Public Works and Government Services Canada | Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

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

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT
MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION

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

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

Comments - Commentaires
THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY REQUIREMENT. / DOCUMENT CONTIENT DES EXIGENCES RELATIVES A SECURITE

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Informatics Professional Services Division / Division des services professionnels en informatique
11 Laurier St., / 11, rue Laurier
4C2, Place du Portage
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet SA & A SERVICES	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation W7714-125509/A	**Amendment No. - N° modif.** 006
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client W7714-125509	**Date** 2017-03-23
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-$IPS-006-31062	
File No. - N° de dossier 006ips.W7714-125509	**CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME**
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin **at - à 02:00 PM** **on - le 2017-03-28**	**Time Zone** **Fuseau horaire** Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. **Plant-Usine:** ☐ **Destination:** ☑ **Other-Autre:** ☐	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Aresta, Arden	**Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur** 006ips
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (873) 469-4958 ( )	**FAX No. - N° de FAX** (819) 956-5078
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**	

Canada

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT NO. 006

This amendment is raised to:

1. Provide answers to bidders questions in relation to this RFP; and
2. Amend the RFP as detailed in Appendix A-4 below.

Question 12:

Regarding R5 for each resource category:
Current criteria: *For M1, the Bidder should demonstrate the relevance of University Degree or College Diploma to IT Security*

- *Degree/Diploma is aligned to IT Security = 2 pts*
- *Degree/Diploma is moderately aligned to IT Security = 1 pts*
- *Degree/Diploma is not aligned to IT Security = 0 pts*

We note that the level of experience for each of these categories is at senior level and the IT security consultants that meet all of the criteria of this RFP would have been in the IT industry for 15 to 20 years at a minimum. This means that their degrees would have been obtained in that timeframe where IT security and subjects related to today's IT context/subjects would not have existed. It would therefore be impossible to demonstrate such relevance.

Given this, we ask that the crown please consider removing the requirement for '*relevance to IT Security'* and in place provide points for Degrees and Diplomas achieved in any discipline as follows: *(We note that academic credentials are optional in M1)*

Proposed change: *For M1, the Bidder should demonstrate the resource has obtained a University Degree or College Diploma in any discipline and certifications/courses taught (in addition to those demonstrated to achieve points in R3 and R4):*

- *Degree = 2 pts*
- *Diploma + certification or courses taught additional to R3 and R4 = 2 pts*
- *Diploma = 1 pts*
- *No Degree/Diploma = 0 pts*

Answer 12:

The intent here is to acknowledge IT, IM related degrees or diplomas with "security" as its main focus, or computer science/engineering (although more general, provide the foundation for security work). "Unrelated" degrees or diplomas would not be compensated, but the courses/training criteria would be used to give credit to those who established a career in the field. The experience criteria would give further credit. While security related degrees did not exist 15-20 years ago, people working in the field would also have more time to take courses/build experience, whereas new graduates with a security degree would not have comparable courses/experience. The criteria will remain as is.

Question 13:

Regarding criterion R1 item 2 "tangible deliverables' for each consultant category:

As stated, the list of 'tangible deliverables' provided in R1 is an example only.

We assume to achieve points the bidder must demonstrate tangible deliverables that are related to each individual category (e.g. those listed in the SOW) and not necessarily with the examples listed in R1 (e.g. Business Case) as those listed may not relate to some of the categories.

Please confirm our assumption is correct.

Answer 13:

Correct; these are examples only. Trade-off studies, reports and other deliverables that are customary for the line of work are tangible deliverables. An incident management specialist would cite investigation reports rather than a business case.

Question 14:

Regarding Part 7, item 7.5 Security Requirement:
Please confirm that at time of bid, each resource must hold a TS clearance and that all other clearance types listed in Part 7 (SIGINT/TSK/NATO) will be required on an 'as and when' needed basis at the TA stage**.**

Answer 14:

Each resource must hold the valid security clearances at bid closing (please refer to Solicitation Amendment 002 – Appendix A-1).

Question 15:

We assume that given the timeframe restrictions for M2 and R1 (for each category) as follows:

- *M2: 2 projects completed within the past 8 years*
- *R1: more than 4 years of experience within the past 6 years (for full points)*

the project durations of the 2 projects demonstrated in M2 may be counted toward the total number of years demonstrated in R1, with the understanding that all months counted must be within the past 6 years.

Our assumption is based on the fact that the 2 projects provided in M2 may, in most cases, take up most of the '*within the past 6 years'* timeframe which would make it impossible for many candidates to score any points in R1. Please confirm our assumption is correct.

Answer 15:

In most cases, active resources may undertake several projects concurrently. Additionally, some tasks may be short duration. This is what was assumed when the criteria were developed.

Ideally, the resources would highlight two shorter projects for M2 and additional (different) projects for R1 that maximize the score.

In the proposed case, where resources were involved in long term work, the criteria would disadvantage the resources. The Crown could consider the change, however if all respondents score maximum points, then the scoring will no longer work as a differentiating tool and the contract will be awarded based on lowest cost.

Question 16:

Regarding R3 for the PKI Specialist category: This requirement is limiting given the high percentage of points offered for PKI specific certifications, which are extremely rare as they are most common with PKI Solutions companies. We therefore ask that the crown please consider one of the following to provide a fair chance to senior consultants who have extensive relevant training and experience to achieve a competitive score:

a) remove this criterion from the PKI category given its specificity and rarity of such certs.
b) allow for other technical certifications relevant to DRDC's requirements

Answer 16:

PKI implementation relies on several underlying technologies/knowledge/skills. In addition to PKI specific certification, as per (b) of the question, certification in these other technical areas relevant to PKI will also be accepted (for example, X.500 certificates, cross-certification of CA's, etc).

Appendix A-4:

1. Canada has amended the RFP as follows:

At Appendix C to Annex A, at section 1.8, at criterion R3:

DELETE: *In its entirety.*

INSERT: ***R3. The Bidder should list the proposed resource's current professional qualifications related to PKI. Since PKI implementation relies on several underlying technologies/knowledge/skills, in addition to PKI specific certification, the Bidder should list certification in other technical areas relevant to PKI that are related to DRDC's requirements (for example, X.500 certificates, cross-certification of Certificate Authority's, etc.).***

Copies of the certifications / qualifications must be included with the bid.

2. Canada has amended the RFP as follows:

At Attachment 4.1, Bid Evaluation Criteria, at section 2.8, at criterion R3:

DELETE: *In its entirety.*

INSERT: ***R3. The Bidder should list the proposed resource's current professional qualifications related to PKI. Since PKI implementation relies on several underlying technologies/knowledge/skills, in addition to PKI specific certification, the Bidder should list certification in other technical areas relevant to PKI that are related to DRDC's requirements (for example, X.500 certificates, cross-certification of Certificate Authority's, etc.).***

Copies of the certifications / qualifications must be included with the bid.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.