



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

**Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions
- TPSGC**

11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier

Place du Portage, Phase III

Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

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

Special Projects/Projets Spéciaux

11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier

Place du Portage/, Phase III

Floor 10C1/Étage 10C1

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet AUTO FINGERPRINT ID SYSTEM SOLUTION	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation M7594-153234/E	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client M7594-153234	Date 2016-08-05
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZL-107-30327	
File No. - N° de dossier 107zl.M7594-153234	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2016-08-19	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: Campbell, Jeff	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 107zl
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (879) 469-3956 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-9235
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

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

The purpose of this amendment is to:

1. Address questions posed concerning the solicitation.
1. Response to questions raised during solicitation:

The following table (Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1) includes answers to questions provided by Bidders in response to the AFIS RFP posted 2016-07-04 in its first release. Questions received 2016-07-22 and 2016-07-25 starting at Q#13 have been added. Questions received 2016-08-02 starting at Q#73 have been added.

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
40.	Appendix A SOW	Section 1.6.2.1 Paragraph 1 Page 7 & Section 3.2 Paragraph 11 Page 18 Section 4.7 Paragraph 1 b ii Page 37	<p>1. GFE servers and AFIS/Transcoder workstations recently procured by RCMP through a GC National Master Standing Offer (NMSO) and existing Transcoder flatbed scanners. Refer to Annex F which includes all components provided as GFE. (I)</p> <p>SOW Section 3.2 (11):</p> <p>11. The Contractor will be responsible for the support and maintenance of the AFIS/Transcoder/VSS/LC MC related GFE (emphasis added) including coordinating replacement parts/upgrades from the</p>	<p>The RCMP can confirm that the cost for the hardware maintenance contract for all GFE servers as they are configured at time of contract award, will be the responsibility of the RCMP.</p> <p>The Contractor will be responsible for any increased maintenance and support cost for any changes applied to GFE servers.</p> <p>It is expected that the current maintenance and support contract for the GFE will be modified until the Production release of the AFIS renewal solution to support GFE changes. Afterward the RCMP will remove all unused GFE servers from the maintenance and support contract to form a new GFE support and maintenance contract.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p>hardware / operating system vendor under the NMSO support contract. The existing RTID AFIS vendor is currently performing this task, using the onsite support personnel, as part of the terms of the existing contract. Support details will be presented later in this SOW. The Contractor will also be responsible for the support and maintenance of any new components provided to satisfy the requirements in this SOW. (M)</p> <p>Whereas Section 4.7 (1 b ii) states:</p> <p>The hardware maintenance contract for the GFE servers, as they are configured at the time of contract award, will be provided by the RCMP (emphasis added) (i.e. GFE changes that increase the maintenance cost will be the responsibility of the Contractor), and</p> <p>Question:</p> <p>With the understanding that the Contractor is responsible</p>	<p>Please note that everything above also applies to the AFIS/Transcoder workstations.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			for the hardware maintenance contract of any new servers added to the configuration, as well as the increased maintenance contract cost for any changes applied to GFE servers, can the PWGSC clarify and confirm the RCMP will provide the hardware maintenance contract for all GFE servers as they are configured at time of contract award?	
41.	Appendix A SOW	Section 1.7 Page 8	<p><i>1. ... What is considered an acceptable level of risk is defined only by RCMP's DSB. The names of the tools and applications used by DSB to identify the vulnerabilities can be provided to the Contractor, as required.</i></p> <p>Question: Can the PWCSG provide the names of tools and applications to be used by the DSB for identifying vulnerabilities?</p>	Please refer to Q#9.
42.	Appendix A SOW	Section 3.2.6 Paragraph 3 and 4	<p><i>3.2.6, 3. e. states: Have one (1) hour response time for production or test</i></p>	Answer to question A: This is not the correct understanding.

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
		Pages 24/25	<p>environment issues during on-site hours;</p> <p>3.2.6, 3. f. states: Have two (2) hour response time from initial notice by the RCMP of a production or test environment issue, during off hours;</p> <p>3.2.6, 4. states: The Contractor must provide an English technical toll-free hotline 24 hours per day, seven (7) days a week and 365 days a year. The toll-free number must be provided within fifteen (15) days of contract award. (emphasis added) The Contractor's hotline must be staffed by qualified resources who are able to respond to questions, resolve problems and provide advice regarding problems related to all deliverables as well as installation and integration issues within the Contractor's AFIS/Transcoder/VSS/LCMC solution installed at RCMP. (M)</p> <p>Comment: <i>It is understood that the delivery of the RTID AFIS Renewal solution will</i></p>	<p>The hotline is not expected to support the implementation phase. The RCMP hotline wording concerning installation and integration are meant to reflect that the hotline can be used to contact a Contractor resource that is aware of the RCMP installation and implementation, which would allow them to effectively respond to questions/problems and provide advice.</p> <p>Answer to question B: There is no requirement to provide two separate toll-free numbers. It is expected that the Contractor will have resources directly engaged for any implementation and that these resources will be participate in the release process which includes status reports and relatively constant contact (daily/weekly) depending on the stage of implementation. Contractor resources must be onsite to make any changes to the Test or Production environments; therefore, relatively constant contact with the implementation team is expected.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p><i>include an implementation phase and an operations and support phase. As the required hotline is to be provided within 15 days of contract award, and the qualified hotline resources must be able to respond to questions regarding deliverables, as well as installation and integration issues, it appears the required hotline is to support both the implementation phase (when the solution is being implemented and integrated with the NNS) and the operations and support phase (after the solution is delivered and accepted by the RCMP).</i></p> <p>Question A: Can the PWGSC please confirm the understanding stated above is correct?</p> <p>Question B: Can the PWGSC confirm it is acceptable for a vendor to provide two different hotline numbers; one for the implementation phase and a separate one for the operations and support phase, with the understanding that both</p>	

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zI

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			numbers meet the toll-free, English speaking, and 24x7x365 availability requirements stated above, and with the understanding that Production / Test environment issues during the operations support phase are responded to within 1 hour (during on-site hours), or 2-hours (during off hours)?	
43.	Appendix A SOW	<p>Section 3.2.8 Paragraph 3 Page 25</p> <p>Section 13.1 Paragraph 2 Page 62</p> <p>Section 13.2 Paragraph</p>	<p>Section 3.2.8 (3): <i>The Contractor must provide a high-level plan and strategy with its proposal explaining: (M)</i> <i>a. How the conversion will be completed;</i> <i>b. What tools and/or processes will be used to complete the conversion;</i> <i>c. When the conversion will be completed; and</i> <i>d. Any impact to the existing AFIS data or data format.</i></p> <p>Section 13.1(2): <i>For the Entire AFIS renewal solution, the Contractor must develop a comprehensive data migration plan for all</i></p>	<p>No, these requirements are mandatory.</p> <p>In Attachment 2 to Appendix G – Technical Proposal Evaluation Submission Tables references are used to provide the Bidder with a guide to what should be provided in the Bidder's proposal. PSPC/RCMP cannot control the content or quality of the Bidder's proposal. PSPC/RCMP can only evaluate the Bidder's proposal based on the information provided; therefore, the versions of the documents provided with the Bidder's proposal is not under PSPC/RCMP control.</p> <p>The final deliverables must be approved by the RCMP;</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
		2 Page 63	<p><i>data to be converted. An initial version of this Data Conversion Plan must be provided with the Contractor's proposal. The Data Conversion Plan must be included as part of the ARIP, where the Contractor must provide the strategy and plan for all activities required to satisfy the entire scope of requirements included in this SOW and its accompanying documents. (M)</i></p> <p>Section 13.2 (2) states: <i>No data conversion will be allowed until the RCMP has approved the final version of the Data Conversion plan. The Contractor's Data Conversion plan must be developed in collaboration with the RCMP to ensure all requirements and data nuances stated throughout this SOW and its accompanying documents are clearly understood and reflected in the Contractor's Data Conversion plan. (M)</i></p>	<p>therefore, the final deliverables by the Contractor are under RCMP control and must meet the mandatory requirements stated herein.</p> <p>Additionally, there are seven (7) references to the Data Conversion Plan in section 13. The Data Conversion Plan is a Bidder's document. The RCMP views the Bidder's Data Conversion Plan as an integral part of the Bidder's ARIP and the final Data Conversion Plan will be agreed to in collaboration with the RCMP as part of the ARIP approval. The format of the Data Conversion Plan is a Bidder's decision which is intended to provide maximum flexibility for the Bidder. The RCMP expects the migration strategy, which must be included in a few different deliverables, to provide sufficient insight into the Contractor's Data Conversion Plan as well as how and when it will impact each environment.</p> <p>Although not specifically noted 13.1 (7) will be used as part of the criteria to assess the quality of the Data Conversion Plan.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p>Table 1-5 in Attachment 2 to Appendix G defines Rated Requirements for the development of an AFIS Renewal and ELMO Data Conversion strategy, and list SOW Section 13 and Annex E as references. The referenced sections have no identified requirements related to the development of a Data Conversion Plan.</p> <p>Question:</p> <p>Should the above referenced requirements, which are classified as Mandatory (M), be re-classified as Rated Requirements (R)?</p>	
44.	Appendix A SOW	Section 3.3.1 Paragraph 1 a. Page 26	<p><i>All AFIS/VSS/LCMC renewal solution servers shall be configurable to operate in a HA clustered (emphasis added) environment.</i></p> <p>High-Availability (HA) capabilities can typically be provided by clustering server platforms, or by implementing multiple instances of server platforms where said platforms provide general services, i.e., fingerprint image encoding, fingerprint matching etc. The</p>	<p>Yes, this was not intended to force a specific HA configuration. This will be reworded as:</p> <p>All AFIS/VSS/LCMC renewal solution servers shall support operations in a HA environment to ensure there is no single point of failure.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p>multiple instances of the server platforms operating in parallel provide the HA capabilities without the need to “cluster” the servers.</p> <p>Question:</p> <p>Will the PWCSG consider revising this requirement to the following:</p> <p><i>All AFIS/VSS/LCMC renewal solution servers shall support operations in a HA environment.</i></p>	
45.	Appendix A SOW	Section 4.2 Paragraph 17 Page 32	<p>The revised RFP added a new Rated Requirement under Section 4.2 (17), which is to be evaluated under the Migration / Transition Strategy Rated Response provided under Table 1-5 of Attachment 2 to Annex G, and states:</p> <p><i>Server hardware that is end-of-life prior to 2010, even though its end-of-service is not declared, should not be used in the AFIS/VSS/LCMC renewal solution. (R)</i></p> <p>In response to LOI Question #272;</p> <p><i>Q3: Should vendors automatically replace all hardware that has reached</i></p>	<p>The response to Letter Of Interest (LOI) Question #272 was re-examined and after further discussion, the final RFP was adjusted prior to being published. It should have stated “Bidder's must make the most cost effective and efficient decisions that support their solution. Any current servers that are EOS or near EOS at the time of bid closing should be replaced.” Our apologies for any confusion.</p> <p>Please note that the LOI answers are not binding. The purpose of the LOI is to solicit comments and suggestions. The feedback from the LOI answers are reflected in the final RFP. The RFP reflects the</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p><i>end of life before January 2017?</i></p> <p>The PWGSC stated:</p> <p><i>Bidder's must make the most cost effective and efficient decisions that support their solution. Any current servers that are EOL or near EOL at the time of bid closing should be replaced.</i></p> <p>Comment:</p> <p><i>In terms of hardware availability and support, IBM/Lenovo defines End-of-Life (EOL) as the product (in this case a server platform) has been withdrawn from the commercial market and is no longer available for commercial sale, whereas End-of-Service (EOS) is defined as the date upon which IBM/Lenovo no longer provides maintenance support services for the product.</i></p> <p><i>IBM/Lenovo periodically (often several times a year) withdraws products from the market when changes to the product line are introduced in order to maintain inventory control. For example, a 4-core processing server</i></p>	<p>final decision on the feedback which is why the EOL wording in the RFP was added.</p> <p>The RCMP agrees with the Bidder's statement that typically the EOS date is five-ten (5-10) years after the EOL. The RCMP agrees with the Bidder's statement that a server has a useful life and can still provide a cost effective solution after the EOL. The RCMP even understands that a server can have a useful life after EOS; however, the risk of operating a server after EOS increases.</p> <p>Answer to Question A</p> <p>This EOL date was not chosen arbitrarily. As the Bidder has noted, typically the EOS is five-ten (5-10) years after the EOL. The RCMP expects the servers that have an EOL prior to 2010 (e.g. 2006 EOL) to be EOS very soon based on this typical pattern; consequently, these were the only non-EOS GFE servers identified as potentially carry more risk than other servers. For example, having production servers that are eleven-twelve (11-12) years passed their EOL as a</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p><i>platform is changed to only be available in an 8-core processor configuration.</i></p> <p><i>When IBM/Lenovo assigns an EOL date and withdraws a product from market, the EOS date for the product is typically not defined for years to come and is typically 5 – 10 years beyond the EOL date when subsequently assigned. This is because IBM/Lenovo realizes the product still has a useful life and can still provide a cost effective solution.</i></p> <p><i>While requiring Bidders to replace servers that have an EOS date assigned prior to Bid Closing makes common sense, requiring bidders to replace servers based upon an arbitrary EOL date, even though the EOS date has not been reached, seems to defeat the overall purpose of the GFE reuse concept.</i></p> <p><i>It is understood that a Bidder's decision to re-use a GFE component that is no longer supported by IBM/Lenovo (i.e., the server's EOS date has already been reached) would be</i></p>	<p>renewed solution would appear to be risky, even though those servers have not reached EOS. This is a rated criteria; therefore, if the Bidder has justification to mitigate the risk to the RCMP (e.g. confirmation from the manufacturer that these servers will not be EOS for several more years or something similar) then this would be considered less risky.</p> <p>Answer to Question B</p> <p>The RCMP believes the correction to LOI Question #272 clarifies this question. Consequently, both the existing requirements and the clarified requirement apply to how the solution will be rated.</p> <p>Existing - Server hardware that is end-of-life (EOL) prior to 2010, even though its end-of-service (EOS) is not declared, should not be used in the AFIS/VSS/LCMC renewal solution. (R) and</p> <p>Clarification to Q#272- Bidder's must make the most cost effective and efficient decisions that support their solution. Any current servers that are EOS or near EOS at the time of bid closing should be replaced.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p><i>considered a high risk strategy. As such, a Bidder's decision to re-use a GFE component that has reached EOL, but has not reached EOS should be considered a lower risk strategy, with the understanding the server is eventually replaced prior to the EOS date being reached.</i></p> <p>Question A:</p> <p>As the decision to reuse GFE hardware is for the Bidder to "make the most cost effective and efficient decisions that support their solution", and all Bidders re-use of GFE components will be evaluated equally for risk (i.e., <i>minimize the risk to RCMP RTID/AFIS operations</i>) as defined under the Table 1-5 Rated Requirement response, can the PWGSC clarify why an EOL date is used for this requirement versus an EOS date?</p> <p>Question B:</p> <p>Would the PWGSC consider revising the requirement to state:</p> <p><i>Server hardware that is end-of-service (EOS) prior to 2016, should not be used in the</i></p>	<p>Answer to Question C</p> <p>The RCMP can confirm that the use of the term "AFIS/VSS/LCMC renewal solution" in this requirement is to be interpreted to mean all servers that will be used to support the Production environment and Test environments of the Stage 1 AFIS/VSS/Transcoder and Stage 2 LCMC functional and technical requirements. However, as with any system, the quality of the Production environment servers are consider more important.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p><i>AFIS/VSS/LCMC renewal solution. (R)</i></p> <p>Question C:</p> <p>Can the PWGSC confirm that the use of the term "<i>AFIS/VSS/LCMC renewal solution</i>" in this requirement is to be interpreted to mean all servers that will be used to support the operations (PROD Environment) and maintenance (Test Environments) of the Stage 1 AFIS/VSS/Transcoder and Stage 2 LCMC functional and technical requirements?</p>	
46.	Appendix A SOW	<p>Section 6.4.2 Paragraph 1 Page 45</p> <p>&</p> <p>Section 6.4.3 Paragraph 2.a Page 46</p>	<p><i>Section 6.4.2 (1)</i></p> <p><i>The AFIS DEVTEST environment must support multiple NNS Integration environments, multiple NNS Systest environments, multiple NNS performance environments and multiple individual developer environments. The AFIS DEVTEST must be configured initially to support at least 20 different NNS environments. Refer to Annex A for a more detailed description of the requirements each AFIS</i></p>	<p>The requirement in 6.4.3 is poorly worded, when considered together with the requirement in 6.4.2.</p> <p>The intent of 6.4.3 (2, a) is that the AFIS DEVTEST environment must support 220 transaction per hour from one NNS environment; however, the other NNS environments using AFIS DEVTEST must also be able to still operate.</p> <p>This 6.4.3 (2, a) requirement will be reworded as follows: Process 220 transactions per hour, based on 200 Ten Print and 20 finger/palm latent</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p><i>environment must support. (M)</i></p> <p><i>Section 6.4.3 (2.a)</i></p> <p><i>Process 220 transactions per hour, based on 200 Ten Print and 20 finger/palm latent transactions per hour from one NNS environment (emphasis added) without negatively affecting any other NNS environment using the DEVTEST AFIS; and</i></p> <p>Comment:</p> <p><i>If the DEVTEST Environment is to support 20 instances of the NNS, and support 200 Ten Print transaction per hour from one NNS without negatively affecting any other NNS Environment using DEVTEST, this equates to the DEVTEST Environment needing to support 4,000 (20 NNS instances x 200 TP transactions per instance) TP transactions per hour.</i></p> <p><i>Based upon the information provided under Table 3-1 in Annex B, the Production Environment is only required to support the processing of 1,600 TP transactions per peak hour.</i></p>	<p>transactions per hour from one NNS environment. The DEVTEST AFIS must be able to support this performance without negatively affecting any other NNS environment using the DEVTEST AFIS. Typically, less than eight (8) other NNS environments would be used at the same time, with less than 40 total additional transactions per hour from these other NNS environments. Consequently a DEVTEST design that supports 260 total transactions per hour is required to support all AFIS DEVTEST environments; and</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			Question: As the processing of TP transactions requires Image processing for TP/PP feature extraction, can the PWCSG confirm the DEVTEST Environment requires more than double (i.e., 4,000 vs. 1,600) the TP/PP Image Processing power of the Production Environment?	
47.	Appendix A SOW	Section 6.4.3 Paragraphs 1 & 2 Page 46	<p>The referenced sections provide the database capacity and hourly workload capacities for the DEVTEST Environment.</p> <p>The answer to the LOI Question # 284 stated: <i>QCS and Maintenance environment performance requirements will be added to section 6.5 in the SOW.</i></p> <p>This Bidder failed to find this additional information in the final RFP.</p> <p>Question: Can the PWCSG provide the database capacity and hourly workload requirements for the MAINT and QCS Environments?</p>	<p>The AFIS MAINT environment must support:</p> <p>a) A database size of 3000 Ten Print records, 1000 Finger Latents, 200 Palm Latents, allow for five percent (5%) growth per year in database size; and be able to process 50 transactions per hour.</p> <p>Please note that the AFIS MAIN must support the Contractor's ability to use MAINT as the Contractor's test environment as described throughout the RFP. Consequently, the performance and capacity requirements required by the Contractor is expected to satisfy RCMP's MAINT performance/capacity requirements.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
				<p>Refer to 6.5.2.1 (1) which states “The QCS environment must be configured with every possible Production component in the Contractor’s AFIS renewal solution. These components must be configured in a manner that allows every possible Production scenario to be tested in the QCS environment, except inter-site fail-over.”</p> <p>Consequently, it is expected that the Bidder’s AFIS QCS environment will support very high processing volumes, even though QCS test volumes and transactions per hour are typically low (i.e. approximately fifty percent (50%) of the AFIS DEVTEST performance requirements). It was determined that identifying specific performance requirement for the QCS did not seem logical since Production components would be provided in the QCS AFIS and the expected requirements would greatly exceed fifty percent (50%) of the AFIS DEVTEST environment.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
				If the Bidders can provide additional clarification and/or comment on any misunderstanding that RCMP may have concerning the QCS AFIS environment; then the RCMP can provide additional information to clarify.
48.	Appendix A SOW	Section 13.5 Paragraphs 6 & 7 Page 67	<p>Requirement 13.5(6) states:</p> <p>6. <i>ULF entries with the same minutia for the same case/image must not be converted. The first or oldest occurrence on the duplicate ULF entry must be retained. (M)</i></p> <p>Whereas Requirement 13.5(7) states:</p> <p>7. <i>Duplicate ULF entries that belong to the same images with different minutiae, even if they belong to the same case must be converted and retained. (M)</i></p> <p>Comment:</p> <p><i>It appears the intent of requirement 13.5 (6) is to identify instances where a</i></p>	This is the correct interpretation, with a small clarification. How the image was duplicated (i.e. same minutia within a case) is not necessarily relevant.

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p><i>latent image within a case was duplicated by an examiner, but never re-edited, i.e., it contains the same minutiae. Whereas requirement 13.5 (7) seeks to identify instances where a latent image was duplicated within a case and the examiner subsequently re-edited the duplicated latent image.</i></p> <p>Question:</p> <p>Can the PWGSC clarify if this is the correct interpretation, and they want to consolidate instances under 13.5 (6) and retain instances under 13.5 (7)?</p>	
49.	Appendix A SOW	Section 13.6 Paragraph 4 Page 67	<p><i>The Contractor shall provide all of the equipment and personnel to conduct the necessary conversion operations. (M)</i></p> <p>Question:</p> <p>Please clarify / confirm that vendor provided hardware to support data conversion services at the RCMP is subject to the same RCMP/DSB Security Requirements stated in the</p>	The RCMP can confirm that any device connected to the RCMP/SSC network is subject to the RCMP/DSB Security Requirements stated in the SOW and accompanying annexes.

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			SOW and accompanying annexes, i.e., OS service patches, AV software, and MacAfee ePo, etc.	
50.	Appendix A SOW	Attachment A1 Deliverables-3 Paragraph 4 Page 82 & Deliverables 8 (SDD) Paragraph 4.1 Page 103	<p><i>.... using the headings and sequence (emphasis added) listed in this DID, and shall be legible and suitable for reproduction.</i></p> <p>Question:</p> <p>While the DID provides for a Miscellaneous Section (Section W – ARIP and Section BB - SDD), that can be used for any additional information deemed appropriate by the Bidder, for ease of readability and evaluation purposes are the Bidders allowed a degree of flexibility here to augment the Heading and Sequence of these deliverables with the understanding the information provided is clearly identifiable and covers all the information defined under the DID Content section? Can the PWCSG confirm this approach is acceptable?</p>	<p>The DIDs states in paragraph 4.3 “As a minimum, the ARIP shall address the following areas”. These areas are related to the format phrase “using the headings and sequence listed in this DID”. There is no restriction on additional headings or sequence related to the deliverable; therefore, there is complete flexibility to augment the headings and sequence as long as the information provided is clearly identifiable and covers all the information defined under the DID Content section.</p> <p>Please note that the versions of the documents provided with the Bidder’s proposal is not under PSPC/RCMP control. The bid deliverables will be used evaluate the bid.</p> <p>The final deliverables must be approved by the RCMP; therefore, the final deliverables by the Contractor are under RCMP control and must meet the requirements.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
51.	Annex B	3.6.1 / 3.6.2 3.6.3, page 40 3.6.14, page 42 and others	<p>There are instances of “Error! Reference source not found.” In Annex B</p> <p>Question:</p> <p>We assume that Appendix H: Requirements Traceability Matrix contains the master requirement text. Can PWGCS confirm this assumption is correct?</p>	<p>Please refer to updated documents posted on buyandsell.gc.ca 2016-07-26 with the reference error corrected. There was an issue when the PDF was generated that caused this reference error.</p>
52.	Annex B	Section 3.6 Paragraph 7 Page 41	<p>The AFIS renewal solution shall include sufficient workstations to meet the volumes specified in Error! Reference source not found. Table 3-1: AFIS Renewal Solution Sizing Design Volumes – 2019. The Contractor must explain the workstation configuration that will support the workstation volumes. As well, any workstation additions or modification to the GFE workstations required to support the Contractor’s AFIS renewal solution software and configuration must be explained. (M)</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>The previous LOI version of the RFP included Table 3 –</p>	<p>Please refer to updated documents posted on buyandsell.gc.ca 2016-07-26 with the reference error corrected. There was an issue when the PDF was generated that caused this reference error.</p> <p>The LOI table was removed. Instead a reference to the AFIS Renewal Solution Sizing Design Volumes – 2019 was use to use an existing reference with the information required.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p><i>Workstation Design Volumes – 2019. This table identified the projected average daily transactions to be processed on AFIS workstations and was to be used by Bidders to justify the number of AFIS workstation required under their solution. This table was removed in the revised version of the RFP.</i></p> <p>Question:</p> <p>As the previous Table 3 defined the number of TP (1,800) and LT (40 x 2) Certifications required, which is required in order to determine the number of workstation required to support the AFIS processing capabilities, can the table be re-instated into the RFP, or at a minimum can the PWCSG confirm the 1,800 and 40 x 2 numbers still apply?</p>	
53.	Annex B	Section 3.6 Table 3-1 Page 41 & Table 3-3 Page 44	<p>Table 3-1 under Annex B identifies four (4) - Latent vs. Latent (finger and palm latent) Peak Hour Load transactions to be supported in Year 2019.</p> <p>While Table 3-3 provides the required response times for each transaction type to be</p>	<p>Table 3-3 does not include any response times.</p> <p>If this question is referring to table 3-2. The Latent vs Latent response requirement is the same as the Latent vs Ten Print response time, which is 2 minutes.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p>processed, the table appears to be missing the response time requirement for the Latent vs. Latent transaction.</p> <p>Question:</p> <p>Can the PWGSC update Table 3-3 to provide this information?</p>	
54.	Annex B	Section 3.6 Table 3-3 Data Volumes Page 46	<p>Table 3-3 lists the Year 2019 design volume for Palm DB Feature Sets at 2M, while the Palm DB Image Sets is listed at 2.2M.</p> <p>Question:</p> <p>Can the PWGSC clarify this discrepancy?</p>	<p>This is typo. The Palm DB Feature Sets and the Palm DB Image Sets should both be listed at 2.2M.</p>
55.	Annex C	Section 4.2 Table 4-1 Pages 15 & 16	<p>The previous version of Table 4-1 listed Vancouver with 3 Transcoders and a total of 32 Transcoders to be supported. The revised version of the table has removed Vancouver and the total to be provided is listed as 28.</p> <p>Question A:</p> <p>Can the PWGSC confirm the correct total to be provided is 29?</p> <p>Question B:</p> <p>Annex H – GFE, Table 1-1 on Page 10 lists 24 Transcoder PCs available for GFE reuse. Can the PWGSC clarify if the</p>	<p>Answer to Question A</p> <p>The correct total is 29.</p> <p>Answer to Question B</p> <p>There are some Transcoders that are owned by the police agency. These Transcoder workstations are not available for GFE use. This is why there is a discrepancy between the total number and the number available as GFE.</p> <p>24 GFE Transcoder workstations (i.e. installed and operational remotely) are available for GFE; however, the total count of 42 GFE PCS</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p>correct number should be 29?</p> <p>Question C:</p> <p>Annex H – GFE, Table 1-1 on Page 11 lists 40 Epson Colour 10000XL Scanners available for GFE reuse and states the count includes Transcoders. Can the PWGSC verify this number is correct based upon the above, i.e., 29 are being used for Transcoders and the remaining 11 are used for the central AFIS workstations?</p>	<p>workstations includes 4 workstations previously used as Transcoders which are also available and can be used for Transcoder purposes, if desired.</p> <p>Answer to Question C</p> <p>There is only one scanner per Transcoder site; therefore, there are 20 scanners used by Transcoder sites and the remaining are used for central AFIS workstations.</p>
56.	Annex C	Section 6.5 Paragraphs 4 & 5 Page 38	<p><i>Section 6.5(4) states:</i></p> <p><i>Refer to the AFIS renewal solution, Annex B, for additional details concerning Transcoder renewal solution performance requirements. (I)</i></p> <p><i>Whereas Section 6.5 (5) states:</i></p> <p><i>The response times in this section are response times that include the LAN response time. In case of dispute, the Contractor shall be required to demonstrate user response times matching the requirements, less 0.1 seconds (100 milliseconds)</i></p>	<p>Yes, for the applicable transactions that use the WAN, the WAN overhead would be considered. Consequently, in case of any dispute, for Transcoder transactions that use the WAN, the user response time requirements will be exclusive of the WAN response time.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p><i>exclusive of the LAN response time. For example, the Contractor would demonstrate 2.9 seconds (2900 milliseconds) response time or less instead of 3.0 seconds. (M)</i></p> <p>Comment:</p> <p><i>The previous version of the RFP included Table 2: GUI Response Times for Select User Functions, and listed 6 different functions. The revised RFP has removed this table and now refers to Annex B (presumably Table 8-3), which identifies 10 different functions, including image fetch operations.</i></p> <p>Question:</p> <p>As the Transcoder Image Fetch operations have to go across the CPIC WAN as well as the local Agency LAN, should the response times calculations not include WAN overhead as well?</p>	
57.	Appendix G	Section 3.3 Paragraph 1 b Page 5	<p><i>Table 3-1: Stage 2 – Point Rated Requirements,Error! Reference source not found. specifies the maximum points available (out of 1365) for each section of the point-</i></p>	Please refer to updated documents posted on buyandsell.gc.ca 2016-07-26 with the reference error corrected. There was an issue when the PDF was generated

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p><i>rated requirements in the written proposals, and the minimum "passing" scores that apply. The Benchmark Plan will only be included after it has been received and evaluated (i.e. the initial passing score for determining invitations to the Benchmark Conference will be based on 60% of 1335 or 801);</i></p> <p>Question:</p> <p>As Table 3-1 indicates a total of 1365 points and a minimum pass score of 819, can the PWGSC please confirm the initial passing score is 819, and not 801, and the referenced text is in error.</p>	<p>that caused this reference error.</p> <p>The RFP text is correct. The Benchmark Plan is not provided with the bid; therefore, it cannot be evaluated. Consequently, the initial passing score for determining invitations to the Benchmark Conference will be based on 60% of 1335 or 801.</p>
58.	Attachment 2 to Appendix G	Section 1.6 Paragraph 4 Page 3	<p><i>The "COTS Y/N" column must indicate whether this requirement is satisfied by the Bidder's COTS product. The requirements identified in the Rated Submission and Evaluation Response Table 1-3, for AFIS, VSS, Trancoder and LCMC COTS compliancy will be used to determine the COTS percentage of the Bidder's solution.</i></p>	<p>Answer to Question A</p> <p>Attachment 2 to Appendix G includes rated submission tables. Each row in the submission tables have a column that identifies the evaluation criteria. There are rows that have rated requirements for COTS compliancy. For example, "AFIS COTS Compliancy" has evaluation criteria that lists all section/paragraph numbers that will be used to evaluate</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p>Comment:</p> <p><i>COTS Compliancy is typically associated with Technical or Functional requirements and not Project Management and/or Implementation requirements. Many of the requirements classified as Mandatory (M) in Appendix H are associated with project management and/or project implementation efforts, e.g., Provide Project Sponsor, develop project documentation, conduct training, provide operations support, etc.</i></p> <p>Question A:</p> <p>If the Bidder believes the requirement is a Project Management or Project Implementation requirements, and COTS compliancy is not applicable, will denoting the COTS Compliancy as "N/A" be acceptable and not counted against the Bidder?</p> <p>Question B:</p> <p>Will the PWGSC take this into consideration when evaluating all bidders on an equal basis as Bidders may</p>	<p>the percentage of the Bidder's solution that is COTS. The RCMP will only consider the section/paragraph numbers in the evaluation criteria to determine the COTS percentage and subsequently the number of points. The Bidder is free to leave the "COTS Y/N" column blank or include "N/A" for requirements that the RCMP considers not applicable; however, the criteria that will be used is determine the points are what is defined in the Attachment 2 to Appendix G submission tables. Therefore, the RCMP will only be considering "COTS Y/N" requirements listed in the evaluation criteria as stated in Attachment 2 to Appendix G submission tables.</p> <p>Answer to Questions B</p> <p>The method for evaluating all Bidders on an equal basis is based on the list of requirements identified as COTS in Attachment 2 to Appendix G submission tables. Either the requirement is satisfied by the COTS or it is not.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			interpret requirements differently?	
59.	Attachment 2 to Appendix G	Section 1.6 Paragraph 6 Page 3	<p><i>Annex A to Appendix A – Current Architecture can be accepted as one mandatory requirement to indicate that the Bidder's solution operates within the current architecture.</i></p> <p>Question:</p> <p>Annex A to Appendix A is not listed under the RTM provided in Appendix H. Should this be included to enable Bidders to respond to this Mandatory requirement?</p>	<p>Section 3.2 (4), 3.2.1 (2), 3.2.3 (6) 6.3.6 (1) and a few others identify that Bidder's solution must operate within the current architecture. This text in Attachment 2 to Appendix G was included to ensure Annex A was noted since it is not specifically included in the RTM. It was an oversight that it was not included as an extra row in the RTM. The Bidder can add a row to the end of the RTM and indicate compliancy to this requirement. However, please note that by signing the requirements declaration in the RTM the Bidder is agreeing that all mandatory requirements included in the Statement Of Work (SOW) and its associated annexes will be satisfied, which includes the Bidder's solution being able to operate within the current architecture as defined in Annex A.</p>
60.	Attachment 2 to Appendix G	Table 1-2 Sub-Contractor Managem	<p><i>The Rated Requirement for Draft Project Documentation includes a Subcontractor Management Plan, which is to include the following information:</i></p>	<p>The 25 points are associated with Draft Project Documentation as a whole. If there is no plan to engage sub-contractors, the Bidder should indicate this is their response for clarity. In this case, the sub-</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
		ent Plan Page 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Agreements, procedures and policies under which Sub Contractors work on the Contractor proposed solution.</i> <i>Controls that ensure Sub Contractors are aware of and adhere to all relevant work and contract terms, conditions and requirements.</i> <i>Describe how the Contractor shall maintain full responsibility for all work assigned as a part of the</i> <p>If the Bidder does not plan to include a Subcontractor on their Bid Team, the plan is effectively not applicable to the Bidder.</p> <p>Question:</p> <p>In this instance, how should the Bidder respond to this request if no subcontractors are being engaged and how will the 25-point evaluation be adjusted for this Rate requirement?</p>	contractor management plan will not exist; therefore, the 25 points will be assess based on the portions of the project documentation that are provided.

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
61.	Attachment 2 to Appendix G	COTS Compliance Table 1-3 Page 15	<p>This Rated Requirement indicates the response will be evaluated based upon:</p> <p><i>... the percentage of the following requirements identified by section and paragraph number in parenthesis:</i></p> <p><i>All requirements in Annex B Sections: 3.1 thru 3.4; 3.7; 4.3 thru 4.8, 4.14, 4.15; 5.4; 5.5; 8.1; 8.2; 8.9; 3.5 (excluding 4 & 16); 3.8 (1b thru 1o, 2 thru 6); 4.1 (4 thru 16); 4.2 (2 thru 15); 5.1 (12a thru 12h, 15); 5.2 (1, 3); 5.3 (1, 3 thru 12, 14, 15, 16); 5.7 (1 thru 7, 11 thru 15); 5.8 (4); 5.9 (3 thru 6, 13); 5.10 (11, 12, 13); and 7.1 (1, 4 thru 11, 15).</i></p> <p>Comment:</p> <p><i>The RTM provided in Appendix H appears to have "greyed-out" the COTS Compliance column for all requirements listed</i></p>	<p>The greyed-out area for the rated criteria was not intended. Only information (I) rows should have been greyed-out. An editable word version of the RTM will be provided by PSPC to all Bidders.</p> <p>To ensure there is no misunderstanding, please note that there are many mandatory requirements that are included in the COTS compliance rated criteria. It is expected that many mandatory requirements would be satisfied by the Bidder's COTS solution. Please refer to Q #58 for additional information related to how this is evaluated.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p><i>as Information (I) and Rated (R).</i></p> <p>Question:</p> <p>As the COTS Compliancy column is only applicable to the evaluation of this rated requirement, and in order for all Bidders to be evaluated on an equal basis and only against those requirements listed above, would it be acceptable for the Bidders to “grey-out” or denote the column as “N/A”, when the requirement is Mandatory (M), but not included in the list provided above?</p>	
62.	Attachment 2 to Appendix G	Table 1-3 Workflow Management and Related Services - Rated User Interface Features	<p><i>General Evaluation Guidelines Table B (emphasis added) Rating Scale.</i></p> <p><i>Score based on the actual percentage of requirements that will be supported by the Bidder's solution based on the following requirements identified by section and paragraph number in:</i></p> <p><i>Annex B 3.7 (10), table 3-4 rated items;</i></p> <p><i>4.2 (11);</i></p> <p><i>4.4 (3, 4, 7);</i></p> <p><i>4.7 (11);</i></p>	<p>The Table B Rating Scale reference was used since the result is a percentage. To ensure clarity on how the percentage would be calculated PSPC/RCMP provided the specific sections and paragraph numbers that will be used to calculate the percentage. As a result, the RCMP believes the evaluation method is clear that the number of requirements satisfied will be divided by the total number of requirements to determine a percentage.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p>4.8 (12, 13, 20, 25); 5.7 (8); 7.1 (6); 8.1.5 (8)</p> <p>Comment: <i>The Table B Evaluation Table assigns a Rating Factor ranging from 1.0 to 0.0 based upon the evaluation Team's assessed level of the requirement being satisfied. Whereas, Table A assigns a Rating Factor based upon the requirement being evident (1.0), or Not evident (0.0).</i></p> <p>Question A: As the evaluation score is to be based upon the percentage of the listed requirements that will be supported by the Bidder's solution, would the use of the Table A Evaluation criteria be more appropriate here?</p> <p>Question B: Can the PWGSC provide the calculation for how this Rated Requirement will be scored?</p>	

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
63.	Attachment 2 to Appendix G	Table 1-3 Workflow Management and Related Services - TP/LT UI Personalized Settings Page 20	<p><i>General Evaluation Guidelines Table B (emphasis added) Rating Scale</i></p> <p><i>Score based on the actual percentage of requirements that will be supported by the Bidder's solution based on the following requirements identified by section and paragraph number in: Annex B 3.7 (5, 6, 7); Annex C 4.4 (8, 9); and 5.3 (5, 6).</i></p> <p>Comment:</p> <p><i>The Table B Evaluation Table assigns a Rating Factor ranging from 1.0 to 0.0 based upon the evaluation Team's assessed level of the requirement being satisfied. Whereas, Table A assigns a Rating Factor based upon the requirement being evident (1.0), or Not evident (0.0).</i></p> <p>Question A:</p> <p>As the evaluation score is to be based upon the percentage of the listed requirements that will be supported by the Bidder's solution, would the use of</p>	<p>The Table B Rating Scale reference was used since the result is a percentage. To ensure clarity on how the percentage would be calculated, PSPC/RCMP provided the specific sections and paragraph numbers that will be used to calculate the percentage. As a result, the RCMP believes the evaluation method is clear that the number of requirements satisfied will be divided by the total number of requirements to determine a percentage.</p> <p>Answer to Questions C</p> <p>Yes, the evaluation criteria references rated requirements Annex C 4.4 (8, 9) should be Annex C 4.4 (9, 10).</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p>the Table A Evaluation criteria be more appropriate here?</p> <p>Question B:</p> <p>Can the PWGSC provide the calculation for how this Rated Requirement will be scored?</p> <p>Question C:</p> <p>The evaluation criteria references rated requirements Annex C 4.4 (8, 9). Can the PWGSC confirm this reference should be Annex C 4.4 (9, 10)?</p>	
64.	Attachment 2 to Appendix G	Table 1-3 User Management Page 22	<p><i>General Evaluation Guidelines Table B Rating Scale.</i></p> <p><i>Score will be based on how many fields, applicable to the requirements, are available in pick list.</i></p> <p>Comment:</p> <p><i>The Table B Evaluation Table assigns a Rating Factor ranging from 1.0 to 0.0 based upon the evaluation Team's assessed level of the requirement being satisfied. Whereas, Table A assigns a Rating Factor based upon the</i></p>	<p>PSPC/RCMP believes this requirement can only be effectively evaluated using the Table B rating scale. Every Bidder's solution is different. A Bidder may have many pick lists that are not applicable to the RCMP requirements or limited flexibility concerning the pick list; therefore, a qualitative assessment is required as to how well this requirement is met. Consequently, points will be awarded based on a percentage of the requirements are met based upon the evaluation Team's assessed level of the requirement being satisfied.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p><i>requirement being evident (1.0), or Not evident (0.0).</i></p> <p><i>The Vendors implementation approach for User Management will vary, with one Vendor providing 10 fields on the UI while another Vendor may provide 20 fields.</i></p> <p>Question A:</p> <p>As the evaluation score is to be based upon how many fields, applicable to the requirements, are available in pick list, would the use of the Table A Evaluation criteria be more appropriate here, i.e., if the evaluation team determines the field can be implemented through a pick list (and it supports a pick list) it receives a score of 1.0, and of not it receives a score of 0.0.</p> <p>Question B:</p> <p>Can the PWGSC provide the calculation for how this Rated Requirement will be scored?</p>	
65.	Attachment 2 to Appendix G	Table 1-3 VSS COTS Complia	<p><i>Score based on the actual percentage of requirements that Bidder identifies in its proposal as being in its COTS VSS</i></p>	Table A, Table B or no table could be stated since the calculation of the percentage is described within the evaluation criteria. Typically, the Table B

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
		ncy Page 24	<p><i>product at bid closing date. This will be evaluated based on the percentage of the following requirements identified by section and paragraph number:</i></p> <p><i>All requirements in Annex D Sections: 2.2.2.1 (1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11 thru 16); 2.2.2.2 (1, 2, 3 (a, c)); 2.2.2.3; 2.2.3; 2.2.6; 2.2.8.1 (1 thru 6); 3.1.2; 3.1.7; 3.2.3; 3.2.4 (3, 4); and 3.2.5 (1, 3).</i></p> <p>Question: Can the PWGSC confirm the evaluation is based upon Table A criteria?</p>	Rating Scale reference would be used since the result is a percentage. To ensure clarity on how the percentage would be calculated, PSPC/RCMP provided the specific sections and paragraph numbers that will be used to calculate the percentage. As a result, the RCMP believes the evaluation method is clear that the number of requirements satisfied will be divided by the total number of requirements to determine a percentage.
66.	Attachment 2 to Appendix G	Table 1-3 Transcoder COTS Compliance Page 24	<p><i>Score based on the actual percentage of requirements that Bidder identifies in its proposal as being in its COTS Transcoder product at bid closing date. This will be evaluated based on the percentage of the following requirements identified by section and paragraph number in Annex C:</i></p> <p><i>3.1 (3, 4); 4.1 (1, 3); 4.4 (1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7)</i></p> <p>Question:</p>	Please see answer to Q#65.

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			Can the PWGSC confirm the evaluation is based upon Table A criteria?	
67.	Attachment 2 to Appendix G	Table 1-3 Transcoder Work Queue performance & Capabilities Page 27	<p><i>General Evaluation Guidelines Table B (emphasis added) Rating Scale</i></p> <p><i>Score based on the actual percentage of requirements that will be supported by the Bidder's solution based on the following requirements identified by section and paragraph number in:</i></p> <p><i>Annex C:</i></p> <p><i>3.1 (5)</i></p> <p><i>4.1 (2);</i></p> <p><i>4.5.1 (10); and</i></p> <p><i>6.1 (3).</i></p> <p>Comment:</p> <p><i>The Table B Evaluation Table assigns a Rating Factor ranging from 1.0 to 0.0 based upon the evaluation Team's assessed level of the requirement being satisfied. Whereas, Table A assigns a Rating Factor based upon the requirement being evident (1.0), or Not evident (0.0).</i></p> <p>Question A:</p>	The Table B Rating Scale reference was used since the result is a percentage. To ensure clarity on how the percentage would be calculated PSPC/RCMP provided the specific sections and paragraph numbers that will be used to calculate the percentage. As a result, the RCMP believes the evaluation method is clear that the number of requirements satisfied will be divided by the total number of requirements to determine a percentage.

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p>As the evaluation score is to be based upon the percentage of the listed requirements that will be supported by the Bidder's solution, would the use of the Table A Evaluation criteria be more appropriate here?</p> <p>Question B:</p> <p>Can the PWGSC provide the calculation for how this Rated Requirement will be scored?</p>	
68.	Attachment 2 to Appendix G	Table 1-3 LCMC COTS Compliance Page 27	<p><i>Score based on the actual percentage of requirements that Bidder identifies in its proposal as being in its COTS LCMC product at bid closing date. This will be evaluated based on the percentage of the following requirements identified by section and paragraph number in Annex E:</i></p> <p><i>3.3 (1, 2);</i></p> <p><i>3.4;</i></p> <p><i>3.5.1 (1, 3);</i></p> <p><i>3.5.2 (1, 6); and</i></p> <p><i>3.5.3 (1, 2a, 2b, 2c).</i></p> <p>Question:</p>	Please see answer to Q#65.

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			Can the PWGSC confirm the evaluation is based upon Table A criteria?	
69.	Attachment 2 to Appendix G	Table 1-4 NPSNet architectural constraints Page 29	<p><i>Fiber channel connections are limited and expensive; therefore, the preferred AFIS/VSS/LCMC renewal solution would satisfy all the requirements stated in this SOW and its accompanying documents with a minimum number of fiber channel connections.</i></p> <p>rated requirement states: The evaluation Criteria states: <i>Points awarded according to the following total fiber connection including PR & DR:</i></p> <p><i>24 connections = 30 pts; 28 connections = 20 pts; 32 connections = 10pts</i></p> <p>Comment: <i>The SOW requirements associated with this Rated Requirement are found under Section 3.3.1 (3 through 5) of the SOW, and state:</i></p> <p><i>3. All AFIS/VSS/LCMC renewal solution servers requiring access to the RCMP SAN shall be configured to interface to</i></p>	<p>Answer to Question A The SOW requirement referenced states that the Contractor's AFIS/VSS/LCMC proposed solution must have sixteen (16) or less fiber channel per site unless approved by the RCMP in writing prior to proposal submission. The evaluation criteria states "Points awarded according to the following total fiber connection including PR and DR". Consequently, the point per connection accurately reflect the SOW when both the PR and DR are considered.</p> <p>Answer to Question B Yes, PSPC/RCMP can confirm that the evaluation is based upon: Connections <= 24 – 30 pts. Connections >24 & <= 28 – 20 pts. Connections >28 & <= 32 – 10 pts. Connections >32 – 0 pts.</p> <p>Answer to Question C</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p><i>the SAN using multiple Host Bus Adapters (HBAs) each capable of four (4) Gbps. (M)</i></p> <p><i>4. Fiber channel connections are limited and expensive; therefore, the preferred AFIS/VSS/LCMC renewal solution would satisfy all the requirements stated in this SOW and its accompanying documents with a minimum number of fiber channel connections. (R)</i></p> <p><i>5. The Contractor's AFIS/VSS/LCMC proposed solution must have sixteen (16) or less fiber channel connections (i.e. a maximum of eight (8) servers each with two (2) fiber channel connections each) per site (emphasis added) unless approved by the RCMP in writing prior to proposal submission. (M)</i></p> <p>Question A:</p> <p>The evaluation criteria of 24, 28, or 32 connections seems to conflict with the maximum allowed under mandatory requirement 3.3.1 (5), which is 16. Can</p>	<p>This rated requirement is limited to the Production environment only.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p>the PWGSC clarify this conflict?</p> <p>Question B:</p> <p>Can the PWGSC clarify if the evaluation is based upon:</p> <p>Connections <= 24 – 30 pts.</p> <p>Connections >24 & <= 28 – 20 pts.</p> <p>Connections >28 & <= 32 – 10 pts.</p> <p>Connections >32 – 0 pts.</p> <p>Question C:</p> <p>Can the PWCSG clarify if the Rated Requirement is limited to the PROD Environment servers only, or does this also include servers in the QCS / DEVTEST / MAINT environments, which may also require access to the RCMP SAN?</p>	
70.	Attachment 2 to Appendix G	Table 1-4Configurable Parameters Page 31	<p><i>This Rated Requirement includes references to Annex B 8.1 (2) and 8.1.11.</i></p> <p><i>The Evaluation Criteria for this rated requirement states:</i></p> <p><i>General Evaluation Guidelines Table B (Emphasis added) Rating Scale.</i></p>	<p>Answer to Question A</p> <p>The Table B Rating Scale reference was used since the result is a percentage. To ensure clarity on how the percentage would be calculated PSPC/RCMP provided the specific sections and paragraph numbers that will be used to calculate the</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p><i>Score will be based on how many configurable parameters above the mandatory configurable parameter requirements are met. Points per configurable parameter will be determined by dividing the total number of rated (emphasis added) configurable parameters into the total points.</i></p> <p>Comment:</p> <p><i>It is unclear what the PWGCS will consider as the total number of Mandatory configuration parameter requirements. The Mandatory Configuration Parameters are identified in Sections 8.1.1 through 8.1.10, to include:</i></p> <p><i>8.1.1 – Thresholds – 5 parameters</i></p> <p><i>8.1.2 – Quality Measure – 2 parameters</i></p> <p><i>8.1.3 - Out of Sequence – 1 parameter</i></p> <p><i>8.1.4 – List Limits – 9 parameters</i></p> <p><i>8.1.5 – Regions –</i></p> <p>Unknown</p> <p><i>8.1.6 – Repositories –</i></p> <p>Unknown</p>	<p>percentage. As a result, the RCMP believes the evaluation method is clear that the number of requirements satisfied will be divided by the total number of requirements to determine a percentage.</p> <p>Answer to Question B and Question C</p> <p>The total number of rated criteria is determined from Annex B 8.1 (2) and 8.1.11. Annex B 8.1 (2) defines the criteria that will be used to judge if a parameter will be considered configurable. Annex B 8.1.11 list the rated configurable parameters. Consequently, this rate criteria will be based on three (3) rated configurable parameters.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p>8.1.7 – Time Related – 7 parameters</p> <p>8.1.8 – Toggle Related – 2 parameters</p> <p>8.1.9 – Size Based – 1 parameter</p> <p>8.1.10 - Table Based – 24 parameters</p> <p>Section 8.1.5 defines the concept of multiple regions, and requires the ability to define initially 5 regions, with the ability to support up to 5 additional regions. Section 8.1.5 (1) states:</p> <p><i>The AFIS renewal solution must allow each region to have separate configurable parameters that allow the thresholds, quality measures and other configurable parameters to be applied per region. (M)</i></p> <p>As such, it is unclear if the Mandatory Region configuration parameters are 5, 10, or 10 times the total number of all configuration parameters.</p> <p>Section 8.1.6 defines the concept of separate repositories and defines and defines two basic</p>	

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p><i>repositories; TP and LT, with each repository containing up to 6 partitions. Section 8.1.6 (3) states:</i></p> <p><i>The AFIS renewal solution must also support the creation of at least six (6) additional TP repositories and six (6) additional latent repositories, of varying sizes at any given time, without affecting the overall performance requirements stated in this SOW and its accompanying documents.</i></p> <p><i>(M)</i></p> <p><i>As such, it is unclear if the Mandatory Repository configuration parameters are 2 (TP & LT), 12 (2 x 6 partitions for each), or 24 (2 x 6 + 2 x 6 additional) configuration parameters.</i></p> <p><i>The Table B Evaluation Table assigns a Rating Factor ranging from 1.0 to 0.0 based upon the evaluation Team's assessed level of the requirement being satisfied. Whereas, Table A assigns a Rating Factor based upon the</i></p>	

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p><i>requirement being evident (1.0), or Not evident (0.0).</i></p> <p>Question A: As the evaluation score is to be based upon on how many configurable parameters above the mandatory configurable parameter requirements are met, would the use of the Table A Evaluation criteria be more appropriate here?</p> <p>Question B: Can the PWGSC provide the calculation for how this Rated Requirement will be scored?</p> <p>Question C: In order for the Bidders to be evaluated on an equal basis, can the PWGSC clarify the total number of configuration parameters that will be used for this evaluation, and clearly indicate which configuration parameters they are?</p>	
71.	Attachment 2 to Appendix G	Table 1-5 Data Conversion Strategy	<p>The Rated Requirements Table provides two responses for Data Conversion Strategy; one for the AFIS Renewal solution (scored at 65</p>	<p>Answer to Question A</p> <p>Yes, one Data Conversion Plan can be provided, as long it clearly articulates how all conversion requirements are satisfied. The portion of the</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
		Pages 35 & 36	<p>points) and one for ELMO (Scored at 45 points), where each requirement calls for the development of a comprehensive Data Conversion Plan.</p> <p>Question A: Is it acceptable for a Bidder to provide a single, consolidated Data Conversion Plan, as long as the single plan covers and easily identifies the sections related to the AFIS Renewal data conversion effort and the ELMO data conversion effort?</p> <p>Question B: The Data Conversion Strategy rated responses for the Entire AFIS Renewal solution and the ELMO/LCMC response reference SOW 13. The only Rated (R) requirement in this section is requirement 13.1 (7). Can the PWGSC clarify if requirement 13.1 (2) should be a Rated Requirement, as it addresses the overall Data</p>	<p>Data Conversion Plan that applies to the AFIS renewal solution will be used to assess the points awarded out of a maximum 65 and the portion that applies to ELMO will be used to assess the points awarded out of a maximum 45.</p> <p>Answer to Question B Please refer to Q #43.</p> <p>Answer to Question C Annex E is referenced since it describes the ELMO database fields and additional information that is considered necessary to effectively develop a Data Conversion Strategy and Plan. Also Q #43 provides additional clarification.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p>Conversion Plan requirement?</p> <p>Question C:</p> <p>The Data Conversion Strategy for ELMO/LCMC also references Annex E. There a no requirements identified as Rated (R) in Annex E that appear to pertain to ELMO/LCMC data conversion capability. Can the PWGSC identify these rated requirements?</p>	
72.	Attachment 2 to Appendix G	Table 1-6 Benchmark Plan Page 38	<p>Table 1-6 references Appendix G, Section 3.4, and the submission requirements state:</p> <p><i>The Bidder's detailed Benchmark Plan provided with its proposal should be clear, logical and include the information as detailed in Appendix G Section 3.4.</i></p> <p>The Evaluation Criteria for this rated response states:</p> <p><i>General Evaluation Guidelines Table B Rating Scale</i></p> <p>Question:</p> <p>As the Evaluation Criteria does not list specific Rated requirements to be evaluated, and Appendix G does not include any requirements identified as</p>	<p>PSPC/RCMP can only evaluate the Bidder's proposal based on the information provided. Appendix G Section 3.4 represents a minimum that PSPC/RCMP would require to effectively assess the Benchmark Plan. The Bidder is encouraged to provide whatever they think will allow the most the effective assessment of the Bidder's Benchmark Plan.</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			Rated (R), can the PWGSC confirm the Table B evaluation is based only the information requested in Annex G, Section 3.4 (5), or should Bidders consider all of Section 3.4 as Rated Requirements, and include the information in the Benchmark Plan?	
73.	Annex B to Appendix A SOW Annex D to Appendix A SOW	Section 3.6 Paragraph 27 Table 3-3 Page 46 Section 3.7 Paragraph 1 Pages 34-35	Table 3-3 identifies 10,000,000 TP Sets (Rolled & Plain, ID Flats) for Year 2019 database volumes. Section 3.7 (1) of Annex D states: The Contractor's proposal shall provide, as part of its design proposal, an analysis of the following requirements, based on the functional and technical requirements stated throughout this SOW and its accompanying documents. (M) a. Database sizing analysis for the VSS; b. SAN sizing analysis for the VSS; c. AFIS renewal solution workstation sizing analysis for the VSS; d. VSS renewal solution fingerprint processing sizing analysis to satisfy	The 10M total TP sets of prints include approximately 25% that are expected to be IMMs.

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p>the requirements stated throughout this SOW and its accompanying documents; and</p> <p>e. VSS renewal solution server sizing analysis.</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p><i>In order for Bidders to provide the requested database and SAN sizing analysis for VSS, the Bidders need to know the database volumes for IMM enrolments for Year 2019. As Table 3-3 only provides the total TP set volumes, Bidders are unable to determine the percentage of TP sets that should be associated with AFIS processing, versus those that should be associated with VSS processing.</i></p> <p>Question:</p> <p>Can the PWGCS clarify if the 10M Year 2019 TP Sets are all associated with AFIS records, or provide the percentage that is associated with AFIS versus VSS?</p>	
74.	Annex E	Section 2.1 Paragraph 1 Page 4	<p>1. The AFIS ICD 2.1 identifies the specific transaction details that must be supported by the LCMC/AFIS renewal solution; however, there</p>	<p>The intent of this requirement is to ensure the Bidder realizes that the AFIS ICD 2.1 identifies specific transactions that are related to LCMC (e.g. LFSNSI, LFSI, SFFRI, SRMI); however,</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p>are many other transactions that contain data and processing which also must be used by LCMC. (M)</p> <p>Question:</p> <p>Can the RCMP provide the other transactions referenced in this requirement?</p>	<p>other transactions such as LSRI, LCANI, LTCI, etc. are used to process data contained in the LCMC specific transactions. Since LCMC is meant to be like a different view into the AFIS/LCMC data for case management purposes, the results of other processing need to be reflected when LCMC is used. For example, the LCMC must show identification data resulting from automated transactions processing and user activity, which reflects that there are other transactions that contain data and processing that will be used by LCMC. Which other transactions depends on the Bidder's solution and the level of integration with AFIS; therefore, all the other specific transactions cannot be precisely identified.</p>
75.	Annex E	Section 3.5.3, Paragraph 5, Page 35	<p>5. LCMC/AFIS will send a SRMI to NNS, which NNS will use to send a Notification Email to the Latent Search Request Contributing Member and the Contributors prime Email address (i.e., normally the members' supervisor). This will be an alert email indicating that the Contributor should use</p>	<p>The questions do not appear to fit with the requirement. However, maybe the last line of the requirement has created confusion, instead of adding clarity.</p> <p>The security is provided by the RCMP/SSC. Contributors use CLC, which is simply a limited NNS access, through a secure connection to view the actual</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
			<p>CLC to view the latest results of the latent search request. The results can only be viewed through a secure connection which CLC provides. (M)</p> <p>Question: What security implementation access do contributors currently have for LCMC now? Does the RCMP expect contributors to maintain the same level of access for the new LCMC solution? Please explain if RCMP's expectations have changed.</p>	<p>results of central latent processing. Please refer to the previous requirement, paragraph 4, which states the LCMC/AFIS database view will be used by NNS to display the results of the central latent processing to the CLC user.</p> <p>This requirement is concerning the SRMI requirement that must be satisfied. Please refer to section 2.2.1 in Annex E and the workflow table 2-1 for additional information. This requirement is AFIS sending to NNS and then NNS sending an alert email to the contributor (i.e. CLC user) using the data provided by AFIS in the SRMI. This alert tells the CLC user to use the NNS secure connection to view the results.</p> <p>The existing security for ELMO, which will be replaced by LCMC is not relevant. ELMO is a separate application with no automated connection to AFIS. Additionally, contributors do not currently have access to ELMO and they will not have access to LCMC/AFIS.</p> <p>LCMC will be an integrated solution with AFIS and the</p>

N° de l'invitation - Solicitation No.

N° de la modif - Amd. No.

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID

M7594-153234/E

003

107zl

N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.

File No. - N° du dossier

N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

M7594-153234

107zl.M7594-153234

Comments Received Table Error! No text of specified style in document.-1: RFP Questions and Answers – Set #1

Q #	Document Reference	Section Reference	Question / Comment	PSPC/RCMP Response
				LCMC security will be the same as AFIS. LCMC/AFIS access will be available for the same set of users that currently access AFIS. Refer to Annex A and the security architecture for a description of the architecture within which AFIS must operate.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.