a. Professional Services provided under a Task Authorization, the financial table doesn't have any mechanism to cover the cost of adding Departments or other non-federal agencies. Is it the intention of PWGSC to use TAs to cover those activities or does the contractor have to build this functionality into the fixed price of the service?

ANSWER: 198

To address industry's requests for clarity on the firm scope of the requirement, Canada has reconsidered the milestones and the implementation approach. Further to discussions with senior officials, Canada has elected to revise the milestones and the firm scope of the requirement to provide the following clarity:

1. Delivery of plans and the solution environment, as articulated in Milestones #1 and #2
2. Delivery of a working baseline solution implemented (Milestone #7) within PWGSC, as articulated in Milestones #3, #4, #5 and #6
3. Delivery of a new Government Electronic Tendering Service, as articulated in Milestone #8

Following the delivery of Milestone #7 the Contractor must deploy the fully operational EPS in two additional departments (in addition to PWGSC), as articulated in the revised Basis of Payment.

Following the completion of Milestone #7 and a limited GC deployment of the baseline solution within two additional DFMS instances (in addition to PWGSC) as described in paragraph k) of section 1.3 of Annex 1 – Statement of Work, it is anticipated that Canada will evaluate if the EPS is meeting the desired objectives and report the results to senior government officials. If senior government officials endorse further deployment of the solution, Canada anticipates it will seek internal approval to mandate the adoption of EPS government wide and to establish EPS as the government wide standard for procurement.

If approval is granted, Canada may exercise contractual options to deploy the EPS to rest of the Government of Canada, on a per instance basis, for the remaining DFMS instances. It is anticipated that the deployment to the broader GC may occur over a 2-year period, once the options begin to be exercised.

Please see the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment revising the milestones and basis of payment.

QUESTION: 199

In terms of the volume of EPS users, is there an estimated number of users that will require formal web-based or instructor-led courses?

ANSWER: 199

It is anticipated that prior to accessing the EPS, users will be required to take mandatory online (computer-based) training. It is anticipated that the instructor led training will be for Authorized Administrator's including GC retained technical staff and the training would be for approximately 100 users. Please refer to section 6.7.3 Training Plan and 6.7.4 Training Delivery of Annex 1 Statement of Work.

QUESTION: 200

Annex 1 - SOW; Part 1; sub-section 1.3 g) indicates that EPS will need to support an unlimited number of users however in order for Bidders to provide the Government of Canada with responses that are based on consistent criteria additional details are required. These details should allow Bidders to use the same criteria to determine software and support pricing to the extent that that pricing is driven by the number of users. To support an effective comparison of financial proposals we suggest the Government of Canada provide the estimated number of internal users by category (i.e. Procure Management, Sourcing and Contract Management) by year and the estimated number of external users by year.

ANSWER: 200

Canada has revised the milestones to provide better clarity regarding the deployment of EPS and when users would be on boarded. Please see the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment, which also includes a breakdown of purchasing group employees by department.

QUESTION: 201

A significant portion of the milestones in the Basis of Payment for the Transition-in period are held back based on the completion of milestones that stretch over a 24 month period. The holdbacks apply to 100% of the transition-in fees and only 35% of these fees are payable before 24 months. When holdbacks are built into a Basis of Payment, our experience is that bidders will increase their price to include contingency and cost of capital in their pricing to compensate for the risk and cost of deferred milestone payments which can significantly increase the cost to the Crown. In some cases, where the sums deferred are high and the cost of capital significant, Bidder may not be able to bid due to the risk and incremental cost caused by these milestone payment structures. For the EPS, we anticipate that Bidders will be forced to include these types of costs in their bids to compensate for the holdback of 65% of the Transition-in Fees over two years which will increase the total price to the Crown. While we understand and accept the rationale for some level holdback until the full deliverable can be accepted, we believe it should be minimal in this case.

We respectfully request that the Basis of Payment be modified to pay the Bidder monthly, in arrears, as services are rendered and to holdback ten percent (10%) on these monthly payments until final acceptance of each Milestone and which point the holdback in respect such milestone would be released for payment?

ANSWER: 201

Canada has revised the percentage of the Firm Lot Monthly Price paid upon completion of milestones to increase the value of earlier milestones. Please see the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment. In the interest of both Canada's objectives and the Contractor's recovery of costs, Bidders are encouraged to deliver milestones sooner than the target dates specified under the milestones.

QUESTION: 202

With regard to Section 1.2.3 (page 80) and Table 1 (page 82), we understand these sections to mean that PWGSC's procurement services for goods is mandatory for departments and agencies based on threshold values. From Table 1, we understand that these department and agencies to be outside of PWGSC. Please confirm the following:

- a) Please confirm that our understanding above is correct.
- b) Will users from other government departments (OGD) and agencies be onboarding EPS in the same timeframe as PWGSC users?
 - i. If yes, could PWGSC clarify how many other agencies will be onboarding within this timeframe?
 - ii. If yes, could PWGSC clarify their plan to integrate EPS within the ERP financial management systems of the departments and agencies provided in response to item b.i. above?

ANSWER: 202

- a) Confirmed, PWGSC's procurement services for goods are mandatory for departments and agencies outside of PWGSC based on threshold values.
- b) Please see the revised milestones in the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment for clarity on when other government departments and agencies are expected to be on-boarded. Please see the response to question #73 for clarity on how EPS is expected to interoperate with departmental financial management systems

QUESTION: 203

With regard to Section 6.10.2 Milestone #2 – Solution Environment item d) where it states "EPS has successfully completed gate 3 of the PWGSC Security Assessment and Authorization (SA&A) Process", we have the following two questions:

- a) Section 6.10.2 states that SA&A gate 3 must be completed within 6 months of contract signature. Since there are dependencies on the GC in the SA&A process, would PWGSC consider using a sliding window approach to account/allow for delays that may come up in activities outside of the contractor's control?
- b) Would PWGSC confirm which environment(s) (e.g. Production, Disaster Recovery, Staging, Test, Training, UAT, Load Testing environments) is/are to be included in the SA&A portion for Milestone 2?

ANSWER: 203

Please see the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment revising the Milestones, including removing the SA&A gate 3 requirements of Milestone #2.

In accordance with *Section 6.6 PWGSC Security Assessment Authorization Process* of the SOW and *Section 1.4 of Annex 2*, the SA&A process is based on the Software Development Lifecycle (SDLC) and therefore includes the validation of production and non-production environments that carry GC data or EPS system configuration, including the COTS and custom software components. Bidders are reminded that during the Security Assessment and Authorization (SA&A) process, Canada will perform a security assessment to determine any security gaps that are open at the end of each gate prior to granting approval to move to the next stage. SA&A gate 3 signifies the completion of the applicable SA&A and will serve as the baseline for subsequent security assessments. Canada expects that all security gaps are remediated prior to Canada granting security authorization for the proposed solution. In accordance with *section 6.6 PWGSC Security Assessment Authorization Process of Annex 1 – Statement of Work*, the SA&A process must be completed in its entirety, and to the satisfaction of the GC, prior to the commencement of any operational activity (e.g. pilots, go-live, etc.) including production transactions and data. Thereafter, with each release or change management implementation, the SA&A process must be repeated and documented.

QUESTION: 204

With regard to requirement H.01-15 where it states “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. CRA, SAP) and ensure integrity of the data between different systems including, but not limited to legal name and procurement business number”, please confirm:

- a. If the Near Real-Time validation is required during the initial Supplier Registration process?
- b. And is the Near Real-Time validation required each time a Supplier Record and/or Contact is updated?

ANSWER: 204

The requirement for near real time validation has been removed. Please see the amendment to requirement H.01-15 in the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION: 205

Annex 1; Section 4.3 Int.02 states that "The Contractor must deliver a solution that provides the functionality to interoperate with DFMS(s)...". We understand the solution needs to be able to integrate with various DFMS applications, however, the RFP it is not clear on what DFMS integrations are to be included in the Firm Lot Price. Please confirm whether the Firm Lot Price should include the deployment of any DFMS integrations other than the integration with the PWGSC DFMS.

ANSWER: 205

In accordance with the revised Milestones and Basis of Payment in the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment, the EPS Transition-In Firm Lot Price and the EPS Operational Firm Lot Monthly Price must include the interoperability between EPS and PWGSC's DFMS. Integration with other DFMS instances must be included in the DFMS Instance EPS Transition-In Firm Lot Price and the DFMS Instance EPS Operational Firm Lot Monthly Price, on a per instance basis as identified in Annex 3 - Price Schedule and the Basis of Payment in Part 7 of the RFP.

QUESTION: 206

Annex 1; Section 1.2.2 states "Once EPS is operational, other government Departments and Agencies within the GC may, at their discretion, begin using EPS to manage contracts and sourcing events within their own departmental delegations." Please confirm that the Firm Lot Price should include the deployment of EPS for contracts and sourcing for PWGSC only.

ANSWER: 206

In accordance with the revised Milestones in the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment, the Firm Lot Price for Transition-In should contemplate the deployment of Contract and Sourcing Management within PWGSC and two additional instances only, as described in paragraph k) of section 1.3 of Annex 1 – Statement of Work.

QUESTION: 207

Annex 1; Section 3.5 refers to GC Users having the ability to execute Procurement Management activities, however, the RFP does not provide details regarding the departments and agencies who will use the EPS, how many users they will have, or when they will start using it. From the Bidders Conference, we understand the vision for the end state solution includes the deployment of the GETS and Procure to Order functionality across the government of Canada, however, the RFP is not clear to what extent this deployment should be included in the Firm Lot Price. Please confirm whether the Bidder should assume that all GC Users, across departments, will have access to EPS by the 36 month milestone and, if Bidders should make this assumption, please provide a breakdown of user counts and roles by departments.

ANSWER: 207

Please see the revised Milestones and Basis of Payment in the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment for clarity on when other government departments and agencies are expected to be on-boarded and associated scope of each price of the Price Schedule and Basis of Payment.

While it is not expected that all employees in the GC will use EPS, the EPS must be accessible to all GC employees.

User counts and roles by departments can be estimated in accordance with *section 1.3(e) Population of the Federal Public Service* and *section 1.3(g) User Base within the GC*.

Additionally, please refer to the response to question #200 for a historical breakdown of procurement officers by department.

QUESTION: 208

H-01.15 – This mandatory requires detailed information to ensure compliance. Recommend that this requirement be moved to rated and specific scenarios for scoring be provided.

ANSWER: 208

This requirement has been amended to provide better clarity. The amended requirement remains mandatory and no specific scenarios for scoring need to be provided. Please see the amendment to requirement H.01-15 in the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION: 209

Milestone #2, defined in section 6.10.2 of Annex 1, indicates that the contractor is to deliver "the functionalities and objectives described in Part 3: Functional Requirements and Part 4: Technical Requirements and the functionalities are ready for configuration, integration and testing in both official languages". Would PWGSC please confirm their expectation with regards to solution functionality delivered as part of Milestone #2? Is the intention simply for the contractor to install the Out-of-the-box functionality in the environment?

ANSWER: 209

The intention of Milestone #2 is that the Contractor has delivered a solution environment that is ready for configuration, integration and testing in both official languages. Depending on the Contractor's solution, this may consist of delivering the COTS functionality or it may include additional work to ensure the solution is ready to be configured, integrated and tested in accordance with the requirements. Please see the revised Milestones in the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment for clarity.

QUESTION: 210

Although most areas of Part 3: Functional Requirements are explicitly included in the Milestones defined in Section 6.10, some areas of Part 3: Functional Requirements and all of Part 4: Technical Requirements are not included in specific Milestones and are believed by the contractor to be required prior to Milestone #7. Could PWGSC please identify the milestones that should include the configuration, integration and testing of the requirements in the following areas:

- a) Section 3.10 Data and Information Management;
- b) Section 3.11 User Management;
- c) All sections of Part 4: Technical Requirements?

ANSWER: 210

Please refer to the amendment to milestones in the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION: 211

Section 3.3.2 Government Electronic Tendering Services (GETS) of Annex 1 describes the functionality required for GETS and is included in Milestone #4 defined in section 6.10.4. GETS requirements are included in Section 3.3.3 Portal Requirements, numbered B-05.00 through B-05.08 and Section 3.3.3 is included in Milestone 3 defined in section 6.10.3. Would PWGSC please clarify which milestone should include GETS functionality?

ANSWER: 211

A new milestone has been created for the Government Electronic Tendering Service. Please see the revised milestones in the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION: 212

PWGSC is open to using some shared system to support the EPS system. The important factor is to maintain data segregation between other clients and PWGSC. The deployment of a dedicated ITSM system is a very expensive item in any costs model and the use of a shared system would greatly reduce the implementation time, one-time costs and on-going costs. Would the use of a shared system where the data is restricted logically using row-level access permissions within ITSM and access is granted based on the Company Access in the user's profiles in ITSM be acceptable to PWGSC?

ANSWER: 212

Yes, the use of a shared ITSM system would be acceptable providing that the data segregation can be achieved either via logical separation, physical separation, or both, as applicable within the Bidder's proposed solution. The solution must adhere to the EPS security requirements.

QUESTION: 213

PWGSC provided clear directives on the application of the SLAs to the DR environment in their response to question 36 in Amendment 005 dated 2016-05-17. Could PWGSC also provide the same clarity for the following non-production environments:

- a) Control Test/UAT;
- b) Staging;
- c) Load Testing;
- d) Training;
- e) Development?

ANSWER: 213

SLA's do not apply to non-Production environments, however, any non-production environment that carries GC data or includes EPS system configuration, including the COTS and custom software components, must be compliant with the security requirements in Annex 2.

QUESTION: 214

Attachment 1 to Part 4; R5: Security Plan; Point Rated Criteria 5.1 states *"The Bidder should demonstrate its ability to comply with the IT security requirements by maintaining policies and procedures that support IT security throughout the Contract by providing evidence of any existing policies and procedures that support the security control families described in Annex 2 and ITSG-33."*

Given how difficult it can be to address security controls in the operational planning phase of a project, we understand and appreciate the Crown is seeking a level of assurance regarding the security of both the Bidder's solution and the operation of that solution during the RFP process. However, we have determined that gathering and documenting policies and processes to address each of the 173 control objectives specified in the RFP will require a substantial effort. Further, it is our experience that control objectives will evolve throughout the life of an implementation, resulting in rework if completed too early in the process. Lastly, we believe the certifications described in R5.7 provide sufficient assurance that a completed Security Requirements Traceability Matrix (SRTM), which addresses the 173 control objectives, can be completed within the four month operational planning period. We therefore suggest that the Crown remove Rated 5.1.

ANSWER: 214

Evaluation criteria R5.1 will evaluate, for example, the thoroughness and effectiveness in achieving the level of security represented by the security control families described in section 1.7 and Table 1 of Annex 2 – Security and Privacy of this solicitation and ITSG- 33. The degree to which the Bidders decide to provide the level of detail described in the question above (which is taken from the submission requirements for this criteria) may impact their score for evaluation criteria R 5.1. It is also expected that specific tailoring of the Bidder's current process, procedures and policies to address the security requirements will happen during the Security Assessment & Authorization (SA&A) phases.

QUESTION: 215

In follow-up to question #207, please provide the number of internal users that should be assumed, for pricing, for each year of the operational phase. This number impacts software and support costs and without this information, Bidders are required to assume the number of users. Basing the procurement in part on Bidder's unstated assumptions about this crucial metric could result in downstream risk for the Crown.

ANSWER: 215

Please see response to question #207.

QUESTION: 216

Bidders are asked to confirm they meet all requirements contained in Annex 1 of the RFP. However, the RFP does not provide a structure in which to note any assumptions a vendor may have made in determining fit. Amendment 5, question 47 notes that the related risk to this approach will be partially mitigated by the Proof of Proposal however the POP will only assess a small subset of the solution functionality. Please clarify how the Crown intends to manage any disagreements, during contracting or delivery, related to the details of how a Bidder/Contractor intends to fulfill a requirement.

ANSWER: 216

Bidders should not state any assumptions when preparing their bids as Canada may interpret these as bid conditions. If any requirements are not clear, the Bidders should seek clarification through the enquiries process described at section 2.3 *Enquiries – Bid Solicitation* of the RFP. Bidders should also note that the POP test has been expanded from the limited examples originally stated in the RFP. If the Contractor does not comply with all required elements of the SoW, Canada reserves its right to “exercise Canada's rights or remedies under the Contract or at law, including terminating the Contract for default under section titled “Default of the Contractor”.”

QUESTION: 217

There are possibilities that data could be released during the life of the contract to the general public or competitors because of security breaches without no fault of the contractor. If data were to be compromised, and Canadian or foreign government suppliers' reputation or livelihood were to be impacted, could the crown provide the location of where our firm can access these international bilateral industrial security instruments that have been negotiated with each specific foreign country by the crown.

ANSWER: 217

Canada is not in a position to provide Bidders access to the International Bilateral Industrial Security Instruments. However, Bidders can find information regarding Canada's international industrial security relations and associated instruments at the following link: <http://iss-ssi.pwgsc-tpsgc.gc.ca/gvnmnt/risi-iisr-eng.html>.

QUESTION: 218

Amendment #8, Change 27 states "*Maximum Payment Credits: The maximum payment credits per month are capped at 15%. However, if payment credits are incurred for three 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.*" Please clarify if the elevated payment credit will apply if there is a failure with a specific SLR for three consecutive months or whether it will apply if there is any SLR failure for three consecutive months.

ANSWER: 218

The elevated payment credit will apply if there is any SLR failure for three consecutive months.

QUESTION: 219

Amendment #8, Answer 73 states "...the EPS will be required to interoperate with the existing SAP instances...", please clarify whether "interoperate" means the systems must be able to communicate, or whether the Fixed Fee Amount needs to include the deployment of the integrations between EPS and the 18 DFMS instances. If the Fixed Fee Amount needs to include the deployment of the integrations between EPS and the 18 DFMS instances, please clarify how these integrations can be deployed before the 36 month milestone, given the 2-3 year S4 rollout plan.

ANSWER: 219

Please see the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment revising the milestones, the Basis of Payment and clarifying the deployment of EPS to the DFMS instances.

In accordance with Annex 5 – Glossary, "Interoperability" is defined as *"The ability for different systems and applications to communicate, exchange data, and use the information that has been exchanged"*. If integration is required to achieve interoperability, then the Contractor must perform the required integration.

QUESTION: 220

Amendment #8, Answer 73 states *"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"*. Since this timeline is concurrent with the EPS deployment, please confirm that:

- a) Any integration changes required after the initial deployment, including those related to the evolving GC landscape, will be managed through a budget impacting change management process.
- b) Any Contractor activities to assist with the DFMS initiative, expected to be required given the integration of the solutions, will be managed through a change management process.

ANSWER: 220

Please see the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment revising the milestones and clarifying the deployment of EPS to the DFMS instances.

- a) Canada confirms that integration changes required after the initial deployment will be managed through the Task Authorization process, using the Professional Services fees.
- b) Canada confirms that if the GC requires the Contractor to assist with the initiative to transition departments and agencies to the SAP S/4Hana solution, Canada will request services through a Task Authorization in accordance with *Section 7.1.2 Additional Change Management and Business Transition Support Services*.

QUESTION: 221

Amendment #8, Answer 73 states *"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"*. Since this timeline is concurrent with the EPS deployment, please confirm that any Contractor activities to assist with the DFMS initiative, expected to be required given the integration of the solutions, will be managed through a change management process.

ANSWER: 221

Please see response to question #220.

QUESTION: 222

Amendment #8, Answer 73 states *"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"*. Our proposed solution may include a native integration between EPS and the SAP DFMS applications. If we can propose native integration, is interoperability through the GC ESB solution mandatory?

ANSWER: 222

In accordance with the response provided in Amendment #8, Answer 73, Canada, at its own discretion and if it sees fit, may evaluate other potential GC solutions to achieve interoperability between the EPS and the DFMS. Should Canada accept the proposed alternative, the GC ESB may not be required for interoperability with the SAP DFMS applications.

QUESTION: 223

Amendment #8, Answer 74 states *"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."* Given there will necessarily be some duplication of data between EPS and DFMS, e.g. a purchase order will be created in EPS and pushed to DFMS, please confirm the use of the word "should" rather than "must" indicates Bidders should consider this a guiding principle rather than a mandatory requirement.

ANSWER: 223

Canada confirms the use of the word "should" as a guiding principle rather than a mandatory requirement in the response provided under Amendment #008, answer #74.

QUESTION: 224

Amendment #8, Answer 75 states *"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."* The outputs listed are not part of the RFP scope; please confirm that these are GC deliverables.

ANSWER: 224

Please see response to question #225.

QUESTION: 225

The Contractor deliverables required by Annex 1, Section 6.8.1.2 are not clear. Please confirm what deliverables Bidders should include in the Fixed Fee Amount. Two possible scenarios are:

- a) Facilitate workshops to socialize the COTS-provided processes and, given the COTS configuration, make suggestions related to the improvement and re-engineering of existing GC-wide processes.
- b) For each in-scope department: document current state processes, document gaps between current state and the COTS-provided future state processes and re-engineer current processes to adapt to a future state.

ANSWER: 225

Please see the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment clarifying the requirement.

QUESTION: 226

Should the Bidders assume the contingent labour functionality will only be used for new labour agreements or is it the Crown's expectation that legacy contracts and agreements will be migrated and supported by the Bidder's solution?

ANSWER: 226

PWGSC has been developing a new procurement *Strategy for Temporary Help Services* (referred to as contingent labour in the question) in conjunction with Industry and Clients. Before finalizing the strategy the EPS functionalities will be analyzed in order to determine if any changes are required to the Strategy. Therefore, it is not known at this time if the existing Temporary Help Services Methods of Supply will be migrated into EPS.

QUESTION: 227

In Amendment 8, Section 6.13.3.2, there is a gap between the stated SLR performance target and the range where credits are applicable. Please revise the target from 70% to 60% or state if a penalty is applicable when 'Less than 70% but equal to or greater than 60%'.

ANSWER: 227

This SLR's performance target has been revised to 60%. Please see amendment in "Changes" section of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION: 228

Section 1.3.i – Volumetric Data states, *"PWGSC maintains 183,000 Supplier records in its existing Supplier registration database"*. How many of the 183,000 suppliers have actively engaged with PWGSC in the last 12 months (i.e. how many active suppliers are there in the current system)?

ANSWER: 228

10,476 suppliers have actively engaged with PWGSC in the last 12 months. For the purpose of this answer, active engagement is defined as a supplier to which PWGSC has issued a new contract, standing offer, call up against a standing offer or amendment to an existing contract in GC fiscal year 2015-2016. Suppliers that bid on a tender but that weren't issued a contract are not included in this total.

QUESTION: 229

Section 5.6.4.1.j - General states, *"The proposed ITSM service or system must support communication with other managed service providers (MSPs) and GC's ITSM, at the Application Programming Interface (API) level"*. Please provide a description of any integrations, including support data elements, with the Bidder's ITSM service/system that must be included in the Fixed Fee Amount.

ANSWER: 229

Please see response to question #231.

QUESTION: 230

Could PWGSC confirm if there is a requirement for the EPS Service Desk to accept calls from non-authenticated users accessing the public site? If this is a requirement, could PWGSC provide the expected volume of calls from the existing system?

ANSWER: 230

Please refer to the response for question #60. It is anticipated that the EPS Service Desk will accept calls from non-authenticated users accessing the public site. The call volumes specified in answer #60 cannot be broken down to distinguish the caller type.

QUESTION: 231

Regarding Section 5.6.4.1 of Annex 1, item j) where it states "The proposed ITSM service or system must support communication with other managed service providers (MSPs) and GC's ITSM, at the application programming interface (API) level", we have the following questions:

- i. Is the requirement simply to have APIs available for other service providers and GC's ITSM so they can create interfaces into the contractor's ITSM?
- ii. Is the requirement to create a fully functional interface with one PWGSC EPS ITSM and if so, what is the tool used in this case?
- iii. If not item ii, how many interfaces must be built by the Contractor and to what tool?

ANSWER: 231

The Contractor's ITSM system will not be required to integrate with current GC ITSM systems as part of the EPS Transition-In and the EPS Operational fixed fee amounts. The GC will use the Task Authorization process on an as requested basis, including the All Inclusive Daily Fixed Rates as per *Annex 3 – Price Schedule*, should integration of future GC ITSM systems be required.

QUESTION: 232

Annex 1 Section 6.10.2 – Milestone #2 item d) requires the service to have completed Gate 3 of the SA&A process which is the validation that the security controls were properly applied in accordance with the approved design documents. Could you clarify the following points in order to assist us in developing the project plan:

- i. Does the SA&A validation at the end of Milestone #2 include all the environments such as Production, Disaster Recovery, Training, User acceptance Testing, Load Testing and Testing?
- ii. Since not all functionalities are required in Milestone #2 (e.g. GETS), is the expectation that the software product will be installed and hardened but not configured at the end of Milestone #2?
- iii. When additional functionalities are delivered in the follow up Milestones will there be another SA&A Gate 3 review each time a Milestone is completed?

ANSWER: 232

Please see the revised Milestones in the "Changes" section of RFP this RFP amendment and the response to question #209 for clarity regarding the requirements for Milestone #2.

For additional clarity, in accordance with Section 6.6 PWGSC Security Assessment Authorization Process of the SOW and Section 1.4 of Annex 2, the SA&A process is based on the Software Development Lifecycle (SDLC) and therefore includes the validation of production and non-production environments that carry GC data or EPS system configuration, including the COTS and custom software components. The SA&A process must be completed in its entirety, and to the satisfaction of the GC, prior to the commencement of any operational activity (e.g. pilots, go-live, etc.) including production transactions and data. Thereafter, with each release or change management implementation, the SA&A process must be repeated and documented.

QUESTION: 233

Amendment 8, Section 6.13.3.8 states *[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]*. We understand the service desk will receive calls related to both functional (e.g. how do I submit an RFP) and technology questions or issues. Please confirm that any program questions or issues that get transferred to the Crown for processing will not be included in this calculation.

ANSWER: 233

Yes. PWGSC confirms that any program questions or issues that get transferred to the Crown for processing will not be included in this calculation.

QUESTION: 234

Annex 1 seems to use the terms Tier and Level to mean the same thing, see 5.6.4.6 c) and 6.7.3 m). Please confirm these words have the same meaning and, if not, please clarify.

ANSWER: 234

Yes, the words Tier 1, 2 or 3 support and Level 1, 2 or 3 support in a service desk context mean the same.

QUESTION: 235

Regarding Section 6.13.3.9, please confirm whether the Crown will allow for incidents to be "on hold", stopping the SLR clock when mutually agreed upon based on the complexity of the resolution, a need to agree on the cause of the issue, or constraints like the release schedule?

ANSWER: 235

Based on the Contractor's incident management process and its associated service levels, the GC may consider "on hold" status for incidents, in accordance with the ITIL practices.

QUESTION: 236

Regarding Section 6.13.3.9, please clarify at what point an incident is considered resolved. For example is it resolved once the fix has been validated in the Test environment, once it has been deployed to Production, once the Crown has accepted it, or other?

ANSWER: 236

In accordance with ITIL terms, the "resolved" status means that the service desk has confirmed that the incident is resolved and that the user's service is restored to the SLA levels.

QUESTION: 237

Amendment 8 replaces Section 6.13 in the RFP, however the Amendment does not explain the change to the related Table 18 in Annex 1, Section 5.6.4.4. Please clarify how Table 18 should be interpreted given Amendment 8.

ANSWER: 237

The amendment to 6.13 revised the word "severity" to "priority" to be consistent with *Part 5 – Non-Functional Requirements of Annex 1 – Statement of Work*, including *Table 18*.

QUESTION: 238

Regarding Amendment 5 Answer 48, *"Yes, there are other mandatory requirements throughout the RFP and Bidders are responsible for carefully reviewing the RFP to identify all mandatory requirements and ensure that they are in compliance with each of them."* We ask that the Crown clearly identify any mandatory requirements in a consistent manner (i.e. the provision of a chart/table clearly identifying these "other" mandatory requirements in Attachment 2 to Part 4 section 3. Mandatory Technical Criteria). We suggest the current approach of embedding requirements throughout the RFP where they are to be identified by the word "must" or similar will result in gaps in understanding between the Bidder and the Crown.

ANSWER: 238

Canada has endeavoured to clearly state the mandatory requirements pertaining to the selection process (for example, the Mandatory Technical Criteria, the Mandatory Financial Criteria, the Point-Rated Pass Marks, Part 5 – Certifications, etc.). For all other mandatory elements Bidders are responsible for carefully reviewing the RFP (for example, Annex 1, Annex 2, etc.) to comply with all mandatory elements.

QUESTION: 239

Annex 2 Section I - Security Requirements E2.13 states: *"The Contractor must implement a mobile device policy for PWGSC EPS that includes the following at minimum"* and bullet (i) states *"Contractor must keep and maintain an inventory of all mobile devices used to store and access PWGSC eProcurement Solution data."* Please clarify the following:

- a) Does the mobile device policy apply to mobile devices and users within the Government of Canada and if so is PWGSC responsible for reporting and monitoring compliance to this policy?
- b) Do requirements of E2.13 that apply to the contractor also extend to all subcontractors in the Bidder's supply chain?

ANSWER: 239

- a) The mobile device policy is applicable to all mobile devices provisioned by the Contractor. These devices are to be managed by the Contractor.
- b) Yes, the Contractor and all sub-contractors must adhere to the contracting clauses and the security requirements as detailed in EPS RFP commensurate with their role in the proposed EPS solution.

Please see the amendment in the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION: 240

Section 4.2.1.2 states that Canada will notify the Bidder if Canada has any *"concerns"* with the submitted SCSI, but that in some cases (due to national security) *"... the bidder will not know the underlying reasons for Canada's concerns"*. While the Crown will notify and provide the Bidder with one opportunity to submit a revised SCSI, no changes will be permitted to the technical bid or the financial bid. These conditions appear to suggest that Canada may effectively disqualify a bid without giving justification or effectively force a bidder to withdraw from evaluation. To ensure the technical and financial bids align with the SCSI assessment, we ask the Crown to clarify the criteria used to assess the Bidder's SCSI.

ANSWER: 240

As stated in section 3.2.1 of the RFP, Canada will assess the Bidder's SCSI by assessing *"(...) whether, in its opinion, a Bidder's proposed supply chain creates the possibility that the Bidder's proposed e-Procurement Solution could compromise or be used to compromise the security integrity of Canada's equipment, firmware, software, systems or information (...)"*. The assessment is a risk based assessment.

QUESTION: 241

Annex 2, E2.51 appears to be incomplete. Please clarify the purpose of this requirement.

ANSWER: 241

Requirement E2.51 in Annex 2 will be deleted. This is covered under incident response requirements.

QUESTION: 242

Annex 2, E2.123 states *"The PWGSC EPS must include a Denial of Service (DoS) capability that limits concurrent connections as specified by PWGSC."* Our solution leverages an industry standard approach to managing DoS attacks which will evolve as the DoS threat evolves. We therefore suggest the following requirement change; *"The PWGSC EPS must include controls to manage Denial of Service (DoS) attacks in a manner that consistent with leading industry practices as agreed to by both PWGSC and the Contractor."* If this is not acceptable, please provide the limits referred to in the requirement.

ANSWER: 242

Canada will revise the requirement. Please see revisions to E2.123 in the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION: 243

Please confirm if Annex 2 E2.114 applies to employees of subcontractors, subcontractors of subcontractors and suppliers.

ANSWER: 243

Requirement E2.114 applies to the Contractor and all subcontractors delivering the services and performing the Work described in the Contract. Please also refer to section 7.5 Security Requirements, in the RFP for additional details on Personnel Security.

QUESTION: 244

Annex 2, E2.36 states *"The Contractor must configure the PWGSC EPS to provide only essential capabilities and specifically prohibits or restricts the use of the following functions, ports, protocols, or services as approved by PWGSC."* We ask that the Crown share this list or indicate when the list will be provided to the Contractor.

ANSWER: 244

During the Security Assessment and Authorization (SA&A) process, and after Contract Award, PWGSC will provide the list of functions, ports, protocols, or services when the proposed solution design and deployment details have been made available to PWGSC for assessment.

QUESTION: 245

Annex 1, Section 6.4.1 f), asks that a Privacy Management Plan include *"any new measures the Contractor will implement"* to safeguard Personal Information. We request following clarifications:

- a) Is there an existing Privacy Management Plan that describes existing measures?
- b) Are there known gaps with the existing Privacy Management Plan or are there desired improvements that require "new measures" in the context of EPS?

ANSWER: 245

For clarity, the Privacy Management Plan deliverable addresses the Contractor's approach to the management of private information within the EPS and is not based on existing privacy management practices within PWGSC. The new measures described in section 6.4.1 (f) relate to new measures (i.e. gaps the existing solution must remedy to be compliant) the Contractor must put in place to ensure the solution meets Canadian Privacy requirements. The new measures do not relate to desired improvements in PWGSC's existing practices.

For information about the functions, programs, activities and related information holdings of government institutions subject to the Access to Information Act and the Privacy Act, Bidders may consult Info Source at the following link: <http://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/aiprp-atip/ressources-resources/infosource2014-eng.html#a3.1> . Info Source provides individuals with relevant information to access personal information about themselves held by government institutions subject to the Privacy Act and to exercise their rights under the Privacy Act.

QUESTION: 246

Please confirm the scope of the Privacy Impact Assessment described in Annex 1 Section 6.4.3 is limited to those portions of the EPS operated by the Contractor and that the Crown will conduct a separate PIA for Personal Information stored in the GC systems.

ANSWER: 246

Yes, PWGSC will address the GC systems related Privacy Impact Assessment internally.

QUESTION: 247

Please confirm if the Crown's definition of "close cooperation" between the Contractor's SOC and the GC is limited to the description contained in the RFP, "...[collaboration] with PWGSC's Information Protection Centre for activities that include: integration of processes; oversight; security Incident handling and response; and auditing" and therefore close cooperation with other Crown organizations is not required.

ANSWER: 247

PWGSC confirms PWGSC is the point of contact and that "close coordination", as written in the EPS RFP, is limited to the description contained within the EPS RFP.

QUESTION: 248

Annex 2 E2.14 states "The Contractor must obtain PWGSC's approval for the use of external (i.e., non-Contractor) information systems for the delivery of PWGSC EPS." Please confirm whether this refers to EPS solution components or systems used by the Contractor in the delivery of its solution (e.g. Microsoft Exchange)?

ANSWER: 248

The requirement covers the Contractor's entire EPS. Any component(s) that are used by the Contractor in the delivery of its EPS must be approved by PWGSC. The intent is to ensure Canada is aware if the Contractor's plans to use any shared or common or external systems such as SLA Management, ITSM, billing and invoicing for the delivery of the Work and has the opportunity to assess the information that will get stored and processed on these systems.

QUESTION: 249

Annex 1 Section 6.6 states "The SA&A process must be completed in its entirety, and to the satisfaction of the GC, prior to the commencement of any operational activity (e.g. pilots, go-live) including production transactions and data." However, many of the security requirements to be addressed in the Security Requirements Traceability Matrix (SRTM) apply to the ongoing operating posture of EPS, for example, E2.158 states "... PWGSC EPS managers are responsible for maintaining awareness of, and complying with, security policies, procedures, and standards that are relevant to their area of responsibility." Please clarify how the Crown will evaluate compliance given that some SA&A related security requirements will only be met by effective operation of security controls after implementation.

ANSWER: 249

The PWGSC Security Assessment and Authorization (SA&A) process will assess the conformance to all identified security requirements. During the SA&A process, the Contractor's operational security controls will be assessed for capability and adequacy to support the proposed solution. Compliance with security controls that come into effect after implementation will be assessed based on the Contractor's existing and proposed operational practices and policies in the Contractor's IT Security Plan. Ongoing reviews and audits will ensure enforcement throughout the operational term of the contract. Where applicable, PWGSC has identified the requirement of periodic audits and reviews to ensure that the requirements maintain the approved security posture.

QUESTION: 250

Attachment 2 to Part 4: Technical Evaluation, Section 4, R1.1, Section A (p 345). Please confirm that the aggregate numbers are to be achieved by adding the number of contracts, users, and value of orders across all project references provided.

ANSWER: 250

Yes, that is correct.

QUESTION: 251

Attachment 2 to Part 4: Technical Evaluation, Section 4, R1.1, Section B (p 346). Section B will be evaluated using Scale 1, which states that in order to score 5 (get 100% of the 190 points), "The bid demonstrates that the Bidder met all of the similarity and relevancy on the scope with very few or no deficiencies or weaknesses..."

- a) Will the Scale 1 scoring be applied to R1.1, or to each individual sub-criteria R1.1 (a) to (j)?
- b) Does that mean that if one of the 10 sub-criteria (a to j) is not met, that reference would automatically get a score of 4 at best (80% of 190 points)?
- c) Specifically for "(g) the types of services provided". If the reference included implementation services but did not include the provision of multi-year service desk and service management support, would it be deemed to NOT have "met all of the similarity"?
- d) Specifically for "(a) the solution implemented is the same functional solution they are proposing in response to the

solicitation". If the reference project did not include the majority of the Financial Management Requirements, or was not multi-lingual, would it be deemed to NOT have "met all of the similarity"?

e) Specifically for "(d) the solution was implemented for a public sector client". If the reference is not for a Public Sector client, would it be deemed to NOT have "met all of the similarity"?

f) Specifically for "(e) the solution was delivered as a Software as a Service". If the reference is for a Managed Service or 3rd Party Hosted implementation, would it be deemed to NOT have "met all of the similarity"? (Note: This would be of particular interest since the requirements of this RFP lean more towards a tailored Hosted or Managed Service solution than a commercial SaaS offering.)

ANSWER: 251

a) As per the answer and amendment to question #253, the points for Section B of R1.1 will be determined by giving a single score for all of the projects combined using Scale 1.

b) Yes, that is correct. To score a 5 on R1.1 Section B, all of the sub-elements a) to j) must be covered by the portfolio of projects.

c) No, as per the scale 1, very few or no deficiencies are permitted to score a 5 on Section B of R1.1.

d) No, as per the scale 1, very few or no deficiencies are permitted to score a 5 on Section B of R1.1.

e) Yes, that is correct. To score a 5 on R1.1 Section B, all of the sub-elements a) to j) must be covered by the portfolio of projects.

f) Yes, that is correct. To score a 5 on R1.1 Section B, all of the sub-elements a) to j) must be covered by the portfolio of projects.

QUESTION: 252

Attachment 2 to Part 4: Technical Evaluation, Section 4, R1.1, Section B (p 346). Section B will be evaluated using Scale 1, which states that in order to score 4 (get 80% of the 190 points), "The bid demonstrates that the Bidder met most of the similarity and relevancy on the scope with few deficiencies or weaknesses..."

a) How many of the 10 sub-criteria (a to j) must be met in order for the project reference to be considered to have "met most of the similarity"?

b) Does it matter which of the 10 sub-criteria from a to j are met?

ANSWER: 252

a) The evaluation will determine whether the portfolio of projects merits a score of 4 under Scale 1 for Section B of R1.1.

b) The 10 sub-criteria for Section B of R1.1 will be assessed in a global manner to determine the overall degree of similarity and relevance which will contribute to the evaluation result under the applicable Scale 1.

QUESTION: 253

Attachment 2 to Part 4: Technical Evaluation, Section 4, R1.1, Section B (p 346), Section B, Please confirm that the score out of 190 will be determined by taking the average score across all references provided.

ANSWER: 253

No, the score for R1.1 Section B will be determined by giving a single score for all of the projects combined. This means that Scale 1 will be applied to the portfolio and not on the individual projects.

Please see amendment in "Changes" section of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION: 254

We recommend a change in the scoring mechanism for Attachment 2 to Part 4: Technical Evaluation, Section 4, R1.1, Section B. The current Scale makes it difficult to calculate scoring across the 10 sub-criteria (a to j) and introduces ambiguity in the scoring of project references. Would the Crown consider assigning points to each sub-criteria (a) to (j) (e.g. 190 points divided by 10 sub-criteria = 19 points per sub-criteria), and then calculating the score for each sub-criteria using Scale 1?

ANSWER: 254

Canada will not change the scoring mechanism used for R1.1 Section B. See the answer to question #253 for clarity on how points will be determined for R1.1. Section B.

QUESTION: 255

In regards to the restrictions to rates place on Annex 3 – Table 3, we understand the reasoning behind the requirement, however, there are many different skill sets in the pricing table that have a wide variety of experience and skill sets associated with them. We request that Canada consider implementing the same rules for three streams of categories. As such, we are recommending the following three streams: Stream 1 would start at the top of the table with the “Application/Software Architect” category and end with the “Technology Architect” category (inclusive); Stream 2 would start with the “Business Analyst” category and end with the “Organizational Development Consultant” category (inclusive); and Stream 3 would start with the “IT Security Analyst” category and end with the “IT Security VA Specialist” category (inclusive).

ANSWER: 255

Please see revised Annex 3 – Price Schedule, version 2.0.

QUESTION: 256

The current approach to pricing requires that the vendor commit to a firm monthly price for the first 5 years. The uptake and the volume of users on the system is not committed to, so even if the vendor decides to take the risk of submitting a bid, the price provided will be at a premium to cover the risk the vendor will take for these unknowns. One of the key advantages of a SaaS model is to allow customers to add or remove capacity as volumes change. With the approach currently described, Canada is locking itself into a model of fixed payments, even if the vendor is able to reduce as a result of volume demand. We strongly suggest that Canada revisit this section and ask the vendors to provide pricing by bands of volume.

ANSWER: 256

Canada has revised the milestones and the basis of payment to provide better clarity regarding the deployment of EPS and when users would be on boarded. Please see the “Changes” section of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION: 257

The current milestone payment schedule provides for provision of a maximum of 35% of the milestone payments in the first year, this is further to the fact that milestone payments are dependent on 1000 vendors “self-registering” and 100 contracts have been sourced which could further delay payment and create significant cash flow issues. This is a significant issue for vendors as this does not reflect the level of up front effort that will be required to implement the foundation of the system and to begin to configure a solution. While we understand the intent of the payment plan, we request that Canada consider implementing a much more balanced approach that would see milestones 1 to 4 reflect the actual work involved in achieving them. Our recommendation is that milestones 1 to 4 should represent a reasonable portion of the effort that the contractor would have performed, since this is the period of time that foundational efforts for the system are being implemented. In our opinion, this number should be at least 60% of the overall milestones cost.

ANSWER: 257

Canada has revised the percentage of the Firm Lot Monthly Price paid upon completion of milestones to increase the value of earlier milestones. Please see the “Changes” section of this RFP amendment. In the interest of both Canada’s objectives and the recovery of costs, Bidders are encouraged to deliver milestones sooner than the target dates specified under the milestones.

QUESTION: 258

Canada has recently adopted an e-Procurement solution at Shared Services Canada (SSC), and many of the features and requirements of the solution are similar to those in the EPS RFP. For example, SSC has implemented e-sourcing and cataloguing as well as a significant supplier engagement portal. PSPC has also invested significantly in the creation and maintenance of the BuyandSell.gc.ca portal. We believe that there is value to Canada in extending these solutions to minimize avoid re-work, additional cost, and duplication of effort. There is also value in harmonizing the activities of the Government of Canada, and providing continuity to the vendor marketplace. Would Canada consider offering up the SSC solution as well as the BuyandSell.gc.ca portal as government furnished equipment (GFE), to maximize the value of past investments and to provide a fair and accessible EPS procurement for all vendors?

ANSWER: 258

Canada is not in a position to provide the above solutions as government furnished equipment. The GC is procuring an EPS as a Software as a Service (SaaS). In accordance with section 4.1 Information Technology and Solution Maintenance and Updates, section 4.2 Hardware requirements, and section 1.1 Requirement of Annex 1 –SoW, the Contractor must deliver, enable, and maintain an EPS, including relevant information technology hardware and software components on cloud infrastructure. Where Canada deems appropriate and has the appropriate rights, Canada will use and make available to the Contractor documentation from related projects to support the delivery of the EPS.

QUESTION: 259

In lieu of dedicated management consoles as described in E2.11, would Canada accept the use of monitored "jump-boxes" as a control mechanism for managed administrative access into the EPS?

ANSWER: 259

Canada would accept the use of dedicated management consoles, monitored 'jump-boxes' or any similar capability as long as it meets all the associated security requirements including E2.11, identified in the RFP.

QUESTION: 260

Regarding Requirement E2.78 – Incident Response, please clarify and confirm the types of "requests" to be handled through this email procedure.

ANSWER: 260

Canada will identify the applicable types of 'requests' during the Security Assessment & Authorization (SA&A) process after details on the Contractor's EPS and its capability are reviewed. Please see the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment for clarification on E2.78 b).

QUESTION: 261

In regards of call volumes, how many contacts per type can be expected (Phones, Emails, Live Chat, Self Service)?

ANSWER: 261

Please see question #60 and its response. This is the only breakdown of historical data GC has with the ITSM system. Future volume may not match historical data.

QUESTION: 262

Can Canada confirm that external user calls will be filtered by the Government of Canada Service Desk first, and anything unresolved will be then sent to the Vendor's Service Desk?

ANSWER: 262

As per Annex 1 – Statement of Work, Part 5, Section 5.6.4.2 First point of Contact, the Contractor must act as a first point of contact for all user incidents, requests and general communication.

QUESTION: 263

We could not find any reference to a SLR "Service Desk Phone Call Speed to Answer Response Time Service Level" in the RFP. Please confirm that Canada has no requirement for a Service Desk Phone Call Speed to Answer Response Time Service Level. If this is incorrect, please provide the wording for this requirement, along with the performance expected. Note: in the absence of a stated requirement, the vendor will assume the industry standard (80% - 60 seconds).

ANSWER: 263

As per *Annex 1 - Statement of Work*, section 6.13 *Service Level Requirements*, Canada confirms there is no requirement for Service Desk Phone Call Speed to Answer Response Time Service Level.

QUESTION: 264

We could not find any reference to a SLR "Service Desk E-Mail Response Time Service Level". Please confirm that Canada has no requirement for a Service Desk E-Mail Response Time Service Level. If this is incorrect, please provide the wording for this requirement, along with the performance expected. Note: in the absence of a stated requirement, the vendor will assume the industry standard (95% - 30 minutes).

ANSWER: 264

As per *Annex 1 - Statement of Work*, section 6.13 *Service Level Requirements*, Canada confirms there is no requirement for Service Desk E-Mail Response Time Service Level.

QUESTION: 265

We could not find any reference to a SLR "Service Desk Live Chat Response Time Service Level". Please confirm that Canada has no requirement for a Service Desk Live Chat Response Time Service Level. If this is incorrect, please provide the wording for this requirement, along with the performance expected. Note: in the absence of a stated requirement, the vendor will assume it is an automated email stating that the email has been received (80% - 60 seconds).

ANSWER: 265

As per *Annex 1 - Statement of Work*, section 6.13 *Service Level Requirements*, Canada confirms there is no requirement for a Service Desk Live Chat Response Time Service Level.

QUESTION: 266

Regarding the SLR "Call Abandonment Rate", it is recommended that the formula be modified to include "abandon after xx sec. threshold" For example, if our SLA to answer the phone is 20 seconds, then the "abandonment" will count only after 20 seconds.

ANSWER: 266

Please see the amendment to section 6.13.3.6 *SLR Call Abandonment Rate* in the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION: 267

Regarding the SLR "Service Desk First Contact Resolution", it is recommended that the formula be modified to include the concept of resolvable at the Service Desk or a reference to an exclusion list from the FCR (First Contact Resolution) count.

ANSWER: 267

As per Annex 1 – Statement of Work Part 6, Section 6.13.3.8 - Incident Management: First Contact Resolution, GC feels that the concept of resolvable at the service desk is covered. [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".

QUESTION: 268

Regarding section 6.13.3.2 Client Satisfaction, we have the following questions:

- a) Is the vendor responsible to perform and support the periodic sample of Acquisition Program User or is this entirely the vendor's responsibility?
- b) In either case, will the wording (content) of the survey question be a collaboration effort between the vendor and the Government of Canada?
- c) What will be the methodology used to collect the metric (user selection, number of users and number of questions)?

ANSWER: 268

- a) Please see question #130 and its response.
- b) Yes the wording (content) of the survey question will be a collaborative effort between the Contractor and the Government of Canada in that it will be prepared in consultation with the Contractor.
- c) Please see question #130 and its response.

QUESTION: 269

Regarding requirement I-06.14 where it states "for the content of electronic messages to be imported from an Authorized Administrator's corporate email client", which is part of section on "Document, Record & Content Management", we do not understand why email messages would need to be imported; where do they need to be imported to? In addition, we understand the Email system to be used is GC's email system. Please clarify and provide more details around this requirement.

ANSWER: 269

Requirement I-06.14 has been deleted.

QUESTION: 270

Regarding requirement D-06.04, please provide more details on what type of markup/pricing attribute a Supplier could provide.

ANSWER: 270

The pricing attribute type referred to in D-06.04 is a mark-up or discount percentage. The Supplier will set the percentage which will then be applied to the applicable commodity index feed. See answer to question #134 for an example.

QUESTION: 271

Regarding requirement Int.12, please provide additional information on this interface. Is this an interface for gathering both security profile information and security clearance information?

ANSWER: 271

Please see the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment which revises the milestones and adjusts the requirement to 100 orders. Bidders are encouraged to assess the expected time to reach 100 orders following capability being deployed based on the Bidder's similar experiences with similar sized clients.

QUESTION: 272

Regarding Section 6.10.3 – Milestone #3 item d) where it states "1000 Suppliers have self-registered in the EPS", this metric will incent the advisor (Contractor) to onboard the easier, lowest impact/transaction/spend suppliers into the platform and discourage the Contractor to tackle the higher transactions (therefore higher benefits from an efficiency standpoint), more complex ones. We therefore request that this requirement be removed.

ANSWER: 272

Canada acknowledges the rational and will remove the requirement. Please see the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment revising the milestones.

QUESTION: 273

Please clarify what data and functions EPS needs to be integrated with DFMS (SAP, Oracle, and/or Legacy), including master data, configuration settings, and transactional data. Please also clarify what data objects need to be deduplicated or cleansed.

ANSWER: 273

As per the response provided in Amendment 8, Answer 75, under the services provided in accordance with section 6.8.1.2 *Transition in Delivery of Annex 1 – SOW*, the Contractor must work with the GC to determine which business process step will happen in which system (EPS or the DFMS). The results of these services will include, in accordance with section 6.8.1.3 *Transition Integration and Testing of Annex 1 –SoW*, a proposed integration strategy, recommended integration requirements and an integration plan. It is expected that the integration strategy, requirements and plan will detail what data and functions needs to be integrated with the DFMSs, including master data, configuration settings, and transactional data.

QUESTION: 274

Please provide specifications or requirements for Government Electronic Tendering Service (GETS).

ANSWER: 274

Please see *Annex 1 – Statement of Work, Part 3, section 3.3 Portal Requirements* for the requirements on Government Electronic Tendering Service (GETS).

QUESTION: 275

For business intelligence, will there be a need to provide reports or dashboards based on data objects that do not reside in EPS? If so, please provide relevant data objects that are "externally" sourced.

ANSWER: 275

No. There is no need to provide reports or dashboards based on data objects that do not reside in EPS.

QUESTION: 276

If certain components of the EPS solution, such as Service Desk, is not readily available in a SaaS offering, is GC open for a non-Cloud/on-premise solution?

ANSWER: 276

As per Annex 1 – Statement of Work, Part 5, Section 5.6 Service Desk. It is the responsibility of the Contractor to provide and maintain a service desk accessible by all Users. The GC will not consider an on-premise service desk solution.

QUESTION: 277

If certain components of the EPS solution, such as Service Desk, requires non-Cloud/on-premise data center infrastructure, will the contractor be allowed to leverage existing GC data center infrastructure for ease of operation and lower operational costs?

ANSWER: 277

The Contractor will not be allowed to use existing GC data center infrastructure. In accordance with section 4.1.1 e-Procurement Solution of Annex 1 –SoW, the Contractor must deliver, enable, and maintain an EPS including relevant information technology hardware and software components and related business processes to deliver the functional requirements detailed in the SOW. The Contractor will not be allowed to use existing GC data center infrastructure in the delivery of the services under the Contract.

QUESTION: 278

Is there a requirement for Tier 1 service desk to integrate with the existing GC's Automated Attendant system? What AA system is GC currently using? Will the contractor be able to leverage GC's existing system/infrastructure?

ANSWER: 278

The Contractor's service desk will not be required to integrate with current GC systems as part of the fixed fee amount. If required the GC may request as an optional service the integration of future GC ITSM systems. The primary tool to support the legacy applications being replaced by EPS is IBM TIVOLI Web access for information Mgmt. The Contractor will not be able to leverage GC's existing system/infrastructure.

QUESTION: 279

What service desk IT system (e.g., service request and incident management tool) is GC currently using? Will the contractor be able to leverage GC's existing service center IT system for tier-2 and tier-3 supports?

ANSWER: 279

The primary tool to support the legacy applications being replaced by EPS is IBM TIVOLI Web access for information Mgmt. The Contractor will not be able to use GC's existing service center IT system for tier 2 and tier 3 supports.

QUESTION: 280

One of the exit criteria for Milestone #6 is "1000 Suppliers have self-registered in the EPS". How long should we expect to take from the time of capability being deployed till when 1000 Suppliers have self-registered in the EPS?

ANSWER: 280

Please see the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment which revises the milestones and removes the requirement.

QUESTION: 281

One of the exit criteria for Milestone #5 is "1000 Orders have been processed by Users using the EPS". How long should we expect to take from the time of capability being deployed till when 1000 orders have been processed?

ANSWER: 281

Please see the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment which revises the milestones and adjusts the requirement to 100 Orders. Bidders are encouraged to assess the expected time to reach 100 Orders following capability being deployed based on the Bidder's similar experiences with similar sized clients.

QUESTION: 282

One of the exit criteria for Milestone #6 is "100 SOW Based Services Procurement Contracts / Orders have been awarded using the EPS". How long should we expect to take from the time of capability being deployed till when 100 SOW contracts are to be awarded?

ANSWER: 282

Please see the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment which revises the milestones. Bidders are encouraged to assess the expected time to reach 100 SOW Based Services Procurement Contracts / Orders following capability being deployed based on the Bidder's similar experiences with similar sized clients.

QUESTION: 283

"Section 3.3.3. Portal requirements" are to be realized as part of Milestone #3. If a COTS solution is used for the portal, this milestone is achievable. However, if a custom portal needs to be built, then more time is required to design and build the portal solution. Is GC open to keep operations on the existing portal and GETS, until such time when the custom-built portal becomes available?

ANSWER: 283

Please see the revised milestones in the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment which extends the period for deliverables associated with GETS and the portal. It is anticipated that operations will remain on existing platforms until such time that the Contractor has delivered the Work for the associated milestones.

QUESTION: 284

In order to meet the first 4 milestones in 12 months, we will need to ramp up the full EPS project team at the beginning of the project. The payment percentages associated with milestone 1, 2, and 3 are relatively low comparing to what we will need to spend during the same period. We would like to propose to increase milestone #1 from 2.5% to 10%, milestone #2 from 2.5% to 5%, milestone #3 from 5% to 10%, and decrease milestone #4 from 25% to 10%.

ANSWER: 284

Please see Canada's response to question #201.

QUESTION: 285

Section 3.7 – Section F - Financial Management of Annex 1 indicates "The EPS must have the functionalities described in this section. However, services to configure, test, pilot and deploy these functionalities into production will be on an as and when requested by the GC basis." Section 3.7 Financial Management is also not listed as part of any of the Milestones defined in Section 6.10. Section 7.2 Optional Defined Work does not, however, include Financial Management.

a) Would PWGSC please confirm that the work and cost associated with the services to configure, test, pilot and deploy into production the Financial Management area are not be included in any milestone costs nor the implementation plan and that these efforts fall under Section 7.2 Optional Defined Work?

b) If any of the Financial Management requirements are to be included in the implementation plan and costs, would PWGSC please specify:

- i. Which requirements in Table 9 are required to be implemented and the timeline that they are to be implemented?
- ii. Which requirements in Table 9 are expected to be implemented on an "as and when requested" basis?
- iii. How many suppliers will be using the Financial Management functionality (and if possible, which suppliers)?

ANSWER: 285

Please refer to the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment, moving the Financial Management section to optional services. Pertaining to question b) iii., all potential suppliers could have access to these functionalities.

QUESTION: 286

Regarding the requirements identified in Table 9 – Financial Management Requirements (F-01 series), it appears that the requirements stated in this table are mandatory and must be part of EPS. However, Section 3.7.1 Objectives states the following: "However, services to configure, test, pilot and deploy these functionalities into production will be on an as and when requested by the GC basis". Could PWGSC confirm the following:

- a) Which services mentioned in Table 9 are required to be implemented and the timeline that these services are to be implemented?
- b) Which services mentioned in Table 9 are expected to be implemented on an "as and when requested" basis?
- c) For which suppliers will these services be required?
- d) For how many suppliers will these services be required?

ANSWER: 286

Please refer to the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment, moving the Financial Management section to optional services. Pertaining to question c) and d), all potential suppliers could have access to these functionalities.

QUESTION: 287

Can PWGSC please confirm if the configuration and integration with myKEY and GCKey are to be part of Milestone #2?

ANSWER: 287

MyKey and GCKey (or Contractor-supplied equivalent as per section 4.5.1.2 of Annex 1 - SOW) must be configured, tested, piloted and implemented as part of Milestone #3. Please see the revisions to the milestones in the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION: 288

Annex 3, Price Schedule, Table 1 (EPS Transition In) and Table 2 (EPS Operational)

The RFP requests a firm lot price in Table 1 and a firm monthly lot price in Table 2. To complete these tables, the vendor must make assumptions about volumes/metrics for pricing and internal approval purposes. In a SaaS model, costs are determined based on consumption, should the Crown exceed the estimates utilized in calculations, costs will be incurred by the Vendor that were not anticipated. With limited metrics from the Crown the evaluation of this pricing could also be skewed given vendor assumptions.

Therefore, it is requested that the Price Schedule be amended to include an 'up to' or maximum threshold of spend. Beyond the spend metric utilized, it is recommended that an incremental approach be utilized. For example, the threshold utilized for the firm monthly price be set at \$10B spend and for every \$1B spend above \$10B – a firm lot price will be provided in units of \$1B.

ANSWER: 288

Please refer to the answer to question #198 and the revised milestones, Basis of Payment and Price Schedule which provide additional clarity on scope and a further breakdown into discrete elements that will allow Bidders to more accurately price their services and manage risk. While this may not be a predictor of future volumes, Canada has provided extensive historical data for the government of Canada's spend by department.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME