



**RETURN BIDS TO:**

**RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

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

**Place du Portage, Phase III  
Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2  
11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier  
Gatineau  
Québec  
K1A 0S5  
Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776**

**SOLICITATION AMENDMENT  
MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION**

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

**Comments - Commentaires**

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address  
Raison sociale et adresse du  
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**  
Miscellaneous Special Projects Division (XN)/Division  
des projets spéciaux divers (XN)  
Canadian Building  
219 Laurier Ave. West, 13th Floor  
Room 13077  
Ottawa  
Ontario  
K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> e-Procurement Solution (EPS)	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EN578-131350/H	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 021
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20131350	<b>Date</b> 2016-08-24
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$XN-111-30112	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 111xn.EN578-131350	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> <b>on - le 2016-09-30</b>	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Thauvette, Maxime	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 111xn
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 420-2201 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

**Request for Proposal (RFP)**

**Solicitation Amendment: 021**

**Purpose:**

The purpose of this amendment is to extend the closing date of this Request for Proposals (RFP), amend the RFP and provide answers to questions received with regards to this RFP.

**(A) CHANGES**

**CHANGE: 131**

At e. ii. of section 7.18.2 *First Party Liability* of the RFP,

DELETE: 0.75

INSERT: 0.25

**CHANGE: 132**

At Annex 1, section 3.5 *SECTION D - PROCUREMENT MANAGEMENT*, sub section 3.5.6 *Requirements*, delete requirement D-02.03 in its entirety and replace with:

for Authorized Administrators or Authorized Users to manage access to view and purchase from PunchOut catalogues.

**CHANGE: 133**

At Annex 1, section 3.5 *SECTION D - PROCUREMENT MANAGEMENT*, sub section 3.5.6 *Requirements*, delete requirement D-06.07 in its entirety and replace with:

for Authorized Users and Suppliers to manage and update the price list information for Catalogues.

**CHANGE: 134**

At Annex 1, section 3.5 *SECTION D - PROCUREMENT MANAGEMENT*, sub section 3.5.6 *Requirements*, delete requirement D-06.04 in its entirety and replace with:

for Authorized Users to schedule the frequency (e.g. daily, monthly, on a specific date) to connect to the applicable commodity index feed (e.g. Oil Buyers Guide) in order to update the prices on a dynamic basis in the Catalogue File based on a calculation of markup or discount pricing attribute provided by the Supplier and the commodity index feed marker.

**CHANGE: 135**

At Annex 5 - Glossary, add the following:

**Procurement File:** a case file consisting of a grouping of procurement information and documents related to a specific procurement.

**CHANGE: 136**

At Attachment 3 to Part 4: *Proof of Proposal (PoP) Test*,

DELETE:

C-03.08	for EPS to accommodate complex formulas for technical and financial evaluation scoring.	33. Creating a financial scoring methodology that awards points based on how close a bidder's price is to the average price for all bidders
---------	---	---

**CHANGE: 137**

At Annex 1 – Statement of Work, Part 5, Section 5.6.2.4 Service Desk Tiers and Operating Hours, Table 18 – Service Desk Tiers and Operating Hours,

DELETE:  
Tier 3 Mon-Fri 06:00-18:00

INSERT:  
Tier 3 Mon-Fri 09:00-17:00

**CHANGE: 138**

At Annex 1 – Statement of Work, Part 6, Section 6.13.3.3 Service Desk Availability, Table 23 – Service Desk Availability,

DELETE:  
Schedule - Tier 3 Mon-Fri, 06:00-18:00

INSERT:  
Schedule – Tier 3 Mon-Fri, 09:00-17:00

**CHANGE: 139**

At Attachment 2 to Part 4 - Technical Evaluation, delete evaluation criteria R1.2 in its entirety and replace with:

R1.2	SAP Certified Partner Solution	<p>The Bidder should provide one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. for the Bidder, an SAP certified partner certification;</li> <li>ii. for the Bidder’s EPS software, an SAP certified partner solution certification;</li> <li>iii. confirmation that the Bidder’s proposed EPS is an SAP product.</li> </ul>	<p>Canada will evaluate based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) the Bidder is an SAP certified partner = 70 points</li> <li>(b) the EPS proposed by the Bidder is an SAP certified partner solution = 70 points</li> <li>(c) confirmation that the Bidder’s proposed EPS is an SAP product = 70 points</li> <li>(d) the Bidder is not an SAP certified partner, the EPS proposed by the Bidder is not an SAP certified partner solution or the Bidder did not provide confirmation that the Bidder’s proposed EPS is an SAP product = 0 points</li> </ul> <p>Maximum of 70 points.</p>
------	--------------------------------	---	---

**(B) QUESTIONS****QUESTION: 443**

Currently, the EPS Solicitation requires personnel security clearances for the resources managing the SaaS solution including infrastructure support. Although Canada's expectation is that the Prime vendor will ensure all clearances are in place, in reality any cloud service offered for EPS would be provided by a 3rd party Cloud vendor. The Prime Contractor to PSPC would configure and manage the solution on behalf of PSPC, and the data in the Cloud service would be encrypted as required under the RFP Security Requirements. We are unaware of any scenario where a 3rd party SaaS/Cloud vendor undertakes Government of Canada security clearances for its data centre personnel, or would entertain to do so for the EPS. The personnel requirement does not meet commercial Cloud models and would render all bidders non-compliant. Would Canada amend the security clearance requirement to limit personnel security clearances to only the resources of the Bidder who require access to protected information?

**ANSWER: 443**

As per the section 7.5 *Security Requirements* of the RFP, Canada is requiring that all personnel who have access to the Protected B information undergo a security clearance. Therefore, there is no need to modify the initial security clearance requirements. For clarity, foreign suppliers and resources do not require a Canadian security clearance. Third (3<sup>rd</sup>) party SaaS/Cloud vendors outside of Canada would require security clearances as described in section 7.5 *Security Requirements*, B.f. and 7.5.3.

**QUESTION: 444**

In reference to Section 7.18.2(e)(ii), would Canada consider amending the percentage so that I reads "0.10 times" rather than "0.75 times"?

**ANSWER: 444**

For this procurement, Canada has revised the percentage to "0.25". Please see the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment.

**QUESTION: 445**

If the Prime does not have Document Safeguarding Capability (DSC) screening for Protected B information in place by contract award, is it acceptable to proceed by using proposed work locations provided by "Team Members" (as defined on page 338, Attachment 2 to Part 4) that have DOS or higher screening and the appropriate DSC screening?

**ANSWER: 445**

As stated in section 6.1 of the RFP, the security requirements must be met "on or before Contract award". Furthermore, as stated in section 7.5 of the RFP, "the Contractor must, at all times during the performance of the Contract, hold a valid Designated Organization Screening, with approved Document Safeguarding at the level of PROTECTED B (...)". This applies to the Contractor and all subcontractors.

**QUESTION: 446**

According to the RFP, all contractors and subcontractors must be registered under the Canadian Industrial Security Program (PWGSC/CISD) or foreign equivalent. The role of commercial product vendors needs clarification, can you confirm that their submission on the Supply Chain Integrity list is sufficient (e.g. individual software or hardware vendors whose products are part of the EPS solution and who are providing post-sales vendor configuration support)?

**ANSWER: 446**

No, their submission on the Supply Chain Integrity list is not sufficient; however, the commercial product vendors do not require security screenings if they will not have access to Protected information or Protected systems during the performance of their contractual responsibilities.

**QUESTION: 447**

Answer 251 b), e) and f)

We have multiple project references to select from and want to ensure we select the right ones in order to maximize our score. Can the Crown please confirm that a Bidder would get a Score of 5 for Section B of R1.1 if all sub-elements a) to j) are addressed by at least one of the project references in the portfolio?

**ANSWER: 447**

The Bidder may submit a single project for section B of R1.1 and may achieve a score of 5 on the scale, however, the project would have to address all sub-elements (a) to (j) and be assessed by the evaluation to be "Excellent Addressed" as described in Scale 1.

**QUESTION: 448**

Attachment 2 to Part 4: Technical Evaluation, Section 2 b. "...Where a Bidder cites the experience of a team member, Canada will only consider this experience if the experience is accessible to the Bidder and the Bidder can rely upon and use the experience in the performance of any resulting Contract."

If a Team Member is supporting multiple bids, can the same project references be used by multiple Bidders?

**ANSWER: 448**

Subject the provisions of the RFP, a Team Members experience may be used to support more than one bid.

**QUESTION: 449**

In instances (e.g. Test, Dev) where it is not part of the IAAS Production or DR environments and no user (e.g. GC or supplier) data is stored or processed in any way, are the operators of those non-production environments also required to hold Government of Canada or selected foreign equivalent organizational and employee security clearances/screenings, aside from the Supply Chain Integrity screening which is acknowledged in all cases.

**ANSWER: 449**

Section 10.b. of the Security Requirements Check List (SRCL) indicates that unscreened personnel can be used for portions of the work. Operators of non-production environments would not require a security screening provided the following requirements are met:

- No GC or supplier production/Protected data is accessed;
- The environment they are working in is not connected to Production/Protected environments in any way; and
- They are located in a country meeting the requirements identified for Section 7.5 B. a. Security Requirements For Foreign Suppliers.

**QUESTION: 450**

Is it the intent of the Crown to issue all documents in a track change format once the Q&A process is completed?

**ANSWER: 450**

Please refer to the answer to question #416. Canada has also provided a revised Annex 2 – Security and Privacy in Amendment #020.

**QUESTION: 451**

Regarding Change # 111 of Amendment 18, under the category of "Risk Management" sub-category "Security Assessments - Independent Assessment", it states that "*The Contractor should employ an independent assessor or assessment team to conduct an assessment of the security controls in the information system.*" Typical Government of Canada SA&A practice is for the Government to provide their own assessor. Could the GC please clarify the following:

- a) Does the stated requirement refer to SA&A, or to compliance audits to be conducted periodically post-Authority-To-Operate?
- b) If the former, is this in lieu of the normal Government assessor?
- c) If the latter, at what intervals are these audits required and is there an audit framework that is to be used?

**ANSWER: 451**

No, the employment of an independent assessor does not refer to SA&A, it refers to compliance audits to be conducted at least yearly by the Contractor using independent assessor post go-live date.

**QUESTION: 452**

Regarding Change # 101 of Amendment 17 related to a new section added around Key Management Service, we have the following questions:

a) Could the Government of Canada (GC) clarify if this requirement relates to the “*Contractor-supplied equivalent, if available, to be used for secure access to EPS by all non-GC Users under the Contract*” as stated in Section 4.5.1.2 of Annex 1, or is it a new requirement?

b) If it is a new requirement, we have the following questions:

- i. Could the GC provide additional clarification for the need for this additional Key Management Service, given that there are obvious advantages to having users employ GCKey and myKEY as a consistent means of credentialing, and to avoid the additional cost to Canada in requiring an additional contractor-provided credential scheme?
- ii. Could the GC please provide the number of government and non-government users that may make use of this new Key Management Service?
- iii. Could the GC also provide additional information with regards to how this new Key Management Service is expected to be used in order for the Contractor to ensure that its proposed solution and its application can interoperate efficiently?
- iv. Since this Key Management Service could involve a significant amount of work for the Contractor to establish, we highly recommend that the GC considers making this request for service through a separate procurement Request for Proposal (RFP) process.

**ANSWER: 452**

Canada confirms that this new language is clarification of existing requirements in the RFP. The language was added to distinguish between the requirements for Encryption and Key Management security controls E2.153, E2.154, E2.155 and E2.156 in Annex 2 from the requirements for GCKey and myKEY at section 4.5.1.2 of Annex 1. Canada expects that KMS will also be leveraged for the purpose of encryption during data exchange, at rest and in transit, between EPS users.

**QUESTION: 453**

For Milestone #8, since there is a potential for issues outside the control of the Contractor that may impact the onboarding of all GC departments and agencies, would the GC consider a payment structure where the Contractor is compensated once a specific percentage of users are onboarded (e.g. 80% payment once 80% of users are onboarded, and the remaining 20% of the Milestone to be paid out once onboarding has reached 98%, along with meeting the rest of the requirements for this Milestone)?

**ANSWER: 453**

Please see the response to question 395 in Amendment #018. As EPS GETS will be mandatory for GC departments and agencies as a matter of regulatory compliance with Canada’s trade obligations and the Contractor is provided 36 months to complete the milestone, the basis of payment will remain unchanged.

**QUESTION: 454**

The GC has made significant changes to Functional Requirements (Sections A to J) where many requirements have changed from being a specific requirement to a more generic requirement such as:

B-04.01, B-04.02, C-01.01, C-01.04, C-01.10, C-01.13, C-03.08, C-06.10, C-07.01, D-01.05, D-01.06, D-03.15, D-07.04, D-10.02, D-17.01, D-10.02, and D-17.01.

Therefore, can the GC confirm that the intent is that those GC’s generic requirements will align with the vendor’s functionality provided as part of the vendor’s standard SaaS offering?

**ANSWER: 454**

The Bidder’s EPS must meet all mandatory requirements. As articulated in section 6.8.1.2 *Transition-In Delivery* of the SOW, the GC will work with the Contractor to establish an EPS business process in consideration of existing GC processes and the processes within the COTS solution proposed by the Bidder. This will include the manner in which the solution is configured to the business process in accordance with the solution’s functionality meeting the requirements listed in the RFP.

**QUESTION: 455**

For Requirement C-05.09, please provide more details around which requirements in the solicitation does the integrity and security information need to be validated against.

**ANSWER: 455**

For clarity, "solicitation" in the context of C-05.09 refers to solicitations conducted through EPS, not this solicitation (EN578-131350/H). To illustrate the requirement as an example, if a bid solicitation conducted through EPS requires that a bidder have a secret security clearance, the EPS must have the functionality to validate that the supplier's security clearance information in the supplier's profile meets the requirement for a secret clearance.

**QUESTION: 456**

For Requirement D-02.03, since this requirement refers to Authorized Users, could the GC confirm that the words "manage access" should be removed from this Requirement (since Authorized Administrators would be the ones managing access).

**ANSWER: 456**

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

**QUESTION: 457**

In regards to Requirement D-02.02, generally catalogues are provided by the Suppliers and then managed by Authorized Users within EPS. For this requirement to hold, the catalogue data should be provided by the supplier in both official languages or updated by the Authorized User in both official languages. Please confirm our understanding of this requirement or provide further clarification.

**ANSWER: 457**

Your understanding is correct, the catalogue data will be provided by Suppliers in both official languages or updated by the Authorized User in both official languages.

**QUESTION: 458**

For Requirement D-6.07, we understand the phrase 'Dynamic basis' to mean the validation and loading of catalogues via a catalogue loading process. Please confirm if our understanding is correct.

**ANSWER: 458**

Requirements D-06.04 and D-06.07 are related.

D-06.07 is the requirement for Authorized Users and Suppliers to manage and update price list information on Catalogues using the catalogue load process or by directly editing price information using other system functionality (such as using the GUI). For clarity, the GC will remove the phrase 'on a dynamic basis' from requirement D-06.07.

D-06.04 is the requirement for Authorized Users to schedule the frequency (e.g. daily, monthly, on a specific date) to connect to the applicable commodity index feed (e.g. Oil Buyers Guide) in order to update the prices on a dynamic basis in the Catalogue File based on a calculation of markup or discount pricing attribute provided by the Supplier and the commodity index feed marker. For clarity, the GC will add additional wording 'on a dynamic basis' to requirement D-06.04.

**QUESTION: 459**

Many Functional Requirements in Annex 1 refer to a "Procurement File". Could the GC please provide a definition for Procurement File and add to the Glossary?

**ANSWER: 459**

Please see the response to question #460 and the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment.

**QUESTION: 460**

POP Test tasks related to requirement A-11.02, A-11.03, A-12.03, H-02.04 all contain the requirement around 'Procurement File'. Since Procurement File is a Government of Canada specific concept and requires further analysis to scope out functionality around the requirement, we request that all tasks related to these 4 requirements be removed from the POP test. The purpose of the POP test is to demonstrate a vendor's vanilla out of box capability and it is our understanding that this should not include GC specific concepts.

**ANSWER: 460**

The GC's "Procurement File" is a case file consisting of a grouping of procurement information and documents related to a specific procurement. The procurement file may contain, for example, a procurement requisition, SOW, tasks and other business functionality. A "Procurement File" is assigned to an Authorized User (Contracting Officer) who is responsible for sourcing and managing the 'file' throughout the contract lifecycle. While the term "Procurement File" may be specific to the GC it is our understanding that this is a standard industry functionality (although it may be labelled differently and a different label, in and of itself, is acceptable for the purposes of the PoP test). As such, A-11.02, A-11.03, A-12.03 will remain in the POP test.

It is our understanding that "supplier performance tracking" and the "ability to access a supplier performance evaluation" is standard industry functionality. As such, H-02.04 will remain in the POP Test.

**QUESTION: 461**

Regarding POP Test Task # 33 relating to C-03.08, we request that this task be deleted from the POP test. We understand this task to be a GC specific business requirement and this type of work should be done as part of the stated milestones because it requires further analysis.

**ANSWER: 461**

The GC will remove task #33 from the PoP Test.

**QUESTION: 462**

For POP Test task # 40 related to requirement C-05.05, we assume the GC refers to an audit trail and potential contract from the awarded bid. Please confirm.

**ANSWER: 462**

The GC requires an official record for all (including unsuccessful and successful) bid submissions. For POP Test task # 40 related to requirement C-05.05, an official record (electronic receipt) refers to a form of acknowledgement to the bidder (such as a confirmation email or web page) that will act as an official record that the bidder's submission was received.

**QUESTION: 463****5.6.4.4 Service Desk Tiers and Response Levels**

Service Hours for Tier-3 is 6:00-18:00, which is outside of service window for Tier-2 (7:00-19:00). It is more logical to have Tier-3 hours contained so that it is within Tier-2 service hours. In addition, we request GC to consider change Tier-3 hours to an 8-hour shift so that only one shift is required for Tier-3. This can significantly reduce service costs for GC. Relevant SLAs will need to be adjusted accordingly based on Tier-3 hours established.

**ANSWER: 463**

The Tier 3 service desk operating hours have been revised to 8 hours. Please see the "Changes" section of the RFP amendment for the modification to the service desk Tier 3 operating hours.

**QUESTION: 464****6.10.7 Milestone #7 - Fully Operational**

Please further clarify scope and expectations for Milestone #7. It is our understanding all functionalities (with the exception of GETS) would be completed as part of the Milestone #6. It is not clear what we need to deliver for Milestone #7.

**ANSWER: 464**

Milestone #7 contemplates the work to complete the transition of PWGSC onto the functionally delivered under Milestones # 3-#6 as well as "all the Work described in the SOW, with the exception of Transition-Out Services as defined in section 6.8.3 *Transition-Out Services*, the Work described in Part 7.0 Optional Services and the Work described in Milestone #8 – GETS," as detailed in section 6.10.7 *Milestone #7 – Fully Operational Baseline* of Annex 1.

**QUESTION: 465**

For the design phase of EPS, will GC provide business resources and SMEs from PWGSC only, or will GC provide SMEs for all department and agencies? Who will be providing approvals for process and IT designs, PWGSC only or multiple GC departments and agencies?

**ANSWER: 465**

As the intention is for the EPS to be a GC-wide solution, resources will be leveraged from various GC departments and agencies as required by Canada.

The Contractor will be notified of acceptance and approval of Work under the Contract by the Project Authority, who will be confirmed after Contract award and identified under 7.8.2 Project Authority.

The EPS is an integrated project between PWGSC and TBS, with a joint PWGSC and the TBS lead governance structure in place to provide oversight and approval on major decisions (such as go-live readiness). A project execution decision matrix will be shared with the Contractor following Contract award outlining additional details of Canada's internal approval process.

**QUESTION: 466**

Who are the approvers for process design and functional specifications?

**ANSWER: 466**

Please see the response to question #465.

**QUESTION: 467**

What formats are expected to be used for trainings, both for instructor led trainings and web based self-trainings? For instance, for web based self-training, does GC expect video training or PowerPoint training?

**ANSWER: 467**

Please refer to *Attachment 1 to part 4: Evaluation and Selection Methodology*, technical rated criteria R2.2 Training Plan in which the Bidder should describe its approach to the development and delivery of training that will be assessed as a part of its bid submission.

**QUESTION: 468****4.5 Secure Access 4.5.1.1 Group 1: GC Users**

RFP states that "The EPS must interoperate with the GC's Identity, Credential and Access Solution (ICAS) service. Currently, GC has only defined the Credential Management component of this solution." Please provide additional details for ICAS. What tools are used for ICAS, and what interoperability does it have to integrate with COTS solutions? Is it SAML compliant?

**ANSWER: 468**

Canada is currently in the early process of defining and developing an ICAS solution; however, Canada can confirm that the ICAS solution requirements will include use of industry standards such as SAML, OpenID and OAuth.

**QUESTION: 469****6.5.1 IT Security Operations Center**

Since Oracle ESB Gateway is owned by Canada and within Canada's firewall, please confirm that Canada will be monitoring and managing the security activities related to the Oracle ESB Gateway.

**ANSWER: 469**

Canada will be responsible for monitoring and managing security activities on Oracle ESB Gateway.

**QUESTION: 470****6.5.1 IT Security Operations Center**

Please clarify whether SOC should apply security related activities to EPS Service Desk tools, such as Automated Attendant system, or incident management system. Since these systems are not part of the core EPS solution, and we don't anticipate protected data to be stored in these systems, we propose SOC operation not apply to these systems and tools. This would result in cost savings for Canada.

**ANSWER: 470**

The SOC capability must apply to all components of EPS that store, process, or manage GC EPS data and associated security events and incidents.

**QUESTION: 471****6.3.1 Preliminary Project Plan**

The RFP states that "The Contractor must submit a Preliminary Project Plan within 5 business days of the Kick-Off Meeting described in Section 6.9.1 Kick-Off Meeting for approval by GC that identifies a schedule to complete the plans and Work required in this SOW." It is industry's best practice for the bidder to build a (draft) project plan by working together with GC at the beginning of the project. There are activities that GC needs to (agree to) carry out that should be included on the plan, and there are dependencies that need to be identified. 5 business days is not enough to carry out this task, unless we have commitment from GC to work with the bidder team on project plan from day 1. It is not likely that the preliminary project plan submitted within 5 days would be in an approval-ready status. Kindly request GC to extend this 5 days to 25 days to allow the bidder to collaborate with GC's project leaders and to establish a project plan that is ready for review and approval.

**ANSWER: 471**

The due dates for the Preliminary Project Plan and the draft Organizational Change Management Strategy will remain unchanged; however, it is possible plans may be revised after Contract award in the normal and prudent course of the Contract management, (e.g. where unforeseen or new risks develop or concerns are addressed in consultation with its project team to come to a final version). This is also provided that the Contractor considers the interdependencies between documents to be provided leading to Milestone 1 – Operational Planning, which remains due four months post Contract award.

**QUESTION: 472****6.7.1 Organizational Change Management Strategy**

Similar to the request above, we kindly request GC to extend this 5 days for draft Organizational Change Management Strategy to 15 days to allow the bidder to collaborate with GC's OCM team to establish a plan that is ready for review and approval.

**ANSWER: 472**

Please see response to question #471.

**QUESTION: 473****6.1 Security Requirements**

It is understood that all project work needs to be performed in IBISI, EU, or NATO countries. Does this requirement apply if the project work does not require access to Canada's Protected Data, Personal Data or Systems?

**ANSWER: 473**

Yes. Section 7.5 B. a. Security Requirements for Foreign Suppliers, states that the Contractor and any and all subcontractors must be from a country within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the European Union (EU) or from a country with which Canada has an international bilateral industrial security instrument.

**QUESTION: 474****6.6 PWGSC Security Assessment and Authorization (SA&A) Process**

SA&A is required during EPS implementation, is it still required post Milestone 8 go-live? If so, will it be addressed via task authorizations?

**ANSWER: 474**

As articulated in 6.6 PWGSC Security Assessment and Authorization (SA&A) Process of the SOW, post go live, all security controls that were approved during the SA&A process must be maintained and must comply with the requirements of Annex 2. With each release or change management implementation the Contractor must provide Canada with a security impact assessment in alignment with these changes and Canada will evaluate the security risk. The costs associated with these ongoing activities for releases must be included in the ongoing operational fee.

The cost associated with any new security requirements triggered by a change management implementation (change request) requested by Canada, may be addressed by the Task Authorization process as described in the RFP.

**QUESTION: 475**

R1.2 on Page 347 requests "The Bidder should provide copies of the following certifications: i. for the Bidder, an SAP certified partner certification; and ii. for the Bidder's EPS software, an SAP certified partner solution certification." For requirement ii., if we are proposing software from SAP, can we state "The EPS Software is an SAP product." in order to fully address the requirement?

**ANSWER: 475**

As SAP products, by their nature, cannot receive "SAP certified partner solutions certification", Canada will accept evidence that the Bidder's EPS software is an SAP product as an acceptable alternative to R1.2(ii). Please see the "Changes" section of this RFP amendment for modification to point-rated criterion R1.2.

**QUESTION: 476**

For 'Procurement File' requirements such as A-11.02, A-11.03, A-12.03, H-02.04, we understand that the existing GC process around 'Procurement File' is that of different procurement documents filed together and that it tells a story. Converting this GC existing process into a functionality within an eProcurement software tool, we understand the documents filed together would be the following business objects: PR, PO, Sourcing and Contract. And these would be connected together via tabs and clicking on any tab would interconnect with the remaining business objects. And a GC user would view and manage such a Procurement File through the dashboard. Please confirm our understanding of the 'Procurement File' within an eProcurement Software tool or clarify further.

**ANSWER: 476**

Please see responses to questions #459 and #460.

**QUESTION: 477**

While we respectfully await amendments from Canada, there are many significant issues raised in questions submitted to Canada that have not yet been addressed. Would Canada please indicate when addenda with responses to all questions will be published and extend the RFP submission date to October 15, 2016 or 6 weeks following the final amendment with all questions answered so that proponents have sufficient time to review and consider those items and adjust their proposal responses accordingly?

**ANSWER: 477**

At the time of publishing this amendment, the majority of questions have been answered and only a small number of questions remain. Furthermore, to allow Bidders time to revise their bids, as necessary, following the release of Annex 2, version 2.0 last week, Canada extends the closing date of the RFP to 2:00 PM (EDT) on September 30th, 2016.

**QUESTION: 478**

We respectfully request that the closing date be further extended to, at a minimum, September 30th; without this additional time we will not be in position to submit a response.

We understand that the closing date for this solicitation has been extended numerous times and the current closing date is September 19, 2016; however, with the amount of changes and amendments that have been made and continue to be made to the RFP and the SOW, it is going to take Bidders time to review, analyze and then rewrite their responses to fully address the Crown's requirements.

**ANSWER: 478**

At the time of publishing this amendment, the majority of questions have been answered and only a small number of questions remain. Furthermore, to allow Bidders time to revise their bids, as necessary, following the release of Annex 2, version 2.0 last week, Canada extends the closing date of the RFP to 2:00 PM (EDT) on September 30th, 2016.

**QUESTION: 479**

With the issuance of a revised Annex 2 – Security and Privacy in Amendment 20 and given that there are still a few outstanding questions for which we have not seen a response from Canada, we respectfully request a 2 week extension to the closing date of the RFP in order to allow us sufficient time to review the changes and clarifications provided in the latest amendment and assess the impact to our proposed solution.

**ANSWER: 479**

At the time of publishing this amendment, the majority of questions have been answered and only a small number of questions remain. Furthermore, to allow Bidders time to revise their bids, as necessary, following the release of Annex 2, version 2.0 last week, Canada extends the closing date of the RFP to 2:00 PM (EDT) on September 30th, 2016.

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.**