



**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**

**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**

THERE IS A SECURITY REQUIREMENT  
ASSOCIATED WITH THIS SOLICITATION

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**

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

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**

Business Transformation and Systems Integration  
Service/Division de transformation des opérations et  
d'intégrat

Special Procurement Initiative Dir

Dir. des initiatives spéciales

d'approvisionnement

11 Laurier, Place du Portage III

12C1

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

<b>Title - Sujet</b> ISS Transformation - RFP	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> EP243-170549/B	<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 004
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20170549	<b>Date</b> 2017-06-27
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$XE-678-31237	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 678xe.EP243-170549	<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 2017-07-14</b>	
<b>Time Zone</b> Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
<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> Oates, Christine	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 678xe
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (873) 469-3917 ( )	<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>

**Amendment Number 004**

**Purpose:**

- A. To identify changes to the RFP.
- B. To provide answers to questions received with regards to this RFP.

---

**A. CHANGES**

**Change 46:**

At ANNEX A, Section 1, 3.1 Volumetric Data:

**DELETE** the text at 3.1.1 User Accounts in its entirety and **REPLACE** with the following:

Internal User Accounts: Current total of 487 accounts, of which 396 are CSP and 91 are CGP user accounts.

External User Accounts: Current total of 183,905 user accounts which breaks down as follows:

- (a) CSP External User Accounts - Industry: 161,000 user accounts;
- (b) CSP External User Accounts – Government Users: 905 user accounts; and
- (c) CGP External User Accounts - 22,000\* user accounts.

\*Note: Currently CGP does not have any External User Accounts. However, it is estimated that the Solution will facilitate access to approximately 22,000 CGP External User accounts.

**Change 47:**

At ANNEX A, Section 1, 3.1 Volumetric Data, 3.1.2 Activity Specific Volumes.

**DELETE** "Reported volumes are based on totals from the 2015-2016 fiscal year." and **REPLACE** with the following:

Represented below are the different transactions within the ISS business with an indication of annual and daily volumes. Reported volumes are based on totals from the 2015-16 fiscal year.

**Change 48:**

At ANNEX A, Section 5 under 1.2 Detailed Requirements:

**DELETE:**

SC.71	The Solution must dynamically provision identities.
-------	---

**NOTE: The following Changes 49 to 56 apply to Attachment 1 to Part 4.**

**Change 49:**

At 3. Mandatory Criteria, M1:

**DELETE** paragraphs 1 and 2, and **REPLACE** with the following:

The Bidder must provide **three (3)** similar Reference Projects completed within **fifteen (15)** years of the date of Bid Closing and having a public-facing internet-based information exchange component. For all Reference Projects, the Bidder must have been contracted to provide services including Business

Process Re-engineering and Change Management for a business systems transformation project, from high level business requirements through to an operational, Customer accepted solution.

For the purpose of this evaluation, a similar project would be defined as having similar requirements to those described in ANNEX A Sections 2 through 8, at least 65% of the total number of user accounts, and at least 65% of the number of and diversity of transactions as indicated in ANNEX A, Section 1, 3.1, Volumetric Data. See table below for reference.

Metric	RFP	Minimum for Reference Projects
User Accounts – Internal & External	184,392	119,854
Number of transactions	209,469	136,154
Diversity of Transactions	12	7

**Change 50:**

At 3. Mandatory Criteria, M1:

**DELETE** Item D, sub-item vi in its entirety and **REPLACE** with the following:

Volumetrics, including number of user accounts, number of and diversity of transactions; and

**Change 51:**

At 3. Mandatory Criteria, M2:

**DELETE** paragraphs 1 and 2, and **REPLACE** with the following:

The Bidder must provide **three (3)** similar Reference Projects completed within **fifteen (15)** years of the date of Bid Closing and having a public-facing internet-based information exchange component. For all Reference Projects, the Bidder must have been contracted to provide three (3) of the six (6) key activities (IT design, configuration, development, implementation, integration and data migration services). All six (6) key activities must have been a contracted service for at least one of the Reference Projects.

For the purpose of this evaluation, a similar project would be defined as having similar requirements to those described in ANNEX A Sections 2 through 8, at least 65% of the total number of user accounts, and at least 65% of the number of and diversity of transactions as indicated in ANNEX A, Section 1, 3.1, Volumetric Data. See table below for reference.

Metric	RFP	Minimum for Reference Projects
User Accounts – Internal & External	184,392	119,854
Number of transactions	209,469	136,154
Diversity of Transactions	12	7

**Change 52:**

At 3. Mandatory Criteria, M2:

**DELETE** Item A, sub-item vi in its entirety and **REPLACE** with the following:

Volumetrics, including number of user accounts, number of and diversity of transactions; and

**Change 53:**

At 3. Mandatory Criteria, M2:

**DELETE** Item D in its entirety.

**Change 54:**

At 3. Mandatory Criteria:

**DELETE** M3 in its entirety and **REPLACE** with the following:

For each Reference Project provided in response to M1 and M2, the Bidder must complete Form 2 to Part 4. The client contact may be contacted to validate the information provided in the Bidder's response, in accordance with Part 4.2.4, Reference Checks.

**Change 55:**

At 4. Point Rated Criteria:

**DELETE** R4 in its entirety and **REPLACE** with the following:

The Bidder should provide, for two (2) operational scenarios, a description of the necessary security considerations for steady-state operations as required for the ISST Solution. The response should contain sufficient information to be considered an end to end description for that particular scenario. The document should highlight the requirements for security as indicated in the Security Requirements section of ANNEX A, Section 4.

The Bidder should respond in a format for a Concept of Security Operations (SecConOps) document typical for industry usage. A Table of Contents will not be provided by GC.

For the purposes of this evaluation, Operational Scenario is defined as a single activity or group of activities that are related and are required to complete a process within the Solution. Each scenario used in this response, requires consideration of all of the Security Controls referenced in A, B, C, D, below.

Examples of "Operational Scenarios" include, but are not limited to:

- a) describe the end to end movement of a single message from within Dynamics CRM to a third party recipient;
- b) describe the scenario of an ISS Field Inspector completing an on-site inspection and submitting the final document to the Dynamics CRM based solution;
- c) describe the ETL extraction of data for the purposes of Business Intelligence Reporting;
- d) describe the provision of a single users credentials;
- e) describe the submission of a user completed service request (excluding ISS processing); and

f) describe the process to move a recently completed case to the “solution” archive.

Despite the fact that actual implementation of some of the activities described may fall under other Government of Canada group’s responsibilities, the Bidder should assume for the purposes of this response and this response only, that they will be responsible for all aspects of the implementation of the operational scenarios of their choice. It is important that all points be addressed even if deemed not applicable. Non-applicable items should contain Bidder reasoning for their non-applicability.

Canada will evaluate the degree to which the Bidder’s approach to security management reflects the required security controls. In particular, the approach should :

- A. Reference and address all parts of SC.47 General;
- B. Reference and address all parts of SC.16 Information Security Architecture; and
- C. Reference and address all parts of SC.09(a) Information Systems Connections; and
- D. Reference and Address all parts of SC.42 Security Test Plan.

**Change 56:**

At 4. Point Rated Criteria:

**DELETE** R8 in its entirety and **REPLACE** with the following:

The Bidder should provide up to three (3) Reference Projects where it has successfully delivered an IT solution for a Government of Canada client. Reference Projects can include projects provided in response to the Mandatory Criteria where appropriate. Bidders are requested to complete Form 2 to Part 4 for all Reference Projects provided in response to R8. The client contact may be contacted to validate the information provided in the Bidder’s response, in accordance with Part 4.2.4, Reference Checks.

**B. QUESTIONS**

**Question 38:**

M2 requires that corporate experience projects must include a “public-facing internet-based information exchange component” and “no less than 35% of the number of users, number of accounts and number and diversity of transactions indicated in Annex A”. The Requirement M2 is linked to the Rated Requirement R8, which scores bidders favourably for M2 projects that are within the Canadian federal government. In our experience, there are very few similar programs within the federal government that would have a public facing portal component, and still meet the requirement for volumetrics. We also believe that both these requirements are addressed in the experience requirements for M1. Would Canada consider removing the requirement for a “public-facing internet-based information exchange component” and the volume requirements for no less than 35% of the number of users, number of accounts and number and diversity of transactions indicated in Annex A” from M2?

**Answer 38:**

To provide clarity for the definition of similar projects in terms of size and complexity, M1 and M2 have been amended. Reference Projects are to have 65% of the volumetric data indicated in ANNEX A. See table below for reference.

<b>Metric</b>	<b>RFP</b>	<b>Minimum for Reference Projects</b>
User Accounts – Internal & External	184,392	119,854
Number of transactions	209,469	136,154
Diversity of Transactions	12	7

Canada acknowledges that there may be a limited number of government projects, at all levels of government, which are public facing and are similar in size and complexity. As such, Evaluation Criteria M2, Item D has been deleted.

Evaluation Criteria R8 has been amended and is no longer linked to Evaluation Criteria M2. Instead, it now allows the Bidder to reference other IT solution projects that were delivered to the Government of Canada.

Please see Changes 49 – 53, and 56 in this Amendment 004. Additionally, see Question and Answer set 39.

**Question 39:**

With respect to Mandatory M1 & M2, PSPC has stated the following:

*For the purpose of this evaluation, a similar project would be defined as no less than*

*35% of the number of users, number of accounts, and number and diversity of transactions indicated in ANNEX A, Section 1, 3.1, Volumetric Data.*

Can you please confirm the following:

1. The Volumetric Data in section 3.1 references “user accounts” and does not separate number of users from number of account. Therefore, does the requirement for “number of users and number of accounts” actually mean the “number of user accounts”?
2. That the correct volume number of user accounts based on the 35% calculation is 64,537:

<b>Metric</b>	<b>RFP</b>	<b>Minimum for Reference Projects</b>
User Accounts - Internal	487	170
User Accounts - External	183,905	64,367
<b>Total:</b>	<b>184,735</b>	<b>64,537</b>

3. For “diversity of transactions” a project that has several different transaction types, but not necessarily the exact type or number of transaction types, is acceptable.
4. That the correct number of transactions for a similar project based on the 35% calculation is:

Metric	RFP	Minimum for Reference Projects
Transaction Volume - Yearly	362,178	126,762

5. That demonstrating that the reference project meets the minimum number of user accounts, and number of transactions is sufficient to comply with the requirement:

*For the purpose of this evaluation, a similar project would be defined as no less than 35% of the number of users, number of accounts, and number and diversity of transactions indicated in ANNEX A, Section 1, 3.1, Volumetric Data.*

**Answer 39:**

Mandatory Evaluation M1 and M2 have been amended to provide clarity for the definition of similar projects in terms of size and complexity. M1 and M2 have been amended to indicate that referenced projects are to have 65% of the volumetric data indicated in ANNEX A.

1. The term users has been removed and reference is now made only to user accounts. Changes have been made to both ANNEX A, Section 1, 3.1 Volumetric Data as well as M1 and M2 of the Technical Evaluation.
2. Please see the response to Question 38 in this Amendment.
3. An amendment has been made to ANNEX A, Section 1, 3.1 Volumetric Data to provide clarity to the different transactions that currently exist within the ISS. Please see the response to Question 38 in this Amendment.
4. Please see the response to Question 38 in this Amendment.
5. Bidders must demonstrate that they meet all of the requirements of M1 and M2, not just the volumetric measures.

Please see Changes 46, 47, and 49 – 53 in this Amendment 004.

**Question 40:**

Will PSPC ensure that the existing information exchange agreements with ISS security partners, including RCMP, CSIS, CSE, DND, Credit Bureau/Equifax, are valid for the entire duration of the contract?

**Answer 40:**

Information exchange agreements will remain in place so long as they are required in order for ISS to deliver on its mandate. It will be the responsibility of the GC to update the contractor should there be changes to the exchange agreements that will have an impact on the ISST project.

**Question 41:**

If the term “GC packaged inventory” refers to the products available on the GC SLISA should bidders assume that PSPC will procure these products separately and provide them as Government Furnished Equipment?

**Answer 41:**

The Contractor should not assume that GC will provide any software products other than those identified by name in Section 3, Technical Requirements.

**Question 42:**

In reference to Annex A, Section 5: IT Security Requirements, 1.2 Detailed Requirements, SC.71 (page 51 of 70);

**Question:** *Can you further explain what is meant by “dynamically provision identities”?*

**Answer 42:**

The requirement SC.71 has been deleted. Please see Change 48 in this Amendment 004.

**Question 43:**

In reference to Attachment 1 to Part 4 – Technical Evaluation, Section 3. Mandatory Criteria, M1 (page 3 of 10), the RFP states “For the purpose of this evaluation, a similar project would be defined as no less than 35% of **the number of users, number of accounts**, and number and diversity of transactions indicated in ANNEX A, Section 1, 3.1, Volumetric Data.”

**Question:** *Could PSPC explain the difference between number of users and number of accounts?*

**Answer 43:**

Please see response to Questions 38 and 39.1 in this Amendment.

**Question 44:**

In reference to Attachment 1 to Part 4 – Technical Evaluation, Section 3. Mandatory Criteria, M1 (page 3 of 10), the RFP states “For the purpose of this evaluation, a similar project would be defined as no less than 35% of the number of users, number of accounts, and **number and diversity of transactions** indicated in ANNEX A, Section 1, 3.1, Volumetric Data.”

**(a)** *Could PSPC provide an explanation as to what “Diversity of Transaction” means or refers to? Would an application that included: Registrations, Document Control and an Application specific transaction (as per nature of the reference Application) constitutes a demonstration of diversity of transaction?*

Please note that after implementation, we are no longer on client site and are unable to ascertain the number of transactions. In some cases, clients consider the transaction types and the number of transactions to be confidential information and as such, it will be difficult to provide this information.

**(b)** *Could the “**number and diversity of transaction**” section of the requirement be removed?*

**Answer 44:**

(a) These examples demonstrate some of the various transaction types expected of the Solution. However, please refer to the response to Questions 38 and 39.3 for an explanation of the required diversity of transactions.

(b) As this is part of the evaluation of the Reference Projects, in order to assess similarity in size and complexity, the requirement cannot be removed.

**Question 45:**

Please clarify your direction in terms of the required Document Management System. Do you prefer using OpenText in GC-Docs or can we propose a different system?

**Answer 45:**

Please refer to Question 33 and Change 33 in amendment 003.

**Question 46:**

With respect to Mandatory M2 item D, PSPC has stated the following:

*For at least one (1) Reference Project, the solution must have been a business systems transformation project for a government entity (federal, provincial, or municipal levels of government).*

Can PSPC please confirm that the “government entity” refers to a general public sector entity that does not need to be within Canada? If this is not the case, we respectfully request that the requirement be changed to “public sector entity”.

**Answer 46:**

Evaluation Criteria M2 has been amended to remove item D. Please see the response to Question 38 in this Amendment 004.

**Question 47:**

With respect to Rated R8, PSPC has stated the following:

*The Bidder should demonstrate, for at least one (1) and up to three (3) of the Reference Projects provided in response to Mandatory Requirement M2, that it has successfully delivered a solution similar in nature and scope to that described in Annex A, Section 2 to 7, for a Government of Canada client.*

We respectfully request that the reference to “Government of Canada client” be changed and broadened to a “Public Sector Client”. If this is not acceptable, then we request it be limited to a “Canadian Public Sector client”.

**Answer 47:**

Evaluation criteria R8 has been amended to the effect that the bidder may reference any three projects where it has successfully delivered an IT solution to a Government of Canada client. Please see the response to Question 38 in this amendment.

**Question 48:**

With respect to R8, would Canada open the requirement to include experience for any government entity? This would allow bidders to demonstrate experience outside of Canada that could be leveraged for this project.

**Answer 48:**

Evaluation criteria R8 has been amended to the effect that the bidder may reference any three projects where it has successfully delivered an IT solution to a Government of Canada client. Please see the response to Question 38 in this amendment.

**Question 49:**

Would PSPC consider expanding the requirements in Section R8 to be specific to Government rather than Government of Canada?

**Answer 49:**

Evaluation criteria R8 has been amended to the effect that the bidder may reference any three projects where it has successfully delivered an IT solution to a Government of Canada client. Please see the response to Question 38 in this amendment.

**Question 50:**

Regarding requirement R4, a Concept of Security Operations is requested. Based on Canada's SA&A process, the ConOps is a significant project deliverable that will require input from both PSPC as well as SSC as there are a number of infrastructure and operations related security requirements that will be the

responsibility of SSC and not the contractor. Respectfully, we ask that Canada either remove the requirement and identify it as a project deliverable, or modify the requirement to make it more applicable to the RFP stage by requiring bidders to identify their approach to defining the Concept of Security Operations but not actually build out a complete Concept of Security Operations (which is actually a project deliverable and not suitable for inclusion within an RFP). PSPC, should define a Table of Contents for the Concept of Security Operations in R4 and then score bidders against how they write up their approach to each section of the Table of Contents. In this manner it will be easier to score bidders as they are being scored against the same format and allow for consistency of bidders' responses.

**Answer 50:**

R4 has been amended to clarify the expected response and the scope of the evaluation. Please see Change 55 in this Amendment 004.

**Question 51:**

Per Annex A page 38 requirement SecureInt.05 (should this be # 06?) "Ensures that SCMS is accessible through a VPN"

- a) What is the standard PWGSC VPN technology product and the specific VPN platform version?
- b) Will the Crown supply the VPN platform as Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) as part of this contract?

**Answer 51:**

PWGSC is currently using Cisco AnyConnect Secure Mobility Client V 3.1.03103. The GC will supply, as part of the contract, the VPN platform as GFE where required. The duplication of SecureInt.05 was corrected. Please see Change 37 in Amendment 003.

**Question 52:**

Per SECTION 6: TESTING MANAGEMENT page 53 statement "The Contractor will be provided suitable development environments in which to configure the approved business processes prior to testing." The Crown also requires as per SECTION 5: IT SECURITY REQUIREMENTS on page 39 a Vulnerability Assessment Plan.

- a) Will the Crown provide its standard vulnerability scanning platform as GFE for the vendor to execute the vulnerability Assessment Plan and if so what is the platform?
- b) Will the Crown provide its standard Web Application vulnerability scanning platform as GFE for the vendor to execute the vulnerability Assessment Plan and if so what is the platform?

**Answer 52:**

IBM Security AppScan is the main tool that is used for vulnerability testing within PWGSC. The contractor will work with the PWGSC Vulnerability Team and SSC who perform the vulnerability testing. The Contractor will receive the results of the tests as per the approved Vulnerability Assessment Plan. The Contractor is not responsible to provide any vulnerability scanning platform.

**Question 53:**

Requirement R4, Attachment 1 to Part 4 - Technical Evaluation page 8 of 10 request the definition of a Concept of Security Operations - The bidder is not responsible for the physical security of the ISST. Please elaborate on what scope the Concept of Security Operations the bidder should respond to by providing a table of contents (TOC) of the Con Ops document it wishes to receive.

**Answer 53:**

Please see response to Question 50 in this Amendment 004.

**Question 54:**

Attachment 1 to Part 4, M1, the second paragraph states:

“For the purpose of this evaluation, a similar project would be defined as no less than 35% of the number of users, number of accounts, and number and diversity of transactions indicated in ANNEX A, Section 1, 3.1, Volumetric Data.”

Will a reference project be considered accepted and compliant if the total number of users, number of accounts, and number of Transactions is no less than the defined percentage of the Volumetric Data total?

**Answer 54:**

Evaluation criteria M1 has been amended to clarify reference projects of similar size and complexity. Please see response to Question 38 in this amendment. Bidders must demonstrate that they meet all of the requirements of M1, not just the volumetric measures.

**Question 55:**

With respect to Attachment 1 to Part 4, M1 and M2: The corporate references used in support of both M1 and M2 are required to have a “public-facing” component. Please confirm that “public-facing” in this context refers to an entry point to the referenced system that is external to the referenced Client’s organization.

**Answer 55:**

“Public-facing”, as stated in Evaluation Criteria M1 and M2, is where the entry point to the referenced system is external to the client’s organization and accessible to the public. Please see also the response to Question 38 in this amendment.

**Question 56:**

In reference to Attachment 1 to Part 4 – Technical Evaluation, 3. Point Rated Criteria, R4 Security Management (page 8 of 10), the requirement states:

“Reference and address all parts of SC-04 Audit and Accountability”.

The bidder will not be conducting audits or accountability of the operational solution. That would be the responsibility of the operating authority.

Will Canada consider amending this requirement to have the bidder describe the technical capabilities of the solution (only) and how it would be configured to support audit and accountability consistent with GC standards?

**Answer 56:**

Please see the response to Question 50 in this amendment.

**Question 57:**

In reference to Annex A – Statement of Work, Section 3: Technical Requirements, 1.2 Technical Requirements, Tech.18 (page 33 of 70):

We are unable to reach the following link for GC Web Standards and Web Accessibility. Please validate that this is the correct link.

<http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=23601>

**Answer 57:**

Please see Change 36, provided in Amendment 003.

**Question 58:**

At M2 (E), it seems that one or more words are \*missing here\*. Please confirm it should read as:

E. For at least one (1) Reference Project, the solution implemented must have had security requirements \*similar\* to those identified in ANNEX A, Section 5, 1.2. IT Security Requirements.

**Answer 58:**

Please see response to Question 50 in this Amendment.

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