



SHARED SERVICES CANADA

Amendment No. 001 to the Invitation To Qualify for the Procurement Process for Public Cloud Services

Solicitation No.	16-42051-0/A	Date	August 18, 2016
GCDocs File No.		GETS Reference No.	PW-16-00734694

This Amendment is issued to answer questions raised by suppliers as of **2016-08-13**. Except as expressly amended by this document, all the terms and conditions of the ITQ remain unchanged.

THIS SOLICITATION AMENDMENT IS ISSUED TO:

1. Publish Canada's Responses to suppliers' questions.
2. Modify the Invitation To Qualify.

NOTE: Respondents' clarification questions are numerically sequenced upon arrival at SSC. Respondents are hereby advised that questions and answers for this solicitation may be issued via BuyandSell.gc.ca out of sequence.

1. CANADA'S RESPONSES TO RESPONDENTS QUESTIONS

Question 1

How does SSC plan to understand "Where is the Problem?" when performance problems arise?

Answer to Question 1:

SSC's goal is to procure mature and proven Cloud Services with high availability, performance and the appropriate tools and processes to support the services to the GC. The procurement process is at the ITQ stage, the RFP will address requirements related to performance and root cause problem solving.

Question 2

Given the lack of granular reporting for most Cloud applications, and in many cases, telecommunications service providers, SSC would potentially be operating "Cloud Blind"! With no visibility into the providers' Clouds, there is no opportunity to fix the performance problem quickly. SSC Administrators need real-time tools that give them visibility into their Cloud environments without sacrificing security. What is SSC's plan to:

- A. Ensure network performance
- B. Asses Service Provider performance
- C. Deliver efficient, flexible performance monitoring

Answer to Question 2:

As stated above in response to Question 1, the RFP will address requirements related to performance and root problem solving.

Question 3

The ITQ document we downloaded makes reference to two important Annexes that were not included. In order for AWS (Company A) to make appropriate decisions on bidding or not, and to provide comments for improvements to the preliminary procurement requirements, we need to review the entirety of the ITQ including the Annexes C and D. Can you please provide me with a copy of the following Annexes referenced in the ITQ?

1. ANNEX C – PROPOSED CONTRACT CLAUSES FOR THE RESULTING CONTRACT
2. ANNEX D –DRAFT STATEMENT OF REQUIREMENTS

Answer to Question 3:

Canada intends to publish Annex C and D the week of August 22 to 26.

Question 4

Would Canada provide an editable copy of the Form 1 – Response Submission Form for respondents to use?

Answer to Question 4:

Canada has provided an editable copy of Form 1 as an attachment to Amendment 1.

Question 5

On page 8 of 22, Section 3.3 b) the requirement reads “The response must provide all the information required by 0”. Would Canada please clarify what “0” means in the context of this statement?

Answer to Question 5:

Please see Modification 1.

Question 6

We are wondering if this ITQ is in the process for a specific software procurement or simply to rent space on a certified public cloud.

Answer to Question 6:

As stated in the ITQ mandatory requirements: Canada is seeking Commercially Available Cloud Services and can provide a complete catalogue of all Commercially Available Cloud Services from the proposed Cloud Service Provider. Services could include SaaS, IaaS and PaaS.

Question 7

Annex A section M3 - What is a company achieves the required certifications after the ITQ process? Are they eliminated from, any further government cloud hosting RFP's which may result from this process?

Answer to Question 7:

Canada has modified Mandatory Requirement M3. Please see Modification 1.

Question 8

Annex A section M3 - Why have these 2 certifications been chosen out of the many industry accepted certifications that are currently in use?

Answer to Question 8:

These standards were chosen as they were considered to be the best known commercial cloud certification standards that met the needs of the GC environment in protecting unclassified data. Please see amended requirement above.

Question 9

Annex A section M3 - What if a firm has a different certification of an equal or higher level of security/diligence/procedures like PCI-DSS, PHIPPA, or Tiers 1-4 for example. Are these acceptable in replacement of the stated certifications?

Answer to Question 9:

No, please refer to answer for Question 7.

Question 10

Annex A section M4 - Why does respondent need to provide pre-configured virtual machines when needs may vary by client RFP? This requirement plays to only 1 type of hosting provider (self service). Many hosting providers offer custom hosted solutions based on a client's particular need.

Answer to Question 10:

The requirement for pre-configured virtual machines is to support On demand self-service however it does preclude companies from offering custom hosted solutions in addition to the for pre-configured virtual machines. Support for "On-Demand Self-Service" (as per NIST definition).

Question 11

Annex A section M7 –This requirement presupposes the solution and eventual government client will require. Some client may want a different type of administration service which offloads more administration to the cloud hosting provider. So why is this configuration mandatory? Why not ask respondent what types of service administration they provide vs specifying only one type?

Answer to Question 11:

Please refer to answer for Question 10.

Question 12

Annex E Cloud Computing Definition – The definition only allows for one type of Cloud Model, self-service, when there are many other forms. For example, Gartner's definition is much more broad allowing for others models of cloud hosting – "a style of computing in which massively scalable IT-related capabilities are provided "as a service" using internet technologies to multiple customers." Why is a broader definition being used to allow participation from more cloud providers in ITQ?

Answer to Question 12:

The definition provided is from NIST. The NIST definition was selected as advised by the vendor community in response to the Cloud RFI (<https://buyandsell.gc.ca/procurement-data/tender-notice/PW-EEM-033-28243>) published on Buy and Sell in 2014.

Question 13

Annex E Cloud Services Definition – The same question as the Cloud Computing definition. The ITQ is limiting the respondents to only type of cloud provider. Why is the definition used not broader to allow more providers to participate in this process? The CSDP definition actually speaks to the fact there are different models available. But these definitions exclude them.

Answer to Question 13:

Please see the answer to Question 12.

Question 14

Federal Contractor Program & Employment Equity Certification – Is this required for firms under 100 employees? If so, how does a firm apply for it?

Answer to Question 14:

Please refer to Section 3.3 (c) of the ITQ for certifications required during the ITQ phase. Please refer to Annex B, Section 2.2 for additional information related to the Federal Contractors Program for Employment Equity.

Question 15

Standard Instructions for Procurement, Section 6.7, Regulatory Forms for Telecommunications Procurements – Are these CRTC form required for this particular ITQ?

Answer to Question 15:

Section 3.3 (c) of the ITQ outlines the required certifications for the ITQ phase.

Question 16

M3 requires the Respondent to provide their most recent “certification” for SOC 1 and SOC 2. SOC 1 and SOC 2 are not certifications but reports that are generated by a third party auditor. This CSP’s cloud services are audited against SOC 1/SSAE16 and SOC 2/AT Section 101 and ISAE 3402 standards. The availability of these SOC 1 and SOC 2 reports are restricted to customers who have signed nondisclosure agreements with this CSP. In lieu of providing non-public confidential reports, is it sufficient for Respondents to include in their submission the public facing material this CSP makes available which confirms that this CSP has achieved SOC 1 Type 2 and SOC 2 Type 2 reports?

Answer to Question 16:

Please see Canada’s response to Question 7.

Question 17

If a major CSP is bidding directly, does this exclude another respondent from bidding as prime proposing the same CSP services?

Answer to Question 17:

No. Please see refer to Section 4.2 (a) of the ITQ.

Question 18

Is there any permissible mechanism available for a Respondent to take exception to specific standard instructions, clauses or conditions of the ITQ?

Answer to Question 18:

Please see Section 2.2 - Questions and Comments of the ITQ.

Question 19

Regarding requirement M4 (a), it states:

The Respondent must demonstrate that the Cloud Service Provider identified in M1, provides recommended pre-configured virtual machine templates categorized by: a) development life cycle stage (development, test, staging, production)

While it is desirable to have templates for virtual machines based on the nature of the usage of the virtual machine, when it comes to applications the sizing of a virtual machine is highly dependent on the nature of the application. Therefore it is impractical to provide a pre-configured, single "one size fits all" template for any potential application in each of development, test, stage, and production environments. Can the GoC clarify if they want the ability to create these templates to be stored for future use? (enabling the customer to define templates based on the nature of their application), or if the requirement is to have the ability to create separate environments for deployment of virtual machines for each of development, test, staging, and production in order that any given virtual machine is deployed based on its use and are not deployed into an incorrect environment?

Answer to Question 19:

Please see answer to Question 10.

Question 20

In Question M7, it states:

The Respondent must demonstrate that the Cloud Service Provider identified in M1, has a secure, web-based management interface that enables customers to remotely administer the cloud services.

The Respondent must demonstrate that the Cloud Service Provider's Cloud Services have the following functions:

d) real-time and historical performance against Service Level Agreements (SLA);

For further clarity, can the GoC please advise which Service Level Agreements (SLA) are being referenced? Does GoC have specific SLA requirements defined for cloud services? Most large cloud services providers have standard SLA's that are significantly less than fully managed server instances provided by typical outsourcing vendors. Is SSC contemplating special SLA's beyond the standard ones provided normally by the CSP?

Answer to Question 20:

The GC is requesting real-time and historical performance against the CSP's own standard published Service Level Agreements.

Question 21

In Question M3, it states:

The Respondent must confirm that the Cloud Service Provider identified in M1, has information security policies and procedures that meet the following two certifications:

- a) ISO 27001;and
- b) AICPA Service Organization Control (SOC) – SOC 1 and SOC 2 reports

The SOC 1 report is usually reserved for our internal and our customer's management and their respective auditors as it relates to the financial controls of the organization and our customers. This is not our policy to release to potential customers. We believe that a SOC 2 and a SOC 3 report will attest to the fact that the required controls and certifications are in place. Would SSC accept a signed undertaking that the vendor has a SOC 1 in place and that there are no outstanding issues?

Answer to Question 21:

Please see Canada's response to Question 7.

Question 22

In Question M3, it further states:

The Respondent must provide a copy of their most recent certification documents for each of the two certifications listed above. Each certification document must identify:

- a) the legal business name of the proposed CSP; and
- b) the current certification date and status

With global businesses, the entity being sold in one geography is often not the same legal name as the entity ultimately providing the service (and hence the subject of the audit). Would SSC accept the name of the wholly owned parent or subsidiary on specific audit reports being different than that referred to in

M1? For example: Cloud Service Provider Canada might be the specific provider of the cloud but the services are ultimately managed by Cloud Service Provider Corporation based in another country. The audit report would name Cloud Service Provider Corporation and not Cloud Service Provider Canada even though the Cloud Services were being delivered from cloud locations in Canada operated by Cloud Service Provider Canada.

Answer to Question 22:

Yes. GC will accept the name of the wholly owned parent or subsidiary on specific audit reports even if they differ from the CSP referred to in M1.

Question 23

Would SSC allow services from the Respondent to be included as part of the services of the CSP as long as they were normally accessible from the CSP or Respondent's management web pages? For instance, CSP operates as a separate wholly owned subsidiary of Respondent and Respondent has richer services built on top of CSP. Could Respondent use their richer portal (which includes full CSP functionality) to provide a wider array of services?

Answer to Question 23:

The GC will procure Public Cloud services only as defined in Annex E – Cloud Services - Cloud Services refers to a shared pool of configurable Cloud Computing service models made available to users as a rapid, on demand, elastic self-service via the Internet from a Cloud Service Provider's servers as opposed to being provided from a company's own on-premises servers.

Question 24

In Section 2.2 c) of the response requirements it appears that SSC is asking for feedback on the forthcoming SOW and Contract documents that according to the ITQ will come later in the process: Suppliers are asked to provide comments and suggestions on the Statement of Requirements, attached at Annex D, and the proposed contract clauses for the resulting contract, attached at Annex C and/or identify areas that would benefit from additional clarification by Canada within their Response. But in Annex C and D it says (respectively): SSC anticipates providing the proposed contract clauses for the resulting contract later in the ITQ process and, SSC anticipates providing a draft statement of requirements later in the ITQ process.

Can SSC provide an indication that the vendors would be provided a copy of the SOR with time to provide meaningful comment or modify the statement in 2.2 c)?

Answer to Question 24:

Please see Canada's response to Question 3.

Question 25

We believe that the experience of "Affiliates" in Section 2.4 of the ITQ must be changed in order for global firms to use their experience outside of Canada to meet future corporate experience requirements at the RFP stage.

For tax, accounting and legal reasons, global firms operate through local, country specific operating companies. In Canada, the local company is the legal entity qualified to bid on Government of Canada solicitations. The local company operates only in Canada and by limiting the definition of bidder, the Crown is effectively limiting us to only using Canadian references to meet the corporate experience

requirements of an RFP. The limitation of the definition of Bidder to Canadian entities would severely limit the pool of qualified bidders.

The Crown has generally allowed the use of the experience of the bidder's "Affiliates" on at least three recent procurements: Employment & Social Development Canada's MLAMP procurement; the Canadian Food Inspection Agency's recent ESDP procurement and CBSA's Accounts Receivable Ledger (ARL) procurement.

By way of example, the following language is taken from one of the above noted RFPs:

"The experience of affiliates will be accepted for evaluation purposes in response to these criteria. In such cases, the experience of an affiliate will be considered for evaluation purposes. For the purpose of this evaluation, everyone, including but not limited to organizations, bodies corporate, societies, companies, firms, partnerships, associations of persons, parent companies, and subsidiaries, whether partly or wholly-owned, as well as individuals, and directors, are Bidder's affiliates if:

- a) directly or indirectly either one controls or has the power to control the other, or
- b) a third party has the power to control both.

Indicia of control, include, but are not limited to, interlocking management or ownership, identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment, common use of employees, or a business entity created following the acts or convictions specified in this section which has the same or similar management, ownership, or principal employees, as the case may be."

We suggest that definition should be amended to read as follows: "a project must have been completed by the Bidder itself, the Bidder's Parent Company, or by an affiliate of the Bidder, as such term is defined in the Canada Business Corporations Act (and cannot include the experience of any proposed subcontractor of the Bidder)".

Answer to Question 25:

Canada has considered the proposed changes. The definition of Respondent/Bidder remains unchanged.

Question 26

Location of the Cloud Services

Would the Crown please clarify if any portions of the required services need to be provided within Canada?

Answer to Question 26:

There is no requirement for the public cloud services to be provided within Canada.

Question 27

Only One Response per proposed Cloud Service Provider

Section 2.4 sets a limit of only one response per Respondent, however, there is no definition of the role of service integrators (SIs) in providing enhanced services to the CSPs. Would the Crown please clarify the intended role of SIs in the ITQ?

Answer to Question 27:

Please see refer to Section 4.2 of the ITQ.

Question 28

Infrastructure Services only

In section 1.2 (b)(i), the ITQ states that "It is intended that any contracts or supply arrangements resulting from any subsequent solicitation would be used by SSC to provide shared services to one or more of its clients." There will be a requirement to configure the GC Cloud for SSC and client departments, however it is unclear if these services would be procured separately or if they will be included in the contracts that result from the eventual RFP. Would the Crown please clarify that the "shared services" in resulting RFP and contract will be for the provision of infrastructure only, or will they include services as well? If services are included, please specify within the ITQ the types of services SSC intends to engage.

Answer to Question 28:

The procurement is for Public Cloud Services as defined in Annex E:

Cloud Services: Cloud Services refers to a shared pool of configurable Cloud Computing service models made available to users as a rapid, on demand, elastic self service via the Internet from a Cloud Service Provider's servers as opposed to being provided from a company's own on-premises servers.

Question 29

In regards to Annex A: Qualifications Requirements, Number M3 - In order to provide the required certification documents requested in M3, would the Crown sign an NDA (which will contain provisions respecting compliance with the Access to Information Act) in order to allow us to provide secure log-in access to this proprietary information?" We are unable to provide this documentation attached in a public procurement response due to the security and proprietary content.

Answer to Question 29:

Please see Canada's response to Question 7.

Question 30

Ref. ITQ Section 2.4.b - If a CSP is a Respondent can that same CSP also be named in another Respondent's proposal?

Answer to Question 30:

A Cloud Service Provider (CSP) can be a Respondent to the ITQ, and also have their Commercially Available Cloud Services offered to Canada by other Respondents submissions.

Please see Section 4.2 of the ITQ.

Question 31

Ref. ITQ Section 2.4.b - If a CSP is named in a Respondent's proposal can that same CSP be named in another Respondent's proposal?

Answer to Question 31:

Please see Canada's response to Question 30.

Question 32

Ref. ITQ 3.3.b - ITQ please clarify the statement specifically "must provide all the information required by 0".

Answer to Question 32:

Please see Canada's response to Question 5.

Question 33

Please confirm when Canada expects to release Annex C and D?

Answer to Question 33:

Please see Canada's response to Question 3.

Question 34

Will the procurement for Protected B and above workloads be initiated via a separate ITQs?

Answer to Question 34:

The procurement for Protected B will be addressed in a separate procurement.

Question 35

RE: Standard Instructions for Procurement Documents No. 1.0, 6. Standard Instructions and Conditions for Telecommunications Procurements, 6.7 & 6.8 Regulatory Forms

With respect to Regulatory Form A – D, are vendors required to sign and submit the forms as part of their submission?

Answer to Question 35:

No these forms are not required. Please refer to Section 3.3 - Content of Response.

Question 36

Section 3.3 b) [page 8 of 22] - In the first sentence "The response must provide all the information required by 0.", it is assumed that the "0" in the sentence should be replaced with additional instruction. Please provide the updated sentence.

Answer to Question 36:

Please see Canada's response to Question 5.

Question 37

Annex A, M1 to M7 [pages 13 – 16 of 22] Please confirm that the Respondent does not have to own the proposed CSP solution; instead, the Respondent needs to be an authorized provider of the CSP solution.

Answer to Question 37:

As stated in M2:

The Respondent must confirm that they are:

- a) an authorized provider of the Commercially Available Cloud Services offered by the CSP identified in M1; and
- b) capable of providing all Commercially Available Cloud Services of the proposed CSP identified in M1.

Question 38

Section 3.3 [page 8 of 22] & Section 4.2 a) [page 12 of 22] – It is understood that a Respondent may propose multiple CSP solutions (and must do so as separate proposals) and could subsequently become a Qualified Respondent for each CSP solution submitted (assuming each solution meets the requirements of the ITQ). Please confirm this understanding is correct.

Answer to Question 38:

Yes that is correct.

Question 39

Could SSA let us know when Annexes C and D will be available?

Answer to Question 39:

Please see Canada's response to Question 3.

Question 40

Could SSA confirm that the requirements for this submittal consist of the items in Section 3.3 a) through d) only at this ITQ stage?

Answer to Question 40:

Yes that is correct.

Question 41

Reference Annex A – Qualification Requirements M3 (b) – (AWS) Company X does not disclose its SOC 1 and SOC 2 certification documents without a Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) being in place with the recipient of the documents. Will the Crown sign our Unilateral NDA prior to the deadline for ITQ response submission or post-submission?

- a. The oath that public service employees take under the Public Service Employment Act requiring them to maintain confidentiality of information is insufficient by (AWS) Company X standards to permit waiver of the NDA requirement. If there is no NDA, will the Crown accept any alternative that would satisfy this requirement to ensure the confidentiality of documents and to prevent public disclosure, such as: reference to the SOC certificate numbers and dates, without providing the actual document; or, a screenshot of Section II of the SOC 1 and 2 documents, which is the auditor's dated letter stating (AWS) Company X ' compliance?

Answer to Question 41:

As stated in M2:

The Respondent must confirm that they are:

- a) an authorized provider of the Commercially Available Cloud Services offered by the CSP identified in M1; and
- b) capable of providing all Commercially Available Cloud Services of the proposed CSP identified in M1.

Question 42

Reference Annex B – SSC Standard Instructions Section 1.8 (j) – Since the Respondent's entire submission is a public record or otherwise subject to public disclosure, how can (AWS) Company X protect the confidentiality of SOC1 & SOC2 certification documents to prevent public disclosure without a Non-Disclosure Agreement with the Crown?

Answer to Question 42:

Please see answer to Question 7.

Question 43

Reference Annex A – Qualification Requirements M3 (b) - Presuming there will be multiple independent Respondent submissions to this ITQ for (AWS) Company X as the named CSP, would the Crown accept

one set of the SOC1 and SOC2 documents directly provided to it under NDA, with each Respondent's submission making reference to the same?

Answer to Question 43:

Please see answer to Question 7.

Question 44

Reference Section 4.1 Basis of Qualification – Can the Crown please confirm that the CSP named in Annex A M1 by their respective Respondent(s) will also become a Qualified Respondent (QR), presuming the Respondent(s) submission qualifies, and will be able to participate independently as a QR during the subsequent RRR phase of the procurement process? In other words, is the CSP required to provide a direct qualified submission to the ITQ to also be declared a QR and participate in the RRR phase independently?

Answer to Question 44:

No. Only the Respondent becomes a Qualified Respondent. Please see Section 4.2 (a).

Question 45

The Crown is closing the question period for new issues and concerns before the vendor conference and only 1 week after the ITQ was published. This does not allow bidders enough time to get partnerships and teams in place, nor allow time for assigned resources to assess the requirements for any potential issues or concerns. We request that the Crown extend the period for new questions by an additional 2 weeks beyond Aug the 13th.

Answer to Question 45:

Canada will not be granting an extension for Question Period 1.

Question 46

The SOC1, SOC2 and ISO27001 documents contain confidential and proprietary information, including critical security and operational details about our cloud offerings. Our legal department has requested that we get an official NDA in place before releasing these documents. Would the Crown agree to signing our corporate NDA agreement before we release these documents?

Answer to Question 46:

Please see answer to Question 7.

Question 47

Form 1 – Response Submission Form (7th block) requests Security Clearance Level of Respondent. However, Section 2.5 of ITQ states that "A respondent is not required to have security clearance in order to become a Qualified Respondent. Security clearance and other security requirements will be identified at a later stage of the procurement process." Can you please clarify if we need to have a security clearance for submission?

Answer to Question 47:

As per Section 2.5, "A Respondent is not required to have security clearance in order to become a Qualified Respondent. Security clearance and other security requirements will be identified at a later stage of the procurement process."

Question 48

Section 4.2 Basis of Qualification a) states: “Each Respondent whose response meets all the requirements of this ITQ will become a Qualified Respondent in regards to the CSP identified in the response, for the next stage of the procurement process. Therefore, a Respondent may become a Qualified Respondent for multiple CSPs.” How does this fit in with 2.4 – Submission of Only One Response per proposed Cloud Service Provider? Specifically, with regards to: b) “Each Respondent (including related entities) will be permitted to qualify only once per proposed Cloud Service Provider (CSP).” And 4.2 e). Any individual, sole proprietorship, corporation, or partnership that is a Respondent as part of a joint venture cannot submit another response on its own or as part of another joint venture.

We request the government’s consideration of allowing technology solutions that can benefit all cloud solutions from an end user performance and enhanced security capability be allowed across multiple proposed cloud solutions versus being tied to one solution. Such an approach would allow the government to benefit from all solutions proposed.

Answer to Question 48:

A Respondent can propose and qualify as a Qualified Respondent for multiple CSPs, provided they submit a separate response for each proposed CSP.

Question 49

This question pertains to Mandatory Requirement “M3” where GC has listed two mandatory certifications (ISO 27001, SOC Type 1 and Type 2). We recognize the need for our client’s to have evidence that the proper controls and oversight with regards to the services delivered by proponents are in place. Often is the case that such evidence via audit reports, attestations or certifications are required by regulation. However, why has GC chosen to require both of these certifications, versus an approach to require either for a public cloud? Furthermore, will GC consider attestations in lieu of M3 (or combination of) for existing Canadian providers who have already made significant facility investments in order to qualify for Facility Security Clearance (FSC) including Document Safeguarding Capability (DSC) up to and including PROTECTED “B” level certification, which is the standard for much of the Federal Government existing hosting requirements?

Answer to Question 49:

Please see answer to Question 7. FSC only focuses on physical and personnel security. It does not focus on all people, process, and technology aspects of security.

Question 50

Do sections 2.5 and 2.6 in the Standard Instructions for Solicitations No. 100 apply to the ITQ? E.g. there could be hundreds or a higher number of certifications technically required in a cloud system to meet this requirement.

Answer to Question 50:

Section 3.3 (c) of the ITQ outlines the required certification for the ITQ phase.

Question 51

SOC1 reports are restricted use reports and highly confidential. It is our policy to only release these reports to existing customers, and only for the cloud solutions which are relevant to the request which are live, financially-relevant systems during the last audit period. Would Canada please amendment Annex A, Mandatory Requirement M3 to remove the requirement for submission of the SOC 1 or provide

specific detail as to how this report will be managed and secured and by name who will have access and under what circumstances?

Answer to Question 51:

Please see answer to Question 7.

Question 52

Service Level Agreements (SLA) by their very nature are based on historical delivery against a committed level of service over a period of time (e.g. mean time between failures, uptime availability by month or by year, etc.) . As such there is no such thing as a "real-time" performance against an SLA. Instead status monitoring and alerting is used to determine the "real-time" status of a service which is covered in other requirements. Would the Crown please amend M7 (d) to remove the requirement for "real-time".

Answer to Question 52:

Canada has modified Mandatory Requirement M7. Please see Modification 002.

Question 53

There appears to be confusion between the first sentence of this requirement which speaks to interoperability and API's, and the second part of the requirement which speaks to Service Management capabilities of the cloud service. To provide clarity, would Canada consider splitting M5 into two separate requirements: one for support for API's and interoperability of their cloud service, and the other for capabilities of their Service Management?

For example:

- M5 The Respondent must demonstrate that the Cloud Service Provider, identified in M1, uses open, published, and supported APIs to support interoperability between components and to facilitate migrating applications

- M8 The Cloud Service Provider must currently provide the following services:
 - a) Service provisioning
 - b) Trouble ticketing
 - c) User provisioning (e.g. to manage users and facilitate user creation and ongoing management)
 - d) Authentication (e.g. to enable SSO experience)
 - e) Service by monitoring (e.g. resource usage statistics, alerts); and
 - f) Service state transitions (e.g. start, stop)

Answer to Question 53:

Yes. Canada recommends separating the two requirements.

Question 54

SOC1 reports are focused on internal controls for financial reporting and it is unclear as to the relevance or specific need for Canada to require these reports at time of ITQ submission. It is a significant burden with real cost impact to request delivery of the report from our auditors. Would Canada please either remove this mandatory requirement, or provide explanation as to why the submission of SOC1 reports has been deemed imperative to this initial qualification phase?

Answer to Question 54:

Please see answer to Question 7.

Question 55

Pre-configured virtual machine images are only one method for delivering computing capacity in support of cloud services. Cloud services (especially higher level services such as DBaaS, PaaS and others) may rely on other tools and approaches such as physical servers, containers (e.g. Docker), application or database level multi-tenancy and automated software orchestration to provide elastic capacity to meet customer demand according to agreed SLAs for services.

We understand the value of knowing the pre-configured VM configuration options available when the customer wishes to procure computing capacity for self-managed software (i.e. IaaS) however by making this a mandatory requirement it limits the ability of vendors to propose cloud services that rely on alternate technology solutions.

Would the Crown please amend M4 a) requirement to broaden the capacity provisioning options available or make this specific requirement mandatory only when the vendor is proposing IaaS services?

Answer to Question 55:

Please see Canada's response to Question 10.

Question 56

It is confusing that Canada has selected Saturday August 13th as the submission deadline for Question Period 1. We assume that this is a clerical error and that Canada would instead have questions due on a business day. Would Canada please confirm that the Question Period 1 date should instead be August 15th at 2pm?

Answer to Question 56:

The Question Period 1 dates specified in Section 2.2 of the ITQ remain unchanged.

2. MODIFICATIONS

Modification 1

On Page 14 of the ITQ, Annex A – Qualification Requirements:

DELETE:

M3	<p>The Respondent must confirm that the Cloud Service Provider identified in M1, has information security policies and procedures that meet the following two certifications:</p> <p>a) ISO 27001;and b) AICPA Service Organization Control (SOC) – SOC 1 and SOC 2 reports</p> <p>The Respondent must provide a copy of their most recent certification documents for each of the two certifications listed above. Each certification document must identify:</p> <p>a) the legal business name of the proposed CSP; and b) the current certification date and status</p>	<p>Does the Cloud Service Provider identified in M1, have information security policies and procedures that meet the following two certifications:</p> <p>a) ISO 27001; and b) AICPA Service Organization Control (SOC) – SOC 1 and SOC 2 reports</p> <p>___ YES ___ NO</p> <p>It is requested that you identify the page number(s) within the Response where the certifications can be located.</p> <p>Page numbers: _____</p>
-----------	---	--

INSERT:

M3	<p>The Respondent must confirm that the Cloud Service Provider identified in M1, has information security policies and procedures that meet the following certification standards:</p> <p>a) ISO 27001;and b) AICPA Service Organization Control (SOC) – SOC 3 reports</p> <p>The Respondent must provide a copy of their most recent and valid certification or audit report for each of the two references listed above. Each certification document or audit report must identify:</p> <p>a) the legal business name of the proposed CSP; and b) the current certification date and status</p>	<p>Does the Cloud Service Provider identified in M1, have information security policies and procedures that meet the following certification standards:</p> <p>a) ISO 27001; and b) AICPA Service Organization Control (SOC) – SOC 3 reports</p> <p>___ YES ___ NO</p> <p>It is requested that you identify the page number(s) within the Response where the certification or audit reports can be located.</p> <p>Page numbers: _____</p>
-----------	--	---

Modification 2 (English)

On Page 14 of the ITQ, Annex A – Qualification Requirements:

DELETE:

<p>M7</p>	<p>The Respondent must demonstrate that the Cloud Service Provider identified in M1, has a secure, web-based management interface that enables customers to remotely administer the cloud services.</p> <p>The Respondent must demonstrate that the Cloud Service Provider's Cloud Services have the following functions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) the ability to manage users and associated data including provisioning and deprovisioning users, changing user permissions;b) providing health or status information and dashboard reporting on system performancec) real-time thresholds and alerts;d) real-time and historical performance against Service Level Agreements (SLA);e) usage and data tracking tools;f) providing configuration management reports and alerts (configuration audit reports, configuration change reports, inventory, file integrity monitoring reports; etc.); andg) trouble ticketing with notification email capabilities.	<p>The substantiation required for M7 cannot simply be a repetition of the mandatory requirement but must explain and demonstrate how the Cloud Service Provider meets the requirement. Respondents can provide screen captures and technical or end-user documentation to supplement their responses.</p> <p>Where Canada determines that the substantiation is not complete, the Respondent will be declared non-compliant. The substantiation may refer to additional documentation submitted with the Response, it is requested that Respondents indicate where in the Response the reference material can be found, including the title of the document, and the page and paragraph numbers.</p>
------------------	---	---

INSERT

M7	<p>The Respondent must demonstrate that the Cloud Service Provider identified in M1, has a secure, web-based management interface that enables customers to remotely administer the cloud services.</p> <p>The Respondent must demonstrate that the Cloud Service Provider's Cloud Services have the following functions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the ability to manage users and associated data including provisioning and deprovisioning users, changing user permissions; b) providing health or status information and dashboard reporting on system performance c) real-time thresholds and alerts; d) performance against Service Level Agreements (SLA); e) usage and data tracking tools; f) providing configuration management reports and alerts (configuration audit reports, configuration change reports, inventory, file integrity monitoring reports; etc.); and g) trouble ticketing with notification email capabilities. 	<p>The substantiation required for M7 cannot simply be a repetition of the mandatory requirement but must explain and demonstrate how the Cloud Service Provider meets the requirement. Respondents can provide screen captures and technical or end-user documentation to supplement their responses.</p> <p>Where Canada determines that the substantiation is not complete, the Respondent will be declared non-compliant. The substantiation may refer to additional documentation submitted with the Response, it is requested that Respondents indicate where in the Response the reference material can be found, including the title of the document, and the page and paragraph numbers.</p>
-----------	---	---

=====

The following is a summary of Attachments/Amendments issued to date for this solicitation:

Document	Distribution	Date	Description
ITQ	Buyandsell.gc.ca	August 5, 2016	<p><u>PDF Version</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SSC ITQ for Public Cloud Services (English) 2. SSC ITQ for Public Cloud Services (French) 3. SSC Standard Instructions for Procurement Documents (English) 4. SSC Standard Instructions for Procurement Documents (French) 5. Additional Information for the Conference (English) 6. Additional Information for the Conference (French)
Amendment 1	Buyandsell.gc.ca	August 18, 2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Publish Canada's Response for Questions 1 to 56 2. Publish Modifications to the ITQ (Modifications 1 & 2) <p><u>Non PDF Version</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Publish MS Word version of Form 1