



**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> 006
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 20170549	<b>Date</b> 2017-07-18
<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 2017-08-11</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> 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 006**

**Purpose:**

- A. To identify changes to the RFP.
- B. To provide answers to questions received with regards to this RFP.
- C. To publish the Bidders' Conference Minutes.

**A. CHANGES**

**Change 57:**

At Attachment 1 to Part 4 – Technical Evaluation, Section 1. Overview of the Technical Evaluation:

**DELETE** the table titled Technical Evaluation Summary and **REPLACE** with the following:

<b>Technical Evaluation Summary</b>			
<b>ID</b>	<b>Mandatory Criteria</b>	<b>Met/Not Met</b>	
M1	Corporate Reference Projects: Business Process Re-engineering and Change Management		
M2	Corporate Reference Projects: IT Solution		
M3	Customer References		
<b>ID</b>	<b>Point Rated Criteria</b>	<b>Maximum Points</b>	<b>Actual Score</b>
R1	Project Management	620	
R2	Business Process Re-engineering	360	
R3	Relationship Management	160	
R4	Security Management	360	
R5	Sensitive Data Migration	200	
R6	Change Management Plan	380	
R7	Testing Plan	160	
R8	Corporate Reference Projects: Government of Canada Client	80	
R9	Corporate Reference Projects: Case Management and Microsoft Dynamics CRM	180	
<b>Maximum Total Points for Point Rated Criteria</b>		<b>2500</b>	
<b>Minimum Pass Mark for Point Rated Criteria (70%)</b>		<b>1750</b>	

**Change 58:**

At Attachment 1 to Part 4 – Technical Evaluation, Section 3. Point Rated Criteria:

**DELETE**

<b>R3</b>	<p><b>Relationship Management</b></p> <p>The Bidder should describe their approach to Relationship Management.</p> <p>Canada will evaluate the degree to which the Bidder's response considers the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Overall approach to Government of Canada and Systems Integrator relationship management;</li> <li>B. Communications between the Government of Canada and the Systems Integrator in respect to a proposed governance model and team structure as detailed in R1. A.;</li> <li>C. Issue management and resolution;</li> <li>D. Joint planning and managing of changes to project scope and schedule.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Maximum Points : 170</b></p> <p>Part A Maximum Points : 50</p> <p>Part B Maximum Points : 30</p> <p>Part C Maximum Points: 40</p> <p>Part D Maximum Points : 50</p>	
-----------	--	---	--

**INSERT**

<b>R3</b>	<p><b>Relationship Management</b></p> <p>The Bidder should describe their approach to Relationship Management.</p> <p>Canada will evaluate the degree to which the Bidder's response considers the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Overall approach to Government of Canada and Systems Integrator relationship management;</li> <li>B. Communications between the Government of Canada and the Systems Integrator in respect to a proposed governance model and team structure as detailed in R1. A.;</li> <li>C. Issue management and resolution;</li> <li>D. Joint planning and managing of changes to project scope and schedule.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Maximum Points : 170</b></p> <p>Part A Maximum Points : 50</p> <p>Part B Maximum Points : 25</p> <p>Part C Maximum Points: 35</p> <p>Part D Maximum Points : 50</p>	
-----------	--	---	--

**Change 59:**

At Attachment 1 to Part 4 – Technical Evaluation, Section 3. Point Rated Criteria:

**DELETE**

<b>R7</b>	<b>Testing Plan</b>	<b>Maximum Points: 170</b>		
	<p>The Bidder should prepare a preliminary testing plan in accordance with the requirements of the ANNEX A, Section 6. The Bidder should be guided by the business and technical requirements and conceptual architecture for preparing the test plan.</p> <p>Canada will evaluate the degree to which the Bidder’s test plan demonstrates:</p>			
	<p>A. Due consideration of related Security requirements from SC-42 Security Integration Test Plan as well as Section 6 of ANNEX A;</p>			Part A Maximum Points: 40
	<p>B. Adequate test coverage to ensure Solution go-live readiness. Due consideration of and reference to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Integration testing;</li> <li>ii. Functional and non-functional Testing, including Security Testing;</li> <li>iii. Data Validation Testing;</li> <li>iv. Client acceptance testing.</li> </ul>			Part B Maximum Points: 100 (Maximum 25 points for each element)
	<p>C. The identification of risk and its management.</p>	Part C Maximum Points: 30		

**INSERT**

<b>R7</b>	<b>Testing Plan</b>	<b>Maximum Points: 170</b>		
	<p>The Bidder should prepare a preliminary testing plan in accordance with the requirements of the ANNEX A, Section 6. The Bidder should be guided by the business and technical requirements and conceptual architecture for preparing the test plan.</p> <p>Canada will evaluate the degree to which the Bidder’s test plan demonstrates:</p>			
	<p>A. Due consideration of related Security requirements from SC-42 Security Integration Test Plan as well as Section 6 of ANNEX A;</p>			Part A Maximum Points: 40
	<p>B. Adequate test coverage to ensure Solution go-live readiness. Due consideration of and reference to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Integration testing;</li> <li>ii. Functional and non-functional Testing, including Security Testing;</li> <li>iii. Data Validation Testing;</li> <li>iv. Client acceptance testing.</li> </ul>			Part B Maximum Points: 100 (Maximum 25 points for each element)
	<p>C. The identification of risk and its management.</p>			

		Part C Maximum Points: 20	
--	--	---------------------------------	--

**Change 60:**

At Attachment 1 to Part 4 – Technical Evaluation, Section 3. Point Rated Criteria:

**DELETE**

<b>R9</b>	<p><b>Corporate Reference Projects: Case Management and Microsoft Dynamics Client Relationship Management</b></p> <p>The Bidder should demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. At least one (1) of the three (3) of the Reference Projects provided in response to Mandatory Requirement M2, that it has successfully delivered a solution, requiring both IT design and configuration, using a Case Management solution.</li> <li>B. If the Bidder demonstrates that it has used a Case Management solution and Microsoft Dynamics CRM for the same Reference Project, that Project will count as two Reference Projects.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Maximum Points: 160</b></p> <p>Maximum Points for A: 80</p> <p>One (1) Reference Project: 30</p> <p>Two (2) Reference Projects: 50</p>	
	<p>For the purposes of this evaluation, Case Management is defined as the management of activities including but not limited to; the initiation, coordination, research, maintenance and completion of a service request action from a client, until its resolution.</p>	<p>Three (3) Reference Projects: 80</p> <p>Maximum Points for B: 80</p> <p>One (1) Reference Project: 30</p> <p>Two (2) Reference Projects: 50</p> <p>Three (3) Reference Projects: 80</p>	

**INSERT**

<b>R9</b>	<p><b>Corporate Reference Projects: Case Management and Microsoft Dynamics Client Relationship Management</b></p> <p>The Bidder should provide up to three (3) Reference Projects which will be evaluated in relation to items A, B and C, below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Reference Projects that have successfully delivered a solution, requiring both IT design and configuration, using a Case Management solution.</li> <li>B. Reference Projects that have successfully delivered a solution requiring both IT design and configuration, using Microsoft Dynamics CRM for the solution.</li> <li>C. Reference Projects that have successfully delivered a solution requiring IT design, configuration, and integration of a COTS Web Portal solution with either a Case Management or Microsoft Dynamics CRM solution.</li> </ul> <p>For the purposes of the evaluation, Case Management is defined as the management of activities including but not limited to; the initiation, coordination, research, maintenance and completion of a service request action from a client, until its resolution. COTS Web Portal is defined as a commercially available (Off the Shelf) software package that provides a public-facing vertical internet-based information exchange component (on-premises) of the Solution that integrates with the Case Management platform (on-premises) and serves as the central, self-service interface enabling communication and interaction between External Users and the two Industrial Security Sector programs: Contracts Security Program and Controlled Goods Program.</p> <p>Bidders are encouraged to provide reference projects that are able to meet the criteria for the evaluation points in order to maximize their score. Reference projects can include projects that were used as reference for the Mandatory Criteria where appropriate. Bidders are requested to complete Form 2 to Part 4 for all Reference Projects provided in response to R9. 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.</p> <p>For Example, if a bidder provides three reference projects where Criteria A is satisfied by all three references, Criteria B is satisfied by two of the three references and Criteria C is satisfied by only one of the three references. The bidder would</p>	<p><b>Maximum Points: 180</b></p> <p>Maximum Points for A: 60</p> <p>One (1) Reference Project: 40</p> <p>Two (2) Reference Projects: 50</p> <p>Three (3) Reference Projects: 60</p> <p>Maximum Points for B: 60</p> <p>One (1) Reference Project: 40</p> <p>Two (2) Reference Projects: 50</p> <p>Three (3) Reference Projects: 60</p> <p>Maximum Points for C: 60</p> <p>One (1) Reference Project: 40</p> <p>Two (2) Reference Projects: 50</p>	
-----------	---	--	--

	receive a total of 150 of the maximum 180 points for Evaluation Criteria R9.				Three (3) Reference Projects: 60		
	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Criteria A</b>	<b>Criteria B</b>	<b>Criteria C</b>			<b>Total R9 Score</b>
	1	X	--	--			
	2	X	X	--			
	3	X	X	X			
Criteria Total	60	50	40	150			

**B. QUESTIONS**

**Question 62:**

Would the Crown please clarify the following scoring scenario? As we read R9, if the Bidder proposes three (3) CRM credentials in response to M2, and two (2) of the credentials are using MS Dynamics, the Bidder would score full points for R9 (a) and (b). Is this correct?

**Answer 62:**

R9 has been amended to remove the requirement that Reference Projects proposed also meet the requirements of M2. R9 has also been amended to clarify the scoring and to introduce an additional evaluation for a COTS Web Portal solution. Points awarded for Rated Criteria R3, R7, R8, and R9 have been revised to accommodate the new evaluation criteria. Please see Changes 57 to 60 in this Amendment.

**Question 63:**

The wording “at least one” in R9 seems to indicate that if none of the Reference Projects provided in response to Mandatory Requirement M2 was delivered using a Case Management solution then the proposal would be non-compliant. At the same time the wording “The Bidder should demonstrate” seems to indicate that this is not a mandatory requirement. Please clarify.

**Answer 63:**

Please see response to Question 62 in this Amendment.

**Question 64:**

Part B of R9 states “If the Bidder demonstrates that it has used a Case Management solution and Microsoft Dynamics CRM for the same Reference Project that Project will count as two Reference Projects”. Should this be understood as “If the Bidder demonstrates that it has used a Case Management solution and Microsoft Dynamics CRM for the same Reference Project, the score for that Project will be doubled (i.e. for one project the score will be 60, for two projects 100 and for three projects 160 points).”

**Answer 64:**

Please see response to Question 62 in this Amendment.

**Question 65:**

In reference to Annex A, Section 2: Business Requirements, 2.2 Detailed Requirements – Functional Requirements, 2.2.1 Service Processing Application, Interconnectivity (APP-ICN) (page 22-23 of 70);

a. **Question:** Can you provide all interface specifications for the entities that are required to be interfaced to (e.g. Saba, RCMP, CSIS, etc)?

b. **Question:** Can you also elaborate on whether the existing automated interfaces should remain the same, or are their new interfacing techniques available from the other Government Entities that you wish to adopt?

**Answer 65:**

The new interface specifications do not currently exist. The contractor must derive them from the business process reengineering activities while taking into consideration any other OGD requirements at that time. The Contractor should not assume that any existing information exchange channel is compliant to the proposed architecture, complies with security requirements, or meets business process requirements.

**Question 66:**

In reference to Annex A – Statement of Work, 2.2 Detailed Requirements – Functional Requirements, 2.2.1 Service Processing Application, APP-OPS.21 (page 18 of 70), are we correct in understanding this requirement as “enabling an automated copy of a production-based environment into a Sandbox instance”?

**Answer 66:**

With respect to ANNEX A, APP-OPS.21, it is expected that an authorized user, via the Solution, will be able to initiate an update to the sandbox environment with a copy of the Solution (application only, no data) that requires no further interaction from the authorized user.

**Question 67:**

Does PSPC have a preference for the ETL tool that will be used to drive the migration (or a selection of tools currently operational within the client site)? SSIS would be the current tool of choice.

**Answer 67:**

GC does not allow direct access to SQL Server or related technologies (SQL Server Integration Services (SSIS) or SQL Server Reporting Services (SSRS)) for support and security reasons. Any ETL tool must connect through the Dynamics CRM Web Services APIs over HTTPS. Examples of tools that have been used by other solutions and connect into the CRM API include KingswaySoft and Scribe. The ETL tool used by the contractor must use the API and fetchXML and be approved by the GC. The contractor must procure and provide the licence(s) to the GC as part of the contract.

**Question 68:**

Have the data owners (those responsible for each of the implicated source data systems) or individuals with titles such as “Data Stewards” of the individual source systems been identified, and will they be available for future consultation?

**Answer 68:**

PWGSC CIOB will be responsible for sustainment and maintenance of the solution’s data and infrastructure components, as well as access to SSC. The Contractor will consult with CIOB on matters related IT storage, security, set up and overall infrastructure in order to seek advice and move forward

with solution's development. These consultations will be set up and facilitated by the PMO upon request of the Contractor.

**Question 69:**

Would it be possible to get an estimation of the sizing of the current source systems (number of tables, number of rows per tables)?

**Answer 69:**

<b>Program Area</b>	<b>Number of Databases</b>	<b>Number of Tables</b>	<b>Rows per Table (Millions)</b>
PSDCA	1	171	1 – 35.7M
DISIS	1	206	1 – 1.02M
CGP	1	229	1 – 1.5 M
FISO	1	65	1 – 10.1 M
OLISS	5	194	1 – 12.5M

Rows per table is defined as a tables within the database having row(s) of data ranging from one row to a maximum number of rows in the Millions.

**Question 70:**

In reference to Annex A – Statement of Work, 2.2 Detailed Requirements – Functional Requirements, 2.2.1 Service Processing Application, APP-IM.23 (page 21 of 70); Microsoft Dynamics CRM does not offer any functionality to access record versioning. Please describe the scenarios which apply to that requirement. How and why will this be used?

**Answer 70:**

With respect to requirement APP-IM.23:

- a. Record versioning is required due to the continuous evolution of the ISS request forms. For Example, should a hard copy of a request be required, upon printing of the request, the information is printed on the same version of the form from which it was submitted to the ISS.
- b. For ATIP inquiries, the original version of requests must be provided.

**Question 71:**

Per page Annex A page 32 statement "All Solution hardware will be provided by GC and no additional installation of hardware is required (other than those related to the network connectivity)."

- a. Will the Crown supply the tokens as Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) as part of this contract to support requirement SecureExt.05 as per Annex A page 38?
- b. If so, please state the token vendor, product model #.

**Answer 71:**

The Contractor can assume that the delivery of any required LoA2 Authentication Tokens will be provided as Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) through GCCF.

The Contractor will be responsible to define the requirements for processes deemed to require LoA3 authentication. The Contractor will work with the GC in the development of the cost of effective authentication LoA3 specific tokens and its related processes that meet the ISS requirements per guidance provided by CSE in its publication "ITSP.30.031 v2 User Authentication Guidance For Information Technology Systems".

**Question 72:**

Please identify the number of dedicated resources, full-time and part-time, assigned by the Crown in support of this project. Please identify these resources in terms of both Business Line, as well as Role. As an example:

<b>Role</b>	<b>Responsibilities</b>	<b>Time Commitment</b>
Program Sponsor	Champions program goals and provides guidance and direction to the program and its projects.	As required
Solution Lead	Supports the Solution Authority. Supports successive iterations of process implementations from a PWGSC perspective.	Full-time
Process Owners	For each process, an owner that is accountable will be identified. This role is accountable for the new/updated process implementation and the realization of benefits. They are the first level validation/verification authority for process design deliverables prior to approval and are the subject matter expert on the current state of the process today	As required
SSC Strategic Change Office	Enterprise-wide center of expertise for organizational change management support and advice in areas such as organizational change management methodology and tools, SSC people readiness, organizational culture and leadership.	As required
OCM Manager	Accountable for establishing and managing the Organizational Change Management (OCM) team for the Project. The Manager and team will provide the Contractor with available organizational data and stakeholder analysis to support OCM planning at the onset of the contract.	Full-time

**Answer 72:**

PWGSC has created an office that is completely dedicated to the ISST project. It has allocated the resources indicated below to the ISST project to either work for the PMO or to support the PMO and the project. Please note that PWGSC may adjust and/or allocate additional resources based on the need of the project as per the Project Authority and/or the PMO. As such, the listing of resources below should not be considered final.

<b>Resource</b>	<b>Responsibilities</b>	<b>Time Commitment</b>
PMO - Project Lead	Provides direction on project goals and liaises between PMO and Senior Management and Project Authority.	Full Time
PMO - Project Manager	Manages the overall project deliverables, project resources, project relationships and the project's objectives as indicated by the project lead.	Full Time
PMO - Project Coordinator	Coordinates and reports on the activities of the project and provides recommendations on overall project approaches.	Full Time
PMO - Project Business Security Officer	Monitors and provides analysis and advice of security and risk considerations for the project.	Part Time
PMO - Up to 5 Project Analysts	Analysts provide analysis, advice and recommendations on approaches to targeted project activities such as change management, process re-engineering and business requirements evaluation.	3 Full Time 2 Part Time
PMO - 2 Junior Analysts	Junior analysts provide support to the other resources of the project through activities such as research	Full Time

	and document drafting.	
CIOB - IT Advisors	Coordinates interactions between PMO and Contractor and SSC and provides technical analysis and advice on GC IT considerations.	As Required
Change Management Champions	Will act as main contacts between PMO and internal business stakeholders and will provide recommendations on requirements and approaches to activities such as training to the PMO.	As Required
PMO - Project Administrator	Keeps track of all project documentation, sets up meetings and drafts records of decision. Supports Project Coordinator in reporting function.	Full Time

**Question 73:**

Per Attachment 1 to Part 4, M1 and M2 – With respect to the requirement that at least one of the reference projects have been initiated and completed within the last 5 years, it is requested that this requirement be changed to at least one reference project be initiated and completed within the past seven and a half years.

**Answer 73:**

Due to the advancements in technology and the developments in project management, we are looking for recent experience that has been initiated and completed within five (5) years of the date of Bid Closing for at least one Reference Project.

**Question 74:**

In reference to Annex A – Statement of Work, Section 5: IT Security Requirements, 1.2 Detailed Requirements, SC.13 (page 43 of 70). The Contractor must employ automated mechanisms to centrally manage, apply, and verify configuration settings and to **respond to unauthorized configuration changes by creating a Security Incident Ticket (PWGSC CIOB)**.

Question/Comment

It should be the operational authority that raises security incident tickets. Will Canada consider deleting this requirement?

**Answer 74:**

The Contractor must employ automated mechanisms to centrally manage, apply, and verify configuration settings and to respond to unauthorized configuration changes to the solution by creating a Security Incident Ticket as per PWGSC standard practices, and notifying in writing, the Operational Authority of the incident. Should the automation of this process not be possible at go-live, an alternate approved process must be in place until an approved automated process is in place. The responsibility will be the Contractor's for the duration of the contract, at which time this function will be returned to the GC.

**Question 75:**

In reference to Annex A – Statement of Work, Section 5: IT Security Requirements, 1.2 Detailed Requirements, SC.14 (page 43 of 70). The Contractor must follow the PWGSC Change Request Management process for any changes to the Solution.

Question/Comment

The bidder is not the operational change manager for the solution once it is delivered. Will Canada consider deleting this requirement?

**Answer 75:**

The contractor must comply with SC.14 for the duration of the contract. The function will return to the GC at completion of the contract.

**Question 76:**

In reference to Annex A – Statement of Work, Section 5: IT Security Requirements, 1.2 Detailed Requirements, SC.15 (page 43 of 70). The Contractor must fully document the contingency plan for the continued operation of ISS business lines to meet the minimal contingency planning requirements for the PB/M/M at a minimum profile of ITSG-33.

Question/Comment

This is the responsibility of the operating authority and the IT hosting organization. Will Canada consider deleting this requirement?

**Answer 76:**

As per SC.15, The Contractor must support the GC, to fully document the solution components section of the contingency plan for the continued operation of ISS business lines, and to meet the minimal contingency planning requirements as outlined in the ITSG-33 for a PB/H/M security profile.

Please see the response to Question 35 in Amendment 003.

**Question 77:**

To implement automated mailing, the Dynamics CRM "Server Side Synch" feature, that connects with Exchange, must be enabled.

- a) Could PSPC please confirm that the Server Synch feature can be implemented at GC?
- b) Could PSPC please indicate the Exchange version implemented at GC?
- c) Could PSPC please provide the upgrade calendar planned for Exchange?

**Answer 77:**

The GC recognizes that MS Dynamics CRM Server Side Synch (SSS) would facilitate the automated mailing. The GC has determined that SSS is not possible with the current MS Exchange Server version (2007) The GC is anticipating a server upgrade to MS Exchange Server (2010) , 3rd quarter 2017.

**Question 78:**

In reference to Annex A – Statement of Work, Section 3: Technical Requirements, 1.2 Technical Requirements, Tech.07, Tech.08, and Tech.09 (page 32-33 of 70):

Does the requirement apply for imaging/scanning system, documents and records management system, forms management and other systems that we reach through the Oracle Service Bus?

**Answer 78:**

The requirement to integrate usage of the GCIP Oracle Service Bus within the Solution architecture is currently limited to integrating the 3rd party service providers and OGD partner systems' interfaces with the Case Management Platform.

**Question 79:**

In reference to Annex A – Statement of Work, Section 3: Technical Requirements, 1.2 Technical Requirements, Tech. 31 (page 35 of 70):

Does the requirement apply for CRM out of the box Services (Organization Service, Discovery Service, Web API)?

**Answer 79:**

All components of the CRM based Solution must have the ability to protect transactional data, in transit and at rest, through the usage of CSE and TBS approved encryption algorithms or GC accepted alternatives.

**Question 80:**

In reference to Annex A – Statement of Work, Section 2: Business Requirements, 2.2 Detailed Requirements – Functional Requirements, APP-OPS.19 (page 18 of 70):

This particular requirement is not a typical functionality for Dynamics CRM. In order to find the appropriate solution, can more details be provided on the business requirements?

**Answer 80:**

With respect to requirement APP-OPS.19, the Solution will provide a screen-sharing capability to facilitate troubleshooting between internal and external users. The purpose is to assist external users submitting an ISS service request that are having difficulty completing the request. The Solution will allow the internal user to see the external user's request as they navigate through the sections to provide guidance. The request-sharing feature will be enabled by the internal user first by prompting the external user to accept and start their request-sharing. Request sharing will only be one way, external to internal.

**Question 81:**

In reference to Annex A – Statement of Work, Section 2: Business Requirements, 2.2 Detailed Requirements – Functional Requirements, APP-UE.02 (page 19 of 70):

The context sensitive hover feature mentioned in this requirement is not present in Microsoft Dynamics CRM. The system does provide a way to customize the help experience to provide contextual information

to users filling in forms. Could PWGSC please confirm that a customized help feature will meet this requirement?

**Answer 81:**

With respect to requirement APP-UE.02, a customized help feature is permitted in order to satisfy the requirement.

**Question 82:**

Data Migration – scope of data to be migrated – Is there any data held in Outlook (e.g. in e-mail folders) that will be part of the scope of Data Migration?

**Answer 82:**

Data (e-mails) that is currently within MS Outlook that will require porting to the new solution will be extracted by PSCP and converted to Adobe PDF. It will be these Adobe PDF files that will require porting to the Solution, so there will be no need for the Contractor to export e-mails directly from Outlook.

**Question 83:**

We respectfully request an extension to July 28, 2017.

**Answer 83:**

The closing date of the RFP has been extended until August 11, 2017.

**C. BIDDERS' CONFERENCE MINUTES**

**Industrial Security Systems Transformation – Bidders' Conference Minutes  
Public Services and Procurement Canada – Solicitation EP243-170549/B**

**Date: Friday May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

**Location: Com #10 – Conference Centre, Place du Portage - Phase IV, Gatineau, QC**

**Time: 9:30 to 11:30 a.m.**

<b>Industrial Security Sector, PSPC:</b> Claude Kateb, Gabriel Frost, Mark Osmond, Sebastian Chirca, Jennifer Kleiman
<b>Chief Information Office Branch, PSPC:</b> Silver Buckler, Suzanne Hepburn, James McGregor, Biray Giray, Rick Grant
<b>Acquisitions Program, PSPC:</b> Xi Chu, Christine Oates, Kaveh Mirfatahi
<b>Participating Firms:</b> Accenture, Alphinat Inc., CGI Information Systems and Management Consultants Inc., DXC Technology, Ernst & Young, Fujitsu Consulting (Canada) Inc., General Dynamics Information Technology, KPMG, Microsoft Canada, PwC, RHEA Inc., Sierra Systems

**1. 9:30 – 10:15 a.m.**

**Presentation of the ISST Project, including overview of the Procurement Strategy and Process, Statement of Work and the Evaluation Criteria – Christine Oates, AB; Claude Kateb, ISS; Sebastian Chirca, ISS; Biray Giray, CIOB; Gabriel Frost, ISS.**

**2. 10:15 – 10:45 a.m**

**Bidder Questions received from the conference floor and WebEx participants - Various**

**Q1.** Going back to R4. All of rated ask for our approach of how we will do something, except R4 where you ask for a security concept of operations – this is usually a project deliverable that leads your SA & A process. Are you looking for a project deliverable, around the con ops here, and if so can you provide a table of contents that you would like us to write to? (Stuart Mackay – DXC Technology)

**A1.** Canada will clarify the wording and the expectations of R4, and will provide a response to Bidders through the formal Q and A. (Gabriel Frost, ISS)

**Additional Comment:** Note that items B, C and D are references, while item A is potentially very significant, as requested. (Stuart Mackay, DXC Technology)

**Q2.** Concept of operation: in the outline that was identified in the SC requirements in the RFP - it identified a number of components required to be outlined in the security concept operations, seems to be at odds with the role of the bidder, as he is not hosting the infrastructure, creating the network nor operating the infrastructure stack, so there are things in there such as physical security of facility, personnel security across the board. That type of context vagueness occurs in some of the other SC requirements – where they are at odds with the stated role, raises a lot of issues of scope. If those components can be looked at, to clarify the portions the bidder can realistically include in the security portion of their bid, and those that are beyond the scope of the Bidder and the Bidder's role. (Burns Macdonald, CGI)

**A2.** Acknowledged – we will take a hard look at what was asked of bidders, surrounding the con ops and security controls. Will conscientiously take a look – if they have to remain, they will, and will be justified, and if not, they will be amended. (Claude Kateb, ISS) Please share any specific questions that bidders have concerning the requirements – that would be helpful for our review. (Suzanne Hepburn, ISS)

**Q3.** When you say Canadian companies, how do you define it?

**A3.** *Yes, it is consistent with FOCI. An amendment will be forthcoming to clarify this. (Sebastian Chirca, ISS)*

**Q4.** The RFP discusses the requirement for both English and French web interfaces. Is there a requirement that project facilitation, the documentation of processes and workflows, and training materials be in both English and French or is an English-only approach acceptable? (Ron Read, Fujitsu Consulting (Canada) Inc.)

**A4.** *Certainly, all system interfaces that are facing the public will have to be translated, and will have to be delivered as such, because we will have to do appropriate accessibility testing. Anything having to do with a public facing portion will have to be translated. Process documentation does not need translation. Training materials that will be delivered to client groups (stakeholders we have identified), will have to be translated. (Claude Kateb, ISS)*

**Q5.** Will the tools need to be bilingual? IT software, do you need bilingual for developer tools? Any of the IT software you will be using, do you want it to be functionally bilingual? I.e. tools for developers who will be maintaining the system going forward. (Curtis Page, Alphinat Inc.)

**A5.** *No, we won't expect the tools to be bilingual. (Claude Kateb, ISS)*

**Q6.** In terms of architecture footprint of products, if we see areas where additional products may be of value, in terms of lower cost of implementation, speed to implementation, improvements for you. Do you want us to recommend them and have you GFE them to us? Or would you like us to figure out how you would procure them? Or should we stay away from them altogether? For example, development tools, environments, ongoing operational support, integration components, connector products to your ESB – there are areas where we're seeing that there are gaps in your solution that could be filled with products. (Stuart Mackay, DXC Technology)

**A6.** *Where we have tools available, and they are appropriate, for example, the SCMS, BI tools, please leverage them. We are refining the conceptual architecture, where we identify the technologies we already have in our toolbox. Some items are inflexible, but there are other areas that are less defined, and in those areas we invite your advice. There is always a requirement for it to be effectively integrated with our existing infrastructures and systems, but if there is a case to be made, then it will be considered. Use them. If it can be used, great, if not, build upon it and provide a recommendation. We are refining the contents of the toolbox. In the case of ill-defined areas, we invite your advice for solutions. There is a requirement for things to be integrated in the existing infrastructure. (Claude Kateb, ISS)*

*We suggest you recommend additional products within the logical architecture deliverable. Within that, we will consider additional products, some of which might be already licensed by GC, and available as GFE. (Rick Grant, CIOB)*

**Additional Comment:** Just about every company has an ability to procure products for you if you have it in the contract. A big risk to the project and timelines is when a new product is needed and it requires an additional procurement. (Stuart Mackay, DXC Technology)

*If recommended products require a departure from standard tools, they won't be accepted. If it is to fill gaps, it is possible that they will be considered. (Rick Grant, CIOB)*

**Q7.** In respect of recommending new products through the logical architecture - currently there is no place within the pricing table to provide pricing for these additional products. (Don Williams, Sierra Systems)

**A7.** *Thank you, noted. (Claude Kateb, ISS)*

**Q8.** Further to this discussion of recommending optional products, that may or may not be used, to build a fixed price solution, there is an inherent problem with the evaluated price component. Solution either must stand alone within the fixed price window, or it needs to include all of the optional products. Will need some clarity surrounding the fixed price point if optional products are to be allowed. (Jim Garnier, General Dynamics)

**A8.** *Noted, in our optimism, we were expecting that through the draft RFP, we would receive feedback to advise us of where there were problems. We hear you now, and we'll take a look and are open to suggestions, but devoid of any specific examples, where the solution can't be delivered as recommended, we will hold the course as best we can. If changes are needed, we will need more granularity about where the problems are. (Claude Kateb, ISS)*

**Q9.** As part of business transformation and stakeholder management, it is not clear if the Contractor will be interfacing with other departments (i.e.: RCMP). Is it the responsibility of ISST to provide the stakeholder engagement? (Syed Ali, KPMG)

**A9.** *As the business, ISS will catalyze all of the engagements. We will expect the Contractor to identify with whom to engage, recommend how to engage, and a strategy, and ISS will assist the Contractor to engage the other departments and get them to the table. (Claude Kateb, ISS)*

**Additional Comment:** Some processes will require departmental cooperation, is ISS responsible for making sure agreements are in place? (Syed Ali, KPMG)

*Yes ISS will be there to help establish connectors. Any proposed solutions requiring a change to the way our stakeholders do business are unlikely. (Claude Kateb, ISS)*

**Q10.** Can you discuss the ISS Project Team model and resourcing for ISST? (Ron Read, Fujitsu Consulting (Canada) Inc.)

**A10.** *This is a business project, ISS as the project authority will take accountability for the project. We have established a Project Management Office (PMO), within the business group we have a trinity between ISS-CIOB (IT)-ACQB (manages procurement). Our partner is going to be the system integrator (contractor) that will provide resources for the project, that will be secret cleared, they will be given space on the floor, as long as they need to be there, within reason. You don't have to work at our location. Any requirement for SSC infrastructure access will be channelled by CIOB. Anything that is a requirement of the systems integrator will be managed by the PMO. (Claude Kateb)*

**3. 10:45 – 10:55 a.m.**

**Selected Bidder Questions received in advance of the Bidders' Conference – Gabriel Frost**

**Q11.** The RFP outlines that the Contractor and Solution must comply directly with all relevant federal legislation, regulations, policies, directives, standards and guidelines, including but not limited to those described in Appendix 4 to ANNEX A. The contractor may not be aware of legislative changes or amendments to policies, without being advised by Canada, during fulfillment of the contract. We

respectfully request that Canada add a statement indicating that Canada will advise the Contractor of any changes to policies, directives and guidelines as required.

**A11.** *Yes, we will make an amendment indicating that Canada will provide the Contractor with any changes to legislation or policies impacting any of the work under the contract.*

**Q12.** Several questions were received requesting that we clarify the definition of similar, and the required project volumetrics related to user accounts, number and diversity of transactions, for the Mandatory Criteria M1 and M2.

**A12.** *The proposed Reference Projects should have no less than 65% of the volumetrics provided in the RFP for user accounts, number of and diversity of transactions. We are revising the wording of M1 and M2 to be more clear, and will provide an amendment when available.*

**Q13.** What do you mean by diversity of transactions?

**A13.** *For clarity, all of the volumetrics are provided in the Background section of the Statement of Work. We have identified in our current systems a diversity of 11 different transactions: New clearances request, clearance update request, clearance termination request, etc. We are looking to see that the solution in the Reference Project was more complicated than a single transaction solution.*

**Q14.** Clarification is requested surrounding the definition of user versus user accounts in the RFP.

**A14.** *There are no metrics for users in the RFP, so that will be removed. Only volumetrics for user accounts, number and diversity of transactions.*

**Q15.** In reference to call centre integrations, can PSPC confirm that there is no integration between call centre technology and the solution?

**A15.** *In the case of call centre technology such as automated voicemail, dial-in conference setup through a system, etc., that is not a requirement of the solution. However as indicated in the RFP, through process maps, and some of the requirements, we do track statistics and workflows for the call centre. For instance, if we get a call, it is logged into the current system and forwarded along to get a resolution. Functionality to receive an email inquiry through the system is a requirement, but phone technology is not.*

4. **10:55 – 11:00 a.m.**  
**Closing remarks – Christine Oates**

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