



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

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

Place du Portage, Phase III

Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2

11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT

MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION

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

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

Comments - Commentaires

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

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

Title - Sujet e-Procurement Solution (EPS)	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EN578-131350/H	Amendment No. - N° modif. 035
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20131350	Date 2016-12-01
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$XN-111-30112	
File No. - N° de dossier 111xn.EN578-131350	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2016-12-21	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Thauvette, Maxime	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 111xn
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 420-2201 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

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

Request for Proposal (RFP)**Solicitation Amendment: 035****Purpose:**

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

(A) CHANGES**CHANGE: 228**

At Annex 1, section 6.3.2 *Project Management Methodology and Plan, i)*,

DELETE: ii. The QA requirements for the implementation and all transition activities as detailed herein;

INSERT: ii. QA requirements for the implementation and all transition activities, including proposed baseline performance requirements;

CHANGE: 229

At Annex 1 – *Statement of Work*, under requirement *SecureInt.06 of Table 16 - Secure Access Requirements for GC Users*,

DELETE: to ensure no simultaneous logons are allowed into the EPS for the same unique User account.

INSERT: to ensure no simultaneous logons are allowed into the EPS for the same unique User account across multiple workstations or devices.

CHANGE: 230

At Annex 1, section 5.6.2.2 *First Point of Contact*,

DELETE: f) Provide password support including self-service password reset capabilities, requests for account privilege change requests, requests for User account activation, suspension and termination.

INSERT: f) Provide password support for Contractor provided credentials (if applicable), including self-service password reset capabilities, requests for account privilege change requests, requests for User account activation, suspension and termination.

(B) QUESTIONS**QUESTION: 658**

In regards to requirement E2.93, it describes a list of reports that must be presented through a Security Management Portal. The multi-tenant cloud applications we are proposing will be able to support some of these reports on-demand, and some may be provided on request. However, given the nature of their operations, large-scale cloud vendors are not set-up to develop non-standard security reports for their commercial customers and doing so would not be consistent with their business model of developing for standard customer requirements and industry leading practices. We, therefore, ask the Crown to modify this requirement to state *'The Contractor will provide reports on security related activity, in accordance with standard multi-tenant cloud vendor practices.'*

ANSWER: 658

Canada confirms that in the context of a multi-tenant cloud solution, operational security reports that are maintained by the cloud provider and are available on an as-needed basis will be assessed for information security and functional completeness during the SA&A process. Any gap identified within the operational security reports will be assessed and remediation may be requested.

QUESTION: 659

In regards to D-09.08, it states *"to filter eligible Catalogue Suppliers that meet a selected socio-economic condition in accordance with their Supplier Relationship Management Profile (e.g. Aboriginal)."* Can the Crown please clarify if the intention is to be able to search for Suppliers based on Supplier data or if the intention is to search for Catalog items based on data characteristics of Suppliers who can provide the Catalog Items? Catalog filtering is typically based on data in the catalog rather than based on supplier profile information. If the Crown is looking to filter the Catalog based on supplier information we ask that this requirement be moved to the rated section.

ANSWER: 659

The GC needs to search catalogues and select catalogue items based upon the current socio-economic information of the Supplier(s). Supplier socio-economic information is maintained in their supplier profile. It is up to the Bidder to determine a method as to how this information is made available to use when searching in the Catalogue environment. Methods include but aren't limited to:

- i. Directly linking the catalogue to the Supplier profile
- ii. Defaulting supplier information in the catalogue during the catalogue load process

QUESTION: 660

In regards to Amendment # 8 change 23, the requirements regarding performance of the solution (i.e. Transaction Response Time) were removed; however, section 6.8.1.3 of version 2.1 of Annex 1- Statement of Work continues to include testing to meet performance requirements as part of Transition Integration and System Testing. Could PWGSC please confirm that since there are no longer performance requirements for the EPS solution, the testing to meet performance requirements is therefore not required as part of Transition Integration and System Testing.

ANSWER: 660

The transaction Response time SLA in amendment #008 was initially included to measure performance once the EPS was operational.

Section 6.8.1.3 of version 2.1 of Annex 1 – Statement of Work describes requirements related to the transition phase testing which is required to test the performance of the system prior to go live. Such testing will be conducted in accordance with the Transition-in Plan and the Quality Assurance (QA) Plan, which, as articulated in 6.3.2.i).ii of the SoW, must include "QA requirements for the implementation and all transition activities". The QA requirements in the QA Plan must include proposed baseline performance requirements that the EPS will be tested against.

Please see the changes to 6.3.2.i).ii clarifying the requirement in the Changes section of this RFP amendment.

QUESTION: 661

In regards to Annex 3 - Pricing Schedule V4.3, Table 1, given the size of this engagement, the frequency and percent payment for each milestone has a significant financial impact. In order to align payments with work effort, we request that payment for total transition-in cost be modified as follows: Milestone 3 increased from 15% to 25%. Both Milestones 6 and 8 could then both be decreased from 10% to 5%.

ANSWER: 661

Canada has considered the request but the percentages of each milestone will remain unchanged. Bidders should note that Canada has revised its deployment approach for the Milestones in amendment #034.

QUESTION: 662

In regards to Annex 3 - Pricing Schedule V4.3, Table 2, bidders must address a significant portion of operational costs at time of milestone 3 go-live and support costs for EPS will be close to 100% at milestone 6 go-live. Therefore the milestone payment percentage for the firm-lot monthly price table for Operational Costs should be updated. In order to align payments with costs, we request the following changes: Milestone 1, 2, 3 payment increased from 40% to 50%. Operational costs for Milestone 6 decreased from 10% to 5% and Milestone 8 decreased from 10% to 5%.

ANSWER: 662

Please refer to the answer to question #661.

QUESTION: 663

In regards to Annex 3 - Pricing Schedule V4.3, Table 1, the milestones during Transition-In are infrequent which creates a significant financial impact to Bidders. Can Canada provide a milestone and deliverable-based payment schedule that aligns more closely with payments every 1-2 months? This could be achieved based on completion and sign-off of key interim deliverables.

ANSWER: 663

Canada has considered the request but the payment of the Transition-In Firm Lot Price will remain unchanged. Bidders should note that Canada has revised its deployment approach for the Milestones in amendment #034.

QUESTION: 664

In regards to Annex 3 - Pricing Schedule V4.3, Table 1, the 40% or less requirement for the Firm Lot Price (C) in Table 1 does not support Bidders' initial fixed cost and other implementation costs. We recommend that the Crown increase the threshold.

ANSWER: 664

Please refer to *Annex 3 – Pricing Schedule, version 4.4* where Canada has revised the threshold to 70%.

QUESTION: 665

In regards to As per Q&A 231 and 278, it was confirmed that the Contractor's ITSM system would not be required to integrate with current GC ITSM systems as part of the EPS solution and that the Task Authorization process would be used should integration of GC ITSM systems be required in the future. As such, please confirm that the requirement item k) in section 5.6.2.1 of Annex 1, version 2.1 is for the Contractor to propose a system that will support this requirement should it be requested via a Task Authorization in the future.

ANSWER: 665

Canada confirms that, yes, if requirement k) under section 5.6.2.1 is required in the future, it would be requested through a Task Authorization.

QUESTION: 666

In regards to Annex 3 – Pricing Schedule, Table 2 Firm Lot Monthly Price (K), the Firm Lot Monthly Price in Table 2 is the amount a SaaS provider requires to stand up a specific customer environment that can then scale using the Tier 1 to Tier 3 Firm Unit pricing. The Firm Lot Monthly Price however should be based on the same Metric used to calculate the Firm Unit Pricing (Users, Spend or Transactions). Table 2 however does not allow for the vendor to state what the minimum Metric used to calculate the Firm Lot Monthly Price (e.g. 20,000 GC users or \$1B spend) nor allow the zeroing out of the Firm Unit Pricing increments until this minimum is reached. Can the Crown please revise the tables in order to take this into consideration?

ANSWER: 666

The Firm Lot Monthly Price (K) in Annex 3 allows the Bidders to include a monthly fee that is not linked to any usage (i.e. Users, Catalogue Spend or Transactions) to cover any on-going costs pertaining to the operation of the EPS. Any costs related to usage should be included in the Firm Unit Prices for EPS Operational. As such, Canada will not revise Table 2.

QUESTION: 667

In regards to Secureint.06, it states the solution needs *"to ensure no simultaneous logons are allowed into the EPS for the same unique User account."* Most browser-based applications restrict the ability to initiate simultaneous logons within a single browser session however they often allow for simultaneous connections within different browser sessions. The reasons for this approach include providing users with the ability to work in the way they find most effective (e.g. working with multiple screens), and reducing the impact of failed browser/network connections that could leave an orphaned server-side login sessions. Since this is a standard approach for web-based applications can the Crown please remove this requirement or move it to rated? If the Crown is not able to move the requirement, please provide more information regarding its purpose, some other solution capability may be able to address the Crown's concern.

ANSWER: 667

Canada will accept that Users might initiate logons across multiple browser sessions on a single workstation; however, Canada will not accept the ability for a single user to log into the EPS on multiple workstations or devices simultaneously.

QUESTION: 668

In regards to Section 7.2.7 Government-Wide Deployment – DFMS Instance Transition-In, can the Crown please confirm that it expects each department to be responsible for planning and executing the organizational change management (OCM) tasks required to onboard to the ePS solution. We suggest that in support of the departments, the Contractor can help PSPC maintain a network of change leads from across departments and agencies, and provide a toolkit of OCM materials that each department or agency can customize to their needs.

ANSWER: 668

Please refer to the answer to question #635.

QUESTION: 669

Given the Milestone #6 is limited to the PSPC Acquisition Program, and the Finance and Administration Branch, and give the response to Question #633, as well as the provided volumetric information, can the Crown please clarify whether it is reasonable to estimate that approximately 3500 GC Users, including 1295 Procurement Users, will be using EPS at the completion of this milestone? If not, can the Crown please provide an approximate range for the number of GC Users and Procurement Users who are expected to use the solution at the completion of Milestone #6?

ANSWER: 669

As per the response to question #633, the number of GC Users that will be provided access within AP and FAB has not yet been assessed by Canada. As per section 1.3 Volumetric Data, (j) *Population of Purchasing Group Employees of Annex 1 – Statement of Work, Part 1: Canada's e-Procurement Solution Overview*, the 1295 Procurement Users are the current number of Users within PSPC that are classified as having procurement and procurement related responsibilities. However, Canada is not in a position to estimate or guarantee how many of these individuals will be using the EPS.

QUESTION: 670

In regards to Annex 1 Section 5.6.2.2, it states *"f) Provide password support including self-service password reset capabilities..."*. Since there is a requirement to integrate with MyKey for GC Users, will the Contractor be required to support self-service password reset capabilities? Also, is the Contractor only required to support non-GC User password resets within the Contractor provided IdP? Lastly, can the Crown please clarify their expectation regarding *"password support"*?

ANSWER: 670

If MyKey and GCKey are used to securely log into the EPS, then password reset would be a GC responsibility. If the Contractor provides secured login requirements then it would be the responsibility of the Contractor. For example, "password support" may be providing guidance as to how a User obtains a new password and technical support that may be required.

QUESTION: 671

Based on the information provided in response to Question #541 we understand that the Acquisitions Branch, including the 5 regions, only initiated 455 Call Ups to purchase goods and services against 2794 Standing Offers and 917 Supply Arrangements established for PWGSC's use. This appears to be a small number of call ups relative to the number of framework agreements. Is the Crown able to provide guidance on how to appropriately interpret these seemingly incongruent numbers?

ANSWER: 671

To clarify, most Standing Offers and Supply Arrangements are established by PWGSC's Acquisitions Program for use by the GC and for the use of PWGSC on behalf of the GC (which includes PWGSC itself as a department). The 455 call-ups issued by the Acquisitions Program for PWGSC are call-ups that are above the approved dollar authority of PWGSC's internal procurement group within PWGSC's Finance and Administration Branch (FAB). As per the response to question #633, PWGSC's internal procurement organization within FAB initiated 5708 Call Ups.

QUESTION: 672

Based on the information provided in response to Question #633 we understand that FAB initiated 5708 Call Ups against Framework Agreements. Are we correct in understanding that these call ups are against the same 2794 Standing Offers and 917 Supply Arrangements referenced in question #671? This still represents just 1.5 call ups per FA per year. Can the Crown please guidance on how to appropriately interpret these data points?

ANSWER: 672

Please refer to the answer to question #671.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME