

## SHARED SERVICES CANADA

### Amendment No. 005 to Invitation to Qualify for Government of Canada Cloud Service Procurement Vehicle (GC Cloud)

Solicitation No.	32099	Date	October 29, 2018
GCDocs File No.		GETS Reference No.	PW-18-00841719

This Amendment is issued to extend the solicitation closing date, answer questions raised by suppliers and modify the ITQ solicitation documentation. Except as expressly amended by this document, all the terms and conditions of the ITQ remain unchanged.

**THIS SOLICITATION AMENDMENT IS ISSUED TO:**

1. Extend the ITQ solicitation for Stream 1
2. Publish Canada's Responses to suppliers' questions.
3. Modify the Invitation To Qualify.
4. Key reminders to suppliers'

NOTE: Respondents' clarification questions are numerically sequenced upon arrival at SSC. Respondents are hereby advised that questions and answers for this solicitation may be issued via BuyandSell.gc.ca out of sequence.

**1. EXTEND THE SOLICITATION CLOSING DATE FOR STREAM 1**

The Solicitation closing date for Stream 1 has been extended as to: **Friday, November 9, 2018 at 2pm EST**. The closing date of the ITQ for Stream 2 remains **Wednesday, November 21, 2018 at 2pm EST**.

Canada will not be extending the solicitation closing dates or question periods.

**2. CANADA'S RESPONSES TO RESPONDENTS QUESTIONS**

Canada hereby confirms that responses to the 185 questions submitted during Question Period for both Stream 1 and Stream 2 have now been posted on buyandsell.gc.ca. Please see Table 1 listed below.

**3. MODIFICATIONS TO THE INVITATION TO QUALIFY (ITQ)**

Please find attached in this amendment the following documents containing modifications to the ITQ solicitation documents.

- a. 32099 - GC Cloud ITQ – (EN) - Amend 005
- b. 32099 - GC Cloud ITQ – Annex A App 1 (EN) - Amend 005
- c. 32099 - GC Cloud ITQ – Annex A App 2 (EN) - Amend 005
- d. 32099 - GC Cloud ITQ – Annex A App 3 (EN) - Amend 005

Canada has provided each document in the following formats:

- Microsoft Word version (a clean version and a marked-up version demonstrating modifications from the original published version of the ITQ solicitation document)
- Adobe PDF version (a clean version and a marked-up version demonstrating modifications from the original published version of the ITQ solicitation document)

**4. KEY REMINDERS TO SUPPLIERS**

Suppliers are encouraged to review Canada's responses and document modifications carefully to ensure and the complete the solicitation requirements as detailed in the solicitation document.

Information provided in Annex C & D of the ITQ are for information purposes only, to inform subsequent phases of the procurement. Responses to the Annexes are not mandatory as part of any response to the ITQ. As per Section 2.2 of the ITQ Canada is happy to receive any and all feedback

related to the content of the two annexes and will consider any suggestions or comments during subsequent phases of the procurement process.

**TABLE 1 – Canada’s responses to the 185 questions submitted during Question Period (for both Stream 1 and Stream 2)**

Question Number	Question	Response
1	Is this specifically for Cloud Service Providers? Or is this for SaaS based solution providers.	Canada is seeking Respondents to propose Public Cloud Services, as defined in Annex E that meet the mandatory requirements identified in Annex A of the ITQ. Given the ever-changing environment for public cloud services, Canada has not specified specific service models within the scope of this solicitation.
2	I downloaded the Zip package and went through all the documentation and this seems to be an RFI for Cloud Service Providers which we are not.	As per Section 1.1, Phase 1 of the procurement process is the Invitation to Qualify phase, and not a Request for Information (RFI). Further details on subsequent phases are detailed in Section 1.3 - Overview of Anticipated Procurement Process.
3	We are requesting a two (2) month extension to ITQ #32099 for Government of Canada Cloud Service Procurement Vehicle.	Please see Amendments 1 to 3 and Canada's modifications to the ITQ. Canada will not extend the question periods.
4	<p>Please see an extension request regarding above mentioned ITQ.</p> <p>Due to the complexity of the ITQ requirements, we would like to request for an extension for both Stream 1 and 2.</p> <p>Would Canada please extend the closing date to following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stream 1: November 8th, 2018</li> <li>• Stream 2: November 22nd, 2018</li> </ul>	Please see Canada's response to Question 3.
5	<p>SSC is requesting feedback on Annex C: “Common Resulting Terms and Conditions” and Annex D: “Overview of Broker Process” by the close of the ITQ. As of September 14th, these documents have not been provided to industry.</p> <p>Can you please confirm a date as to when Annex C and Annex D will be made available?</p> <p>Likewise, we formally request that SSC issue an extension to accommodate.</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 3 and the publication of Annexes C & D in Amendment 3.

Question Number	Question	Response
6	Can Canada confirm that the CSP can be an affiliate or related entity of the "Respondent"?	<p>Please see Canada's modification to the ITQ and specifically Section 2.3 where Canada defines the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In section 2.3 (a), Canada defines who is eligible to be a Respondent, which includes CSP's, ASP's and Cloud Resellers (as defined in Annex E).</li> <li>• In section 2.3 (e), Canada defines that a Respondent including related entities (as defined in section 2.3 (f)) will be permitted to qualify only once per Procurement Stream for a proposed Commercially Available Public Cloud Service.</li> </ul>
7	<p>The ITQ requests that the bidder provide information that is highly sensitive and of a proprietary nature. Can Canada please confirm that all information will be adequately safeguarded as confidential information and will not be subject to Access to Information requests?</p> <p>Alternatively, can bidders provide information directly to Communications Security Establishment under an existing non-disclosure agreement (NDA)? This includes the delivery and inclusion of SOC 2 reports in bidder responses.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically Section 3.3 where Canada has modified the submission process for specific ITQ deliverables. As noted in the modifications to Annex B, all Respondents are required to complete the on-boarding process (Path 1 or Path 2) which includes the establishment of an NDA with the Canadian Centre with the Cyber Security (CCCS).</p> <p>With regards to the sensitivity of information provided in the requested ITQ deliverables, Canada can confirm that this information will be safeguarded by CCCS in accordance with the NDA between the vendor and CCCS.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
8	<p>Per the ITQ, a complete response to the ITQ must include d) Confirmation of registration for the Cloud Service Provider Information Technology Security Assessment (STREAM 1 ONLY) (Mandatory at ITQ Closing for Stream 1). The response must include documentation confirming that the Cloud Service Provider of the proposed cloud services is registered for the Cloud Service Provider Information Technology Security Assessment Process as described in Annex B.</p> <p>Can Canada please confirm what form of documentation is required for "confirmation of registration"?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ.</p> <p>CCCS will provide a confirmation email from the program lead indicating the vendor has provided all necessary documentation and that they have been on boarded for assessment. Any responses that are deficient will be provided notice but will not be considered on-boarded until all necessary documents are provided.</p> <p>Respondents should note that the submission of all required documentation identified in Annex B is an essential part of the assessment process. The Respondent must ensure that all required documentation for the Respondent's ITQ Response is submitted. A Response will only be considered complete (and eligible for evaluation) if all documentation is provided. Any ITQ requirements that must be submitted to CCCS must be received by CCCS prior to the ITQ closing date for Stream 1 in order to be eligible for evaluation. Any ITQ submission that fails to provide CCCS the required documentation to CCCS prior to the ITQ closing date and time for Stream 1 will be deemed non-compliant for the ITQ and given no further consideration for this solicitation process. No exceptions will be made.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
9	<p>M5: Currency. Will Canada accept exchange rate fluctuation for U.S. conversion to CDN currency? If not, will Canada consider removing this requirement from the ITQ?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to Annex A.</p> <p>The referenced requirement in Annex A aims to confirm the willingness of the Respondent to provide Canada with any billing, consumption and support information in Canadian dollars for their proposed Commercially Available Public Cloud Service. This requirement is essential requirement for Canada and will not be removed.</p> <p>Canada recognizes that there are potential Commercially Available Public Cloud Services that are not based in CDN currency, and is open to considering any proposed suggestions or strategies that could be incorporated into any potential procurement vehicles presented in future solicitation phases. Canada encourages Respondents with proposed suggestions and strategies to provide this information as part of their response to the ITQ.</p>
10	<p>M10 requires that copies of ISO and SOC 2 assessment reports be submitted with the stipulation that each certification or assessment must be d) valid for the period of the contract to demonstrate compliance.</p> <p>This is an unreasonable request given that no term has been defined for the period of the contract, and certifications are updated on a reoccurring basis. Will Canada please remove this requirement from the ITQ?</p>	<p>The qualification phase of the solicitation process that aims to identify vendors qualified to meet Canada's requirements as of the closing date of the ITQ. Canada has not identified the nature of any future procurement vehicles, and specified that information related to both subsequent solicitation phases and the procurement vehicle will be discussed with Qualified Respondents.</p> <p>Canada will not be modifying the ITQ requirement and invites Respondents to review Canada's responses to Questions 58 and 59.</p>
11	<p>Canada has defined two procurement streams within the scope of this ITQ.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Stream 1: Aims to establish a source of supply capable of fulfilling GC Public Cloud Services requirements that require Tier 2 cloud assurance (Direct with CSP). Respondents who qualify for Stream 1 will automatically qualify for Stream 2.</li> <li>· Stream 2: Aims to establish a source of supply capable of fulfilling GC Public Cloud Services requirements that require Tier 1 cloud assurance.</li> </ul>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to Annex A and Section 2.3 of the ITQ.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
	<p>Given that the requirements and qualifications for Stream 1 and Stream 2 are different (Protected B and Protected A), there should be the opportunity to submit two separate lists of services (service catalogs) against the M2 requirement in the Stream 1 submission. Will Canada amend the M2 requirement accordingly?</p>	
12	<p>Regarding Procurement Stream 2: you state that “A Respondent (including related entities as defined in subsection (d) below) will be permitted to qualify only once per Procurement Stream for a proposed Commercially Available Cloud Service (CSP).”</p> <p>With this stated requirement, would the following be allowed by GC? As a supplier for more than one CSP, can we submit a response for Cloud Service Provider A and a second response for Cloud Service Provider B where CSP A and CSP B are separate commercial providers of cloud services?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to Section 2.3 and Annex E of the ITQ.</p> <p>Respondents who are either a Cloud Service Provider or an Alternative Service Provider (as defined in Annex E of the ITQ) are eligible to submit a response for a proposed Commercially Available Public Cloud Service. Respondents who are Cloud Resellers (as defined in Annex E of the ITQ) are eligible to qualify and self-identify as an authorized provider of the proposed Commercially Available Public Cloud Service.</p> <p>As per Section 2.3, Respondents are limited to submitting one Response per proposed Commercially Available Public Cloud Service. A Respondent with more than one Commercially Available Public Cloud Service is able to submit multiple ITQ responses.</p>
13	<p>Can a Cloud reseller submit multiple responses if they are for different Cloud Service Providers?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 12.</p>
14	<p>For ITQ Annex A Appendix 1 &amp; 2: we are currently in the process of acquiring one or more of the third party certifications required, however we will not have the certification prior to RFP closing date. Would SSC consider extending the requirement for certifications listed in Annex A, Appendix 1 &amp; 2 to a later date, perhaps the wave 1 solicitation response deadline?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 3.</p>



Question Number	Question	Response
15	<p>There are 2 streams we can apply to : 32099 - ITQ Annex A Appendix 1 - ENGLISH (Invitation to Qualify - Stream 1) - International 32099 - ITQ Annex A Appendix 2 - ENGLISH (Invitation to Qualify - Stream 2) - Only Canadian</p> <p>From what I understand we are or almost already approved for stream 2 but we need to do a lot of things and spend money in order to have stream 1, I need to know how much it improves our chances to win the RFP compared to just applying to Stream 2</p>	<p>Respondents are encouraged to submit a response for any proposed Commercially Available Public Cloud Services based on their ability to meet the ITQ requirements (identified in Annex A) by the solicitation closing date. Respondents are not obligated to submit a response for both streams.</p>
16	<p>What is the amount thresholds Is it the same price thresholds as Standing offers (under 25k, 25K to 89K and 89k to 2 million)?</p>	<p>This phase of this solicitation is to qualify Commercially Available Public Cloud Services that meet the mandatory requirements. Any additional information related to future procurement vehicles will be determined at a subsequent phases of the procurement process.</p> <p>As per Section 2.2, Respondents are able to provide any additional comments, clarifications or feedback with their ITQ response that is deemed beneficial to future phases of the procurement process.</p>
17	<p>What are the required ISO certifications? When I talked to my rep, he was not aware that ISO 27036 existed Please advise</p>	<p>Please see the following mandatory requirements in Annex A, where Canada has identified the required ISO certifications in Part B of Annex A - Appendix 1 and Annex A - Appendix 2.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
18	<p>Our company offers a hosted software solution/SaaS for procurement evaluation. I was pointed to the above-referenced ITQ by a contracting authority at PSPC as a mechanism on which we could seek to qualify in order to provide licenses for our SaaS offering.</p> <p>Reading through the documents, it seems to me that this solicitation is focussed solely on the provision of cloud services, and does NOT include the provision of SaaS.</p> <p>Can you confirm that this understand is correct?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ. Canada aims to qualify any proposed Commercially Available Public Cloud Service that can meet the requirements identified in Annex A of the ITQ.</p>
19	<p>Annex F – Response Submission Form asks for Requested Canadian province or territory for applicable laws.</p> <p>Please clarify what this question is asking vendors to provide.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically to Annex F.</p>
20	<p>Annex F – Response Submission Form asks for Security Clearance Level of Respondent. Section 1.9 in the Standard Instructions state “The bidder must meet the security clearance requirements described in the solicitation. The solicitation will indicate whether the bidder must meet these requirements on the closing date, or before a contract is awarded. If the solicitation does not indicate when the requirement must be met, the requirements must be met before a contract is awarded.”</p> <p>Please clarify if security clearance is mandatory for all work performed by vendors and subcontractors, if any.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically to Section 2.4 and Annex F.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
21	<p>Mandatory ID M5 in Annex A – Appendix 1 states: “The proposed Commercially Available Cloud Service must provide pricing for services, billing and support in Canadian dollars including but not limited to consumption reporting.”</p> <p>Please clarify if this requirement is asking about how a vendor’s solution handles billing/fees or if the requirement is asking about how the vendor itself would bill/invoice the agency.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 9.</p>
22	<p>Can you extend close date deadline by four (4) weeks?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 3.</p>
23	<p>Can you extend the deadline to submit clarification questions accordingly?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 3.</p>
24	<p>In reference to ITQ Section 2.3, if a Respondent is an Authorized Reseller of the Cloud Service Provider and already holds a direct contract for Public Cloud Services with the Government of Canada, can the Reseller respond directly to ITQ procurement Stream 1 on behalf of the Cloud Service Provider?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to Section 2.3 and Annex E of the ITQ.</p> <p>Respondents who are either a Cloud Service Provider or an Alternative Service Provider (as defined in Annex E of the ITQ) are eligible to submit a response for a proposed Commercially Available Public Cloud Service in either Stream 1 or Stream 2.</p> <p>As per Section 2.3, Respondents are limited to submitting one Response per proposed Commercially Available Public Cloud Service. A Respondent who is an Authorized Reseller with more than one than Commercially Available Public Cloud Service is able to submit multiple ITQ responses.</p>
25	<p>SSC has asked Respondents to provide feedback on Annex C and Annex B. However, Annex B Standard Terms and Conditions was not provided with the ITQ. Also this section references Annex D that is not provided with the ITQ. We further understand that the Annex B in this paragraph was really to be Annex D - Cloud Brokering Service. Is SSC going to be providing these during the ITQ phase for Respondents to review and provide feedback? If not, we assume no response is required for these at this time.</p>	<p>Please see Amendment 3 which has published Annex C and Annex D. Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and Amendment 1 where Canada clarified the intent of publishing Annexes C and D.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
26	<p>How will third-party auditors verify that information provided is accurate? Will this be a review of existing audits, or will this require on-site audits and generation of evidence? Will these auditors sign NDAs with the CSP? How can the auditor assure that this information will be properly safeguarded?</p>	<p>(a) Please see the steps identified in CCCS assessment program, found in Annex B. The current evaluation process will utilize existing auditor reports. CCCS has reviewed suggested mappings of controls to audit components as well sample reports in order to establish the level of information that must be provided. Respondents are advised that once initiated, it is possible that CCCS may require additional information in order to complete the assessment of the proposed Commercially Available Public Cloud Service. Should additional information be required, the Respondent will be notified by CCCS, with a consolidated list of questions or points of information for clarification.</p> <p>(b) Please see Canada's response to Question 7. As per the modifications in the ITQ, CCCS will be the party to take receipt of all sensitive ITQ requirements, and will be the GC entity that enters into the NDA with the Respondent.</p> <p>(c) All information will be safeguarded by CCCS as company confidential with reports and documentation maintained on a higher level system. Report findings and specific information are developed on a Protected B level system that ensures a limited access and distribution of that provided information amongst security personnel within CCCS and SSC. In the event any information covered by a specific NDA needs to be provided outside of these GC stakeholders, the Respondent or designated auditor will be contacted as required to confirm release factors and procedures.</p>
27	<p>If the Cloud Service Provider (CSP) provides SaaS and PaaS, but is hosted on a leading IaaS, many of the physical security controls will be provided by the infrastructure CSP. Please indicate how a SaaS/PaaS provider should respond, especially if the IaaS has already been approved and is already under contract by both SSC and CSE?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Questions 1 and 12.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
28	<p>Under Section 2.3 of the ITQ document in paragraph c) it states: “a respondent will be permitted to qualify only once per Procurement Stream for a proposed CSP”.</p> <p>However, can the Crown please clarify and explain, whether under Stream 2 a Respondent can submit a response and qualify for multiple CSP’s?</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 12.
29	<p>In Annex E – Definitions, there are descriptions of Alternative Service Provider and Cloud Reseller. However, these descriptions seem to overlap with the services some organizations provide. For example, we resell Cloud Services, we build the tenant for the customer then we give the customer master access to it and the customer owns the master access and removes our access to the tenant.</p> <p>We also provide consumption reporting, billing and support. In addition, we are also authorized to offer and deliver Commercially Available Cloud Services as per the description of an ASP. Can the Crown please clarify, perhaps with examples, when a Respondent should qualify as an ASP or as a Cloud Reseller?</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 12.
30	<p>We are a SaaS company that leverages a Cloud Service Provider's cloud infrastructure.</p> <p>(a) Could the GoC please confirm whether this is the appropriate procurement vehicle to sell our product?</p> <p>(b) Does this ITQ include Software as a Service (SaaS), or is it only for Platform as a Service (PaaS) and Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS)?</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 1.
31	<p>Requirement M10 states that a respondent must provide certifications to demonstrate compliance. The requirement identifies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ISO/IEC 27001:2013</li> <li>• ISO/IEC 27017:2015</li> <li>• AICPA Service Organization Control (SOC) 2 Type II</li> </ul> <p>Is this requirement an AND statement or an OR statement? In other words, are all three certifications required, or is only one of the listed certificates required?</p>	Canada confirms that all three requested certifications are required.

Question Number	Question	Response
32	<p>Stream 1 - SSCs ITQ PW-18-00841719: Annex A, Appendix 1 - Third party assurances Section M10</p> <p>Are the compliance certificates listed in the section required in order to submit a response or if an audit is in progress, would a compliance status from a third party audit firm and PWGSC – Security Directorate be sufficient at the ITQ stage? Company X is in the process of ISO 27001 &amp; SOCII Type 2 assessments and certification. We would expect to have these in place at the time that a formal RFP is issued for the Cloud services.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ.</p> <p>Canada confirms that all certification must be provided by the respective closing date for each ITQ Stream. Canada will not accept any modifications to the identified certifications in Annex A, nor accept any certifications that are expired or in progress.</p> <p>Respondents who do not have certifications available as of the closing date of each ITQ Stream are encouraged to pursue the establishment of these certifications that will provide the Respondent and opportunity to qualify in future solicitations.</p>
33	<p>Stream 2 - SSC ITQ PW-18-00841719: Annex A, Appendix 2 - Third party assurances Section M9</p> <p>Are the compliance certificates listed in the section required in order to submit a response or if an audit is in progress, would a compliance status from a third party audit firm and PWGSC – Security Directorate be sufficient at the ITQ stage? Company X is in the process of ISO 27001 &amp; SOCII Type 2 assessments and certification. We would expect to have these in place at the time that a formal RFP is issued for the Cloud services.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 32.</p>
34	<p>Stream 1 - SSCs ITQ PW-18-00841719: Annex A, Appendix 1:</p> <p>Can these Appendices be provided in Excel format for bid response purposes?</p>	<p>Canada has provided a clean copy and a copy detailing modifications (with tracked changes) of the modified ITQ documents in both PDF and MS Word format. Canada will not provide these documents in any other format.</p>
35	<p>Stream 2 - SSC ITQ PW-18-00841719: Annex A, Appendix 2:</p> <p>Can these Appendices be provided in Excel format for bid response purposes?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's Response to Question 34.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
36	<p>Closing date and Time Stream 1 &amp; Stream 2</p> <p>Given the nature of the questions above and that the response to the questions will be issued on October 4th, we would respectfully request that SSC provide an extension to the closing date and time to November 12th to allow for sufficient time to provide a complete response in line with the ITQ requirements.</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 3.
37	<p>Can you clarify which types of services are intended to be procured through this vehicle? Does it include general and specialized web applications? Or is it limited to office tools like email or document sharing (like Google Apps)? Or is it intended to procure more network-related services like hosting, CDNs and comparable services?</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 1.
38	<p>Section 2.3 Submission of Only One Response per Respondent for a proposed Commercially Available Cloud Service</p> <p>It is stated that "Procurement Stream 1 – For Stream 1, the Respondent must be the Cloud Service Provider of the proposed Commercially Available Cloud Service. Alternative Service Providers of the proposed Commercially Available Cloud Service will not be permitted as a Respondent for Stream 1.</p> <p>Question: Is there any plan to include alternative service providers and Resellers in steam-1 procurement process? If there is a plan, at what stage it is expected for them to be included?</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 12.
39	<p>Annex C and D:" SSC anticipates providing the proposed contract clauses for the resulting contract later in the ITQ process"</p> <p>Question: Is this expected to be released as part of this ITQ (i.e. before the submission deadline)? If Yes, is there will be extension for the deadline of questions for these two Annexes?</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 3.



Question Number	Question	Response
40	<p>Annex A- M2 “ The Cloud Service Provider identified in M1 must provide Commercially Available Cloud Services”</p> <p>Question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there any specific services that has to be provided by the CSP, i.e. is it a must for them to have all cloud models like IaaS and PaaS or can they provide one or the other?</li> <li>• Is it required that they have a self-service portal to provide these services?</li> </ul>	Please see Canada's response to Question 1.
41	<p>Annex A – M12</p> <p>Question: is it sufficient to submit on the certificates or it should be accompanied by third party assessment report?</p>	Please see Canada's modifications to the RFP and specifically to Annex A. Canada requires both the certification and reports.
42	<p>Annex A M1 “ The Respondent must identify the existing Cloud Service Provider (CSP), who’s Commercially Available Cloud Services will be offered to Canada at the solicitation stage of this procurement process.”</p> <p>Question: if the alternative service provider will suggest several CSPs, should all of them be in one response and qualify them against the criteria in this ITQ or should the alternative service provider submit a separate response for each CSP?</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 12.
43	<p>Annex A M9 “ Compliance must be demonstrated by providing one or more of the following industry certifications identified below, and validated through independent third party assessments, Self-assessment of its services against the Cloud Security Alliance (CSA) Cloud Controls Matrix (CCM) version 3.01 or subsequent version.</p> <p>Question: what does self-assessment mean, i.e. what is the expected format of this self-assessment, is it a compliance matrix with justification against each point or just to mention if the CSP is compliant with each item in CCM?</p>	<p>Please refer to the CSA website which provides an overview of STAR Level 1: Self-Assessment requirements.</p> <p>Link - <a href="https://cloudsecurityalliance.org/star/self-assessment/#_overview">https://cloudsecurityalliance.org/star/self-assessment/#_overview</a></p>



Question Number	Question	Response
44	In order for Company X to apply to the Request for Qualification (RQ) for ITQ does Company X Canadian Data Centers already need to have Facility Level Clearance Protected Level B?	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ.</p> <p>While Canada has not established any security requirements for facility level clearance or personnel clearance within the ITQ phase, this does not preclude Canada from adding such requirements in subsequent solicitation phases if deemed required.</p>
45	In order for Company X to apply to Request for Qualification (RQ) for ITQ does Company X need to have Personnel Clearance from PSPC Industrial Security Branch?	Please see Canada's response to Question 44.
46	Based on the requirements as stated in M8 will Canada have the requirement of the vendor to have more than one geographic location for the GC Cloud within Canada and currently in place?	The Respondent must satisfy the requirements for redundancy and recovery in order to meet prescribed the Service Level Agreement. This includes leveraging IT facilities that are geographically dispersed.
47	If the Respondent is in the process of certifying for ISO 27017 and ISO 27018, and can provide documentation to support this, will Canada accept that as a basis for the M10 and M14 mandatory requirement in Annex A Appendix 1?	Please see Canada's response to Question 32.
48	If the Respondent is registered with CSEC and being evaluated against the CLOUD SERVICE PROVIDER INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ASSESSMENT PROCESS ahead of this ITQ will the crown accept that for meeting M10 and M14 requirements in Annex A Appendix 1?	Please see Canada's response to Question 32.

Question Number	Question	Response
49	<p>Section 2.4 of the ITQ document mentions: 'A Respondent must meet the security clearance requirements contained in Annex A in order to become a Qualified Respondent.' However, we do not see this requirement in the Annex A document.</p> <p>Could you please clarify?</p>	<p>Canada encourages the Respondent to review the requirement in Annex A, Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, where Canada has outlined security requirements applicable to the qualification of each proposed Commercially Available Public Cloud Service.</p> <p>For the ITQ phase, the requirements outlined in Annex A – Appendix 1, M8 and M9 must be met and in Annex A – Appendix 2, M7 and M8 must be met. Additional security screening requirements may be required in a subsequent phase of the solicitation at the discretion of the Crown based on the level of access and a risk-based analysis.</p>
50	<p>Is it possible to have the ITQ documents in Word version?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's Response to Question 34.</p>
51	<p>Will the Crown please extend the closing date of the ITQ from October 11th to October 25th?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 3.</p>
52	<p>After the initial questions have been responded to, will ITQ respondents be able to ask follow-up questions based on the answers from the Crown.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 3.</p>
53	<p>With respect to M8, the RCMP publishes 14 guidelines for physical security, 3 of which are restricted to government of Canada departments and agencies. Which specific RCMP guidelines are being referred to as industry may not have access to the required guidelines.</p>	<p>The Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) guidance and standards on physical security that are publicly accessible. Please see the following links:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">RCMP Guide G1-006 Identification Cards / Access Badges</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">RCMP Guide G1-026 Guide to the Application of Physical Security Zones</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">RCMP Guide G1-024 Control of Access</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">RCMP Guide G1-013 Security Control Room Space Requirements (09/2006)</a></li> </ul>

Question Number	Question	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">RCMP Guide G1-031 Physical Protection of Computer Servers (03/2008)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">RCMP Guide G13-02 Secure Demising Wall (SDW), July 2013</a></li> </ul>
54	<p>Could the Crown please provide additional detail with respect to Section 1.3 Overview of Anticipated Procurement Process? Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the timing of Wave 2 and Wave 3?</li> <li>• What is the expected duration between the completion of Wave 1 and Wave 2?</li> <li>• What is the expected duration between the completion of Wave 2 and Wave 3?</li> </ul>	<p>Please note that the exact timing of any subsequent phases of the procurement process identified in Section 1.3 (including Waves and duration between Waves) will be communicated to Qualified Respondents in subsequent phases of the procurement process.</p>
55	<p>Could the Crown confirm that a bidder can resubmit a cloud service in Wave 2 if it was deemed non-compliant in Wave 1?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 12.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
56	<p>With respect to Section 2.3 Submission of Only One Response per Respondent for a proposed Commercially Available Cloud Service Could the Crown please confirm that a Cloud Service Provider that provides multiple commercially available cloud services, each of which is considered a separate and distinct commercially available cloud service, can provide a separate bid for each cloud service in Stream 1.</p> <p>In Section 2.3 c) below we interpret the “Commercially Available Cloud Service” as a separate and distinct service. The reason for the question is based on the highlighted section of the text in section 2.3 c) which could be seen as precluding the ability to submit separate bids for separate “Commercially Available Cloud Service”.</p> <p>Section 2.3 c) : “A Respondent (including related entities as defined in subsection (d) below) will be permitted to qualify only once per Procurement Stream for a proposed Commercially Available Cloud Service (CSP). If a Respondent or any related entity participate in more than one response for any given Stream (participating means being part of the Respondent, not being a subcontractor), Canada will provide those Respondents with 2 working days to identify the single response to be considered by Canada. Failure to meet this deadline may result in all the affected responses being disqualified or in Canada’s discretion, which of the responses to evaluate.”</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 12.
57	<p>With respect to M12, it is common for cloud providers to publish a list of their subcontractors, and identify the general category of work performed by subcontractors and the location (i.e., country) from which each subcontractor operates. However, the remaining requirement identified in M12 (address of the third party headquarters) is not typically published.</p> <p>Would it be acceptable for a bidder to provide the address information for a subcontractor only if the Crown specifically requests it?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the RFP and specifically to Annex A. Please also note the changes implemented by Canada to limit access of this information to a GC entity with which the Respondent will be required to establish a Non-Disclosure Agreement (in accordance with the onboarding process identified in Annex B – CSP IT Assessment Program.</p> <p>All mandatory requirements in the ITQ must be met in order for a Response to be considered compliant.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
58	<p>Could you please elaborate on the timelines anticipated for the completion of the ITQ, to RFP to contract?</p> <p>Should a vendor be successful, when would you anticipate that the contract be awarded and availability for services to be provided?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 54.</p>
59	<p>Page 4, 1.2.B iii) Term of Procurement Vehicle: is there a sense of what term you are looking to award contracts based on (i.e. 3 years with 2 options)?</p>	<p>Please note that details regarding any aspects of a future procurement vehicle, will be determined at subsequent stages of the procurement and presented to Qualified Respondents.</p> <p>Canada is contemplating multiple procurement vehicle structures and encourages Respondents to provide any feedback or comments with their response that Canada may consider prior to the subsequent procurement phases.</p>
60	<p>With evolving service solutions and changing vendor community, when do you anticipate going back to the market to secure these services again?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 59.</p> <p>Please note that Canada's intent is to establish a source of supply that is flexible and adaptive to the evolving service solutions and ever changing vendor community.</p> <p>Any subsequent procurement initiatives (beyond the scope of Stream 1 and Stream 2) will be communicated in subsequent solicitation processes using the Government Electronic Tendering System (GETS).</p> <p>Any decisions related to additional qualification periods within this solicitation's scope (Stream 1 and Stream 2) will be at Canada's discretion and will carried out based on GC demand, supplier readiness and GC administrative capacity.</p>
61	<p>Can a vendor become an approved vendor through the term of the contract? (I.e. submit in a year and be awarded?)</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 60.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
62	As vendors desire to manage their scale and performance, is there any sense to the size of data/requirements that could be awarded by each stream each year with a growth trajectory?	<p>Given the recent development and implementation of cloud strategies within the GC, as well as the recent establishment of GC procurement vehicles for cloud services, it is difficult for Canada to answer the question at this time.</p> <p>Respondents should keep in mind that this vehicle aims to establish a source of supply for various GC department and agencies.</p>
63	How will the contracting vehicle work in order to accommodate to changing technology, changing service options, and changing vendor community (mergers & acquisitions, new providers within this space etc.)?	Please see Canada's response to Question 60.
64	<p>The security requirements of the ITQ indicate various required certifications or attestations of services – should a vendor be in the process of establishing Cloud services within Canada and/or is in the process of gaining such accreditations, can you award a vendor a position on the contract, but not allow services until such items are granted?</p> <p>Or if the vendor can demonstrate that they have the proper standards, can they provide services while going through the accreditations?</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 32.
65	What Security Clearance Requirements, if any, are required for Stream 1 vendor qualification? Section 2.4 of the ITQ document on page 11 mentions that the Security Clearance Requirements are outlined in Annex A, but we found no such requirements.	Please see Canada's response to Question 49.

Question Number	Question	Response
66	Page 12 of the ITQ document mentions "Confirmation of registration for the Cloud Service Provider Information Technology Security Assessment (STREAM 1 ONLY)" as a Mandatory requirement stating that the proposed Cloud service is registered for the CSP IT Security Assessment process with CSE (described in Annex B). Could you provide instructions on how to register for this assessment as well as what steps are involved?	Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically to Annex B.
67	We request a preview or model of the proposed Common Resulting Contract Terms to be provided "at a later date" as outlined in Annex C.	Please see Canada's response to Question 5.
68	Can Canada confirm that the proposed Common Resulting Contract Terms for Stream 1 Cloud Service Providers (CSP) would include Terms of Service provided by the CSP?	Please see Canada's response to Question 5 and Amendments to Annex C.
69	Given the amount of work required to answer this ITQ, we request a two-week extension for Stream 1, in order to ensure that we can satisfy the mandatory requirements at a minimum.	Please see Canada's response to Question 3.
70	<p>Re: The SSC ITQ for Government of Canada Cloud Service Procurement Vehicle (GC Cloud) response deadline for Stream 1 is October 11, 2018, and Stream 2 is October 25, 2018.</p> <p>We respectfully request a 4 week extension to these respective due dates. Appropriate time is required in order to prepare a response of the scope required. Considering the terms, conditions, and certifications that have been requested, additional time is required to gather and properly assemble the information required. Also, extensive, and time consuming, security processes are required to release our Supply Chain Security Information.</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 3.



Question Number	Question	Response
71	As there is a significant investment required by the CSP to respond to this ITQ, can SSC provide some additional background information and/or context regarding the amount of Stream 1 and Stream 2 cloud services that are currently being consumed by the GOC or are anticipated to be consumed?	Please see Canada's response to Question 60. Canada will not be providing any volumetric information at this time, but may do in subsequent future stages with Qualified Respondents.
72	Could SSC please elaborate on the estimated timelines that are planned for all the steps defined in Section 1.3 - Overview of Anticipated Procurement Process on page 7 of the 32099-GC Cloud Vehicle-ITQ?	Please see Canada's response to Question 59.
73	<p>Re: Section 1.4 on page 8 of the 32099-GC Cloud Vehicle-ITQ is about the Conflict of Interest or Unfair Advantage.</p> <p>Q: Will SSC please provide the list of all the GC employees and contractors that have participated in the development of this ITQ including the list of GC employees and contractors that Canada has conducted protected B cloud work with and/or pilots and/or any other test scenarios and/or the like?</p>	<p>Canada can confirm that only GC employees have participated in the development of this solicitation. Canada will not be disclosing the names of any GC employees who have participated in the development of this solicitation.</p> <p>The scope of this solicitation is for Public Cloud Services as defined in ITQ. Any responses, enquires or comments that extend beyond the scope identified in this solicitation will not be addressed.</p>
74	<p>Re: Section 2.2.b on pages 9 &amp; 10 of the 32099-GC Cloud Vehicle-ITQ file asks suppliers to provide comments and suggestions on Annex B and Annex C with their ITQ response. Annex C on page 21 of this same file states "SSC anticipates providing the proposed contract clauses for the resulting contract later in the ITQ process."</p> <p>Q: Since Suppliers would need a reasonable amount of time to review and comment on these contract clauses, would SSC further clarify what "later in the ITQ process" means? Is there an expected release date for this Annex C?</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 25.



Question Number	Question	Response
75	<p>Re: Annex D on page 22 of the 32099-GC Cloud Vehicle-ITQ file states “SSC anticipates providing the proposed contract clauses for the resulting contract later in the ITQ process.” Annex D is the Overview of the SSC Cloud Brokering Service.</p> <p>Q: This statement about proposed contract clauses doesn’t seem to make sense here. Would SSC please clarify?</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 25.
76	<p>Re: Section 4.4 states that Canada reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to conduct a second qualification round for one or more Streams among the unsuccessful Respondents if, in Canada’s opinion, the first qualification round results in an insufficient number of Qualified Respondents.</p> <p>Q: Given the importance of the Cloud for GC in the future, could the SSC please confirm that there will be an opportunity in the near future for unsuccessful Respondents—to consider SSC’s first evaluation—and make adjustments—in order to give SSC more opportunities to take advantage of the fast-moving Cloud industry?</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 60.
77	<p>Q: It is not explained within the ITQ; however, will the SSC please confirm how often it will qualify new cloud products, new cloud providers, and even new cloud datacenters to either stream? Please provide information on the process that will be used.</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 60.
78	<p>Q: If a provider submits and qualifies for Stream 2 (Tier 1) today, and later wishes to apply to qualify for Stream 1 (Tier 2), what is the process that will need to be followed?</p>	Please see Canada’s modification to the RFP and specifically Section 1.3 where Canada has clarified how additional opportunities will be made available after the ITQ solicitation and the considerations that may facilitate these opportunities to occur in the future.

Question Number	Question	Response
79	<p>On the surface it appears that the current ITQ qualification process may be set up to shutout vendors for potentially many years based on certifications that may be in existence today.</p> <p>Would SSC please confirm if it will allow a vendor to apply at any time in the future providing that the required certifications can then be demonstrated?</p> <p>If not, would SSC please explain its position on why this option would not be considered?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 78.</p>
80	<p>Re: Many cloud service providers are investing into expansion of their data centers globally, and these new facilities are in varying stages of completion. As SSC is fully aware, certifications of these facilities are completed by third party audits and these audits cannot take place until the cloud environment is fully functional. Recognizing all of this, the ITQ indicates that "Respondents who do not successfully qualify at the ITQ Phase for a Stream will not be able to participate in subsequent procurement phases for that Stream." This seems highly restrictive and unnecessary considering that CSPs and cloud innovation is occurring so rapidly. By the time SSC is ready to issue an RFP, many new vendors may have the ability to meet SSC requirements for either Tier 1 or Tier 2 and should have the ability to respond to those requirements. For some, this restriction may be viewed as an unfair procurement practice.</p> <p>Q: Will SSC please explain how excluding CSPs during the ITQ process supports the principles of providing best value?</p>	<p>The purpose of this ITQ is to qualify all vendors who meet the requirements at this time. Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and Canada's response to Question 60.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
81	<p>Re: According to information publicly available (including websites, etc.) it seems that a select number of CSPs may have had unprecedented access to SSC, Treasury Board and CSE resources well in advance of this ITQ. Access to this information a full year or more ahead of the ITQ release would have given these chosen vendors an unfair advantage and a significant “head start” over other potential CSPs. Recognizing that it is no small endeavor and it involves significant investment of time and money for a CSP to adhere to ITSG 33, TBS Cloud Security Profile and/or any of the requirements listed in Annex A—having advanced insight into any of these requirements, or having had the opportunity to influence any of these requirements in advance will have provided specific vendors an unfair advantage. As a result, SSC should disqualify those CSPs from participating in this ITQ and subsequent phases.</p> <p>Q: Will the crown please outline how it will allow the other CSPs the same level of access and the same opportunity to influence how SSC may go about satisfying its requirements?</p>	<p>There have been several industry public engagement activities to date on various GC cloud initiatives, which have involved the contributions of many GC departments and agencies. While it is true these engagements have facilitated development of The GC Security Control Profile for Cloud-based GC Services (PBMM), it should also be noted the engagements were widely-consulted within the GC <b>and</b> with Industry in June 2016, and subsequently updated (based on feedback received) and published in February 2017.</p> <p>In addition, Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) published the Direction on the Secure Use of Commercial Cloud Services: Security Policy Implementation Notice (SPIN) in November 2017, which outlines guidance to assist organizations in the secure use of commercial cloud services (cloud services), for the scope of services for Protected B. This document outlines recommended baseline security controls and the use of third-party assurance, many of which have been incorporated into the requirements of this ITQ.</p> <p>Based on the engagements listed above and the period of time that has elapsed since the publication of each referenced document listed above, Canada will not be considering the suggested actions.</p>
82	<p>Re: Through interactions with various departments, it is this CSP’s understanding that SSC has procured “Private cloud” Pilots from a couple of vendors using the PISA and SSC Cloud contract for non-classified data.</p> <p>Q: Since Private cloud solutions would be on premise and address the protected B requirements, can SSC assure the rest of the community that the vendors selected for these Pilots do not and did not have access to any information that may provide them an advantage in response to this ITQ? (We request that all information, architecture, security, networking etc. that has been shared with these vendors be made public to even the playing field and create a fair procurement process.)</p>	<p>Private cloud solutions are not within the scope of Stream 1 and Stream 2 for this ITQ solicitation. Canada can also confirm that the requirements of this ITQ were not disclosed to any non-GC party prior to ITQ release.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
83	Q: Considering that just about every single major cloud vendor offers a private cloud type of solution, will the crown provide some additional insight as to why an on premise cloud solution that would reside within the already certified and protected SSC data centers is not being recognized and considered as part of this ITQ?	As per the GC Cloud Adoption Strategy, the GC is adopting a “cloud-first” strategy where public cloud is the preferred option for cloud deployment. Canada has initiated this procurement to support this strategy by establishing a source of supply.
84	Re: As the SSC is most likely aware, the certifications that have been requested can only be done by third parties, and often take time to complete.  Q: Therefore, in situations where the vendor has a datacenter that fully meets the requirements for a particular tier; however, certifications remain to be completed by a third party, how will the SSC respond to these situations?	Please see response in Question 32.
85	Q: As the cloud industry is fast-paced and continually evolving with many different standards and certifications, will SSC please provide clarification on why the specific certifications that have been requested have been chosen?	The Direction on the Secure Use of Commercial Public Cloud Services: Security Policy Implementation Notice (SPIN) published in November 2017 outlines the use of third-party assurance, including internationally recognized certifications and industry standards.  The certifications selected in the ITQ represent the most cited and representative standards used by industry and other governments in the review of cloud service providers. The standards are also most aligned to the tailored GC cloud security profile. Each has support and development within recognized bodies such as ISO and AICPA respectively. This is further supported by bodies such as the Cloud Security Alliance which is recognized for its leadership and collaboration with the industry.

Question Number	Question	Response
86	<p>Q: In view of the significant investment, complex processes and associated timelines with meeting SSC's only recently released detailed requirements for protected B cloud—particularly, the mandatory evaluation criteria that must be met in order to be deemed a successful respondent to the ITQ, SSC is asked to amend the ITQ evaluation criteria for protected B as follows:</p> <p>a) To allow CSP providers that can currently demonstrate through evidence that corporate decisions have been taken to meet the GOC protected CSP requirements, and that they are actively engaged in activities on a road map to fully meet GOC protected B Cloud requirements, and achieve the required third-party certifications be permitted to qualify as a respondent to the ITQ.</p> <p>b) It is understood once qualified, these respondents would proceed to the RRR.</p> <p>c) It is further requested that item a) above be carried forward to the RFP.</p> <p>Given that the timelines between ITQ, RRR and RFP for major initiatives like print and public cloud have been quite protracted, sometimes more than a year, restricting the qualification of CSPs for protected B this early in the procurement process is not in the best interests of the GOC or the Canadian economy at large, particularly given that the public sector will likely be the single largest user of digital services in Canada.</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 60.
87	<p>In section 3.3 (d) of the ITQ document it states: "The response must include documentation confirming that the Cloud Service Provider of the proposed cloud services is registered for the Cloud Service Provider Information Technology Security Assessment Process as described in Annex B."</p> <p>Will the crown please provide greater clarification as to what documentation is required and what forms of documentation is acceptable to demonstrate registration in the program. Furthermore, will the crown please confirm why this ITQ has been released without having this requirement and process fully finalized?</p>	Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically modifications to Section 3.3 and Annex B.

Question Number	Question	Response
88	<p>Will the SSC please provide an editable electronic copy of Annex A, Appendix 1, Annex A, Appendix 2 for respondents to use?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 34.</p>
89	<p>Re: SOC 1 and SOC 2 are not certifications, but reports that are generated by a third-party auditor. These documents, including the documents for ISO27001, contain confidential and proprietary information, including critical security and operational details about our cloud offerings. These reports are restricted to customers who have signed nondisclosure agreements with this CSP.</p> <p>Q: In lieu of providing non-public confidential reports, will SSC confirm that it is willing to sign a non-disclosure agreement, or alternatively, what other options may be used to demonstrate compliance?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ.</p>
90	<p>Re: There is a clear trend in the industry for organizations as part of their transformation to look beyond simply putting something into the cloud. They are also looking to work with partners that have the skills, tools and processes to build, deploy, run, and manage their cloud environment. Qualified partners play a critical role in many CSPs go to market strategies—and also are key to meeting some of the specific GOC requirements.</p> <p>Q: Recognizing that CSP partners played a key role in the initial cloud contract, and are also allowed to participate in Stream 2 (Tier 1) of this ITQ, can SSC please explain its rationale for not allowing SIs and other CSP partners to participate in the Stream 1 (Tier 2) requirements of this ITQ?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 12.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
91	<p>Re: The supply chain requirement M12 in Stream 1 (Tier 2).</p> <p>Q: Will SSC please provide a list of the specific types of suppliers the CSP must provide? For example, only those that may have access to Canada's data? What about data centre real estate providers or hardware providers? This is a very broad requirement and the CSP requires firmer guidance from SSC, given that it is a mandatory requirement.</p>	<p>Canada will not be providing specific types of suppliers given each CSP is unique and will have different types of suppliers. The requirement M12 specifically asks for Respondents to provide a list of all suppliers that provide a service required by CSP to deliver its Commercially Available Public Cloud Services.</p>
92	<p>Re: The supply chain requirement M12 in Stream 1 (Tier 2).</p> <p>Q: Can the CSP satisfy this requirement by providing a list of subcontractors or affiliates engaged by the CSP which may process or have access to Canada's data?</p>	<p>Canada cannot accept the proposed modification. The Respondent must provide a list of subcontractors and affiliates engaged with the CSP that can impact the operations of the CSP's proposed Public Cloud Service.</p>
93	<p>Q: The CSP may not always have visibility into the subcontractors of subcontractors or beyond. Will SSC accept disclosure of first tier subcontractors or affiliates of the CSP only?</p>	<p>Canada will not modify the requirement. Visibility at the first tier (or one level down for a contractor supporting a CSP) is insufficient and does not meet Canada's requirements.</p> <p>If a Respondent does not have visibility how the proposed Commercially Available Public Cloud Services are delivered by the CSP and its subcontractors, the proposed Services may not be aligned for this requirement.</p>
94	<p>Q: Will SSC consider removing the supply chain requirement if the CSP takes responsibility for compliance with the resulting contract by its affiliates and subcontractors?</p>	<p>Canada will not be removing the supply chain requirements.</p>



Question Number	Question	Response
95	<p>Reference Mandatory ID M10 Third Party Assurance, sub bullet (f), the requirement states that “Each certification or assessment report must have been issued within the 12 months prior to the bidding closing date”. As the Respondent may currently be in the process of finalizing its various forms of certifications, it is requested that the GC revise this wording so that the certifications can be issued within 12 months prior to the bid being awarded to the Respondent. This allows the Respondent sufficient time to finalize any in-progress certification processes while still satisfying the GC’s ultimate requirement of compliancy prior to the use of the Commercially Available Cloud Services.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 32.</p>
96	<p>With respect to Mandatory ID M10 Third Party Assurance, the requirement states that “The Respondent must provide the following ... c) AICPA Service Organization Control (SOC) 2 Type II for the trust principles of security, availability, processing integrity and confidentiality.”</p> <p>It is understood that the trust principle of processing integrity refers to the completeness, accuracy, validity, timeliness and authorization of system process where completeness generally indicates that all transactions are processed or all services are performed without exception. Depending on the specific nature of the Commercially Available Cloud Services, the CSP may not have full visibility to the transaction level in order to guarantee processing integrity. The application layer and therefore many software elements will often be the responsibility of the GC and therefore the end to end processing integrity of the transaction is not in the full purview of the CSP. As such, it is requested that M10 be restated such that the requirement for processing integrity be removed entirely as its not universally applicable to all cloud services, or that the specific controls relevant to processing integrity that are universally applicable to all cloud services, be listed.</p>	<p>Canada will not be modifying the requirement. Canada recognizes that there is a shared responsibility model when leveraging cloud services. The services for which the SOC 2, Type II applies, including its applicability for processing integrity, should be clearly outlined in the audit report.</p>



Question Number	Question	Response
97	<p>With respect to Mandatory ID M14 Privacy, the requirement states that “To demonstrate compliance to the certification, the Respondent must provide ... a) a copy of the Cloud Service Provider’s most recent and ISO 27018 certification documents, which must have been issued within the 12 months prior the solicitation closing date”.</p> <p>As the Respondent may currently be in the process of finalizing its various forms of certifications, it is requested that the GC revise this wording so that the certifications can be issued within 12 months prior to the bid being awarded to the Respondent. This allows the Respondent sufficient time to finalize any in-progress certification processes while still satisfying the GC’s ultimate requirement of compliancy prior to the use of the Commercially Available Cloud Services.</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 32.
98	In reference to Stream 2, Mandatory 2 - Is Stream 2 intended for Cloud Service Providers or also for Software Providers that host in the Cloud?	Please see Canada's response to Question 1.
99	May a Respondent’s (Cloud Service Provider’s) Stream 1 Response include Commercially Available Services for which the availability of one of the required features (such as data residency, French language access etc.) has been publicly announced to have an effective date that falls after the ITQ Close Date?	Any proposed Commercially Available Public Cloud Service must meet the requirements outlined in Annex A as of the ITQ closing date. Any Respondent that has a Commercially Available Public Cloud Service that does not align with Canada’s requirements as of the ITQ closing date is encouraged to participate in subsequent solicitations in the future.

Question Number	Question	Response
100	<p>Many Cloud Service Providers offer multiple Commercially Available Services built and supported on different infrastructure even though they are all offerings of the same Cloud Service Provider.</p> <p>May the Stream 1 Response of a Respondent (Cloud Service Provider) who offers multiple Commercially Available Services include multiple Commercially Available Services in the same Response (all with respect to which the Respondent is the Cloud Service Provider)?</p> <p>If so, would a Response be deemed non-responsive if some of the Commercially Available Services included in that Response did not meet the ITQ requirements, even though other Commercially Available Services in that Response met all ITQ requirements and would have been deemed responsive in their own right?</p>	<p>Please see Canada`s modifications to the ITQ. A response cannot contain multiple Commercially Available Public Cloud Services. Any Respondent with multiple Commercially Available Public Cloud Service offerings must submit a separate response for each proposed Commercially Available Public Cloud Service.</p>
101	<p>For both Stream 1 and Stream 2, may Cloud Service Providers who normally only sell in US dollars use a reseller as an intermediary/agent to provide pricing, and fulfill orders, in Canadian dollars (the said reseller/intermediaries being one of those normally used for all commercial customers who wish to deal in Canadian dollars)?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 9.</p>
102	<p>What date must the industry certifications in M8 of Stream 1 need to be obtained by?</p>	<p>Please see Canada`s response in Question 32.</p>
103	<p>Given the complexity of the ITQ, will Shared Services Canada extend the ITQ Close Date for Stream 1 to December 14th?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 3.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
104	<p>Regarding Section 1.2 b) iv) (A) of the Invitation to Qualify for Government of Canada Cloud Service Procurement Vehicle (GC Cloud) No. 32099 which states: "Respondents who qualify for Stream 1 will automatically qualify for Stream 2." Can the GoC confirm there is no need for Respondents who fill out form 32099</p> <p>- ITQ Annex A Appendix 1 to fill out 32099 - ITQ Annex A Appendix 2 in order to - upon submitting a successful response – to subsequently qualify for Stream 2?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically to Section 2.3.</p>
105	<p>Certain requirements contained in the ITQ seem to imply that to respond to the ITQ Respondents must have previously done business with the GoC: specifically:</p> <p>a) From Annex F - the requirement to submit a Procurement Business Number (PBN)</p> <p>b) From Annex F –Security Level Clearance of Respondent</p> <p>c) From 32099 – GC Cloud Vehicle – ITQ – "The response must include documentation confirming that the Cloud Service Provider of the proposed cloud services is registered for the Cloud Service Provider Information Technology Security Assessment Process as described in Annex B." Annex B does not provide any instruction re registering for this process.</p> <p>Can the GoC please confirm:</p> <p>a) Which of a,b,c stated above are requirements that must be submitted with the response?</p> <p>b) Regarding c) advise re what the process is to register for the Cloud Service Provider Information Technology Security Assessment Process as described in Annex B. This information does not seem to be included in the 32099</p> <p>- Annex B - CSE CSP ITS Assessment Program (ENGLISH).pdf</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically to Section 3.3 and Annex F.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
106	<p>32099 - ITQ Annex A Appendix 1 requirement M4 states in part that: "...credentials remain within the geographic boundaries of Canada."</p> <p>Many Cloud Services Providers (CSP's) store data in Canada but do some processing in the US. To meet the GoC's requirement already stated, the proponent plans to configure SSO SAML 2.0 authentication to leverage the GoC's managed user directory such that it is the only way a user (Master Account or end user) can authenticate to the service.</p> <p>Since the proponent cannot demonstrate this capability until an actual installation is performed, can the GoC please stipulate exactly what documentation they would require to validate this capability?</p>	<p>Canada is looking for the whitepaper (or equivalent documentation) at this stage of the procurement.</p>
107	<p>32099 – ITQ Annex A Appendix 1 M10 b) "The Respondent must provide the following industry certifications to demonstrate compliance: b) ISO/IEC 27017:2015 Information technology -- Security techniques -- Code of practice for information security controls based on ISO/IEC 27002 for cloud services;" In absence of a CSP having this certification, in order to meet the requirement M10, is the CSP able to outline FedRAMP Moderate Questions re 32099 - Invitation to Qualify for Government of Canada Cloud Service Procurement Vehicle (GC Cloud) level and PCI DSS 3.2 certifications with defined controls which provide coverage for ISO 27017?</p>	<p>Canada has considered the request but will not be modifying the ITQ.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
108	<p>Regarding ITQ no 32099 Main Document page 5 Paragraph labeled (A) and Annex A, Appendix 1 Requirement M1</p> <p>We request that SSC modify the ITQ so that Resellers and Alternate Service Providers are able to respond to Stream 1 for the following reasons:</p> <p>Canada should not exclude small and medium Canadian business from participating in the opportunity to provide Protected B Cloud services to the Government of Canada and other Public Sector Entities that may choose to leverage this Supply Arrangement.</p> <p>Certain Cloud Service Providers who have organized their approach to public sector sales around a third party strategy will have issues responding directly to the resulting RFP. This will restrict the diversity of offerings available to Canada on this supply arrangement and could eliminate offerings that would otherwise provide value to those leveraging the resulting contract for Cloud Services.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically to Section 2.3 and Section 3.3.</p>
109	<p>Would Canada please elaborate on the definition of an Alternate Service Provider? Stating that it is "Not a Cloud Reseller" leaves many interpretations open. Would Canada confirm that an Alternate Service Provider is defined as an entity that is authorized by a CSP to purchase it's cloud services products and bundle other value add products and/or services, and thus provide a complete solution to the customer based on combined product packaging that was not available from the CSP directly.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically to Annex E.</p>
110	<p>Would Canada please modify the ITQ so that it remains open for the life of the supply arrangement? The process currently described will result in restricting all future purchases by any organization that leverages this contract solely to the technology of companies that meet the requirements on or before Oct 11 2018. Since cloud is a rapidly evolving technology an open ITQ Process will allow SSC to take advantage of advancements from any company that chooses to attempt to qualify over the life of the contract.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 60.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
111	<p>Regarding the bottom row of Figure 1 on Page 5 of the main document. Nearly all CSPs now provide an 'On Premise' Cloud which can be an excellent way to handle security, and/or performance/latency for complex, multi-tiered or integrated applications. They are often used as a phase in the journey to Public Cloud in order to De-Risk the migration of workloads. These Cloud solutions that can be located in your data Centre are an essential part of a complete solution and should not be excluded. Please confirm that On-Premise Cloud will not be excluded.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically to Section 1.2.</p> <p>The scope of the ITQ is for commercial Cloud Service Providers (CSP) with existing, global, publicly-available offerings.</p>
112	<p>Regarding the Closing Dates, and deadlines for Questions. We request a one month extension so that we can properly evaluate our options, seek clarifications where needed, and provide a quality response to SSC. The time provided is insufficient given the complexity of the request.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 3.</p>
113	<p>SSC should allow alternate cloud service provider to be qualified to provide Protected B cloud services to SSC, instead of only CSP. By only allowing CSP direct will prevent innovation, execution and successful deployment of cloud. The alternate service providers, in particular the Canadian providers with proper security clearance and certification should be allowing to be qualified in this ITQ. Can SSC please amend the ITQ to allow alternate cloud service provider to be qualified.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 12.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
114	<p>“A Respondent (including related entities as defined in subsection (d) below) will be permitted to qualify only once per Procurement Stream for a proposed Commercially Available Cloud Service (CSP). If a Respondent or any related entity participate in more than one response for any given Stream (participating means being part of the Respondent, not being a subcontractor), Canada will provide those Respondents with 2 working days to identify the single response to be considered by Canada. Failure to meet this deadline may result in all the affected responses being disqualified or in Canada’s discretion, which of the responses to evaluate.”</p> <p>We would like to request that the government consider allowing Reseller Respondents to submit multiple STREAM 2 ITQ, with different CSP. This would allow us to demonstrate technology solutions that can provide the benefits of several different cloud solutions. Such an approach would allow the government to consider the benefits of all solutions proposed.</p> <p>Will SSC allow Reseller Respondents to submit multiple STREAM 2 ITQ, with different CSP?</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 12.
115	<p>Due to the complexity of the ITQ requirements, we would like to request for an extension for the question deadline for both Stream 1 and 2.</p> <p>Would Canada please extend the question period to following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stream 1: October 12th, 2018</li> <li>• Stream 2: October 25th, 2018</li> </ul>	Please see Canada's response to Question 3.
116	<p>The ITQ document indicates that “ANNEX C – COMMON RESULTING CONTRACT TERMS” and “ANNEX D – OVERVIEW OF THE SSC CLOUD BROKERING SERVICE” will be made available “later in the ITQ process”.</p> <p>Given that the windows for asking questions close on September 21 and September 27, please clarify if these Annexes (Annex C in particular) are anticipated during the ITQ or during RRR phases; and, if the Annexes are released after the close of questions but during the ITQ period, will SSC accept any resulting questions after September 21st and/or 27th?</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 25.



Question Number	Question	Response
117	To demonstrate compliance with Annex A Appendix 1 M10 and Stream Annex A Appendix 2 M9, item d) requires each certification or assessment report to be valid for the “duration of the contract”. Is SSC planning to issue multiple 1-year contracts; or, given that some certifications are re-audited every year, will SSC consider rewording item d) to make it clear that a current version of the certification or assessment report is required annually for the duration of the contract?	Please see Canada's response to Question 10.
118	Can Shared Services Canada explain the reason for a second ITQ for cloud services for unclassified/protected A data, was this supply source not achieved with the original ITQ and contract award to the 26 contract holders and 8 CSP's named in February of 2018.	The contracts established under the Public Cloud Services procurement aimed to address the immediate need for a source of supply of Public Cloud Services. The procurement established itself as being interim solution that would only address a limited duration and scope (unclassified data requirements). The current solicitation aims to be the next step in Canada's efforts to develop a sustainable procurement vehicle capable of addressing requirements with various data classification needs, within a procurement vehicle structure that will provide ongoing flexibility to adapt as cloud services evolve.
119	With respect to the eight Cloud Service Providers (CSPs) selected as the initial (and interim) source supply of cloud services for unclassified data. Can Shared Services Canada explain how workload was allocated to the selected CSP's to achieve the original goal of the procurement process?	Please see Amendment 3 which has published Annex C, which contains clauses on various topics. Characteristics of the current procurement vehicle (including allocation) will be established at subsequent phases of this procurement process, independently of any other vehicle.
120	If a respondent has been participating in a proof of concept with Shared Services for cloud services but was not one of the original eight Cloud Service Providers (CSPs) would that be considered a “conflict of interest”?	This solicitation has issued as a standalone procurement that is separate from any and all previous GC procurement solicitations. Canada has not engaged in any proof of concepts that have established any conflict of interest or unfair advantages with a supplier as per Section 1.4 of the ITQ.



Question Number	Question	Response
121	<p>Will Shared Services Canada allow a bidder that currently has the appropriate clearances in place to support Protected A and Protected B workloads be considered compliant with the requirements identified in M8, M9, M10 and M14 given that our current security standards have been previously verified and in use for some time.</p>	<p>This solicitation has been issued as a standalone procurement that is separate from any and all previous GC procurement solicitations. All Respondents must meet the requirements of this ITQ to be considered compliant.</p>
122	<p>There appears to be an inconsistency with respect to the requirement outlined in M10 to provide a copy of a current ISO 27017 certificate for services that in General Requirement M1 are identified as commercially Available Cloud Services that will be offered to Canada at the solicitation stage of this procurement process. It is our understanding that ISO auditors will not formally grant ISO 27017 certification for a particular site until that site is operational.</p> <p>Would Shared Services Canada modify the requirement in M10 to state that the Cloud Service Provider will provide confirmation from a recognized auditor (independent third party qualified under AICPA or CPA Canada, and/or ISO certification regime and that conforms to ISO/IEC 17020 quality management system standard) that they have been retained to complete the audit once the site is operational with the understanding that the audit must be completed and certification granted before the solicitation stage submission date?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically to Annex A and Annex B. Canada has considered but will not be modifying the requirement as requested.</p>
123	<p>It is our understanding that the Federal Government has the right to seize equipment containing data or systems previously deemed Protected B. If this is accurate, how does Shared Services Canada intend to modify this capability to ensure that should this occur other subscribers operating on the same infrastructure are not negatively affected?</p>	<p>The Intent of the solicitation is to qualify Respondents based on the requirements of the ITQ. Comments and feedback of this nature will be reviewed and discussed at subsequent procurement phases.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
124	<p>How does Shared Services Canada foresee and address any risk from the Clarifying Lawful Overseas Use of Data (CLOUD) Act with respect to US headquartered cloud service providers being compelled to release Government of Canada data for any reason upon direction from a US Court. For example, a person utilizing medicinal cannabis and travelling within the US could be arrested and charged with possession and to establish a case the authorities could invoke the CLOUD act without notice to access the individual's medical records. Is this deemed an acceptable risk to Canadian Data sovereignty?</p>	<p>Please refer to the Government of Canada White Paper: Data Sovereignty and Public Cloud located at the link below.</p> <p>Link - <a href="https://www.canada.ca/en/treasury-board-secretariat/services/information-technology/cloud-computing/gc-white-paper-data-sovereignty-public-cloud.html">https://www.canada.ca/en/treasury-board-secretariat/services/information-technology/cloud-computing/gc-white-paper-data-sovereignty-public-cloud.html</a>.</p>
125	<p>Within the CLOUD SERVICE PROVIDER INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ASSESSMENT PROCESS document (ITSM.50.100) contained in Annex B it refers to ISO/IEC 27001 and 27018 reports but does not refer to ISO 27017. The ITQ includes ISO 27017 as a requirement as well. The ITSM.50.100 document effective date is identified as August 31st, 2018 and the ITQ was issued on September 7th, 2018. This short period of time makes it very difficult to achieve the new certifications (ISO 27018) within the time period provided for Cloud Service Provider headquartered in Canada and focused on meeting domestic Canadian government requirements. It should also be noted that neither ISO 27017 nor ISO 27018 are referenced in the currently published "Government of Canada Cloud Security Risk Management Approach and Procedures".</p> <p>Does Shared Services Canada believe this is an adequate period of time to allow a Cloud Service Provider to secure the certification given the recent introduction of the requirement by the CSE?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically to Annex B.</p>
126	<p>Given the complex nature of many of the questions within this ITQ and the amount of detail required to assemble would Canada consider extending the closing date to October 26th to ensure our answers are concise and can reflect the full responses to the questions being submitted.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 3.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
127	<p>Given that Canada has not provided answers to previously asked questions as of September 21, 2018, we formally request an extension to the question period and ITQ submission due date for Steam 1 (Tier 2), given that the turnaround time to respond following receipt of answers is very short.</p> <p>Additionally, will there be an opportunity to submit follow-up questions after the receipt of answers?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 3.</p>
128	<p>a) Annex F (Response Submission Form (Part 1) - Security Clearance Level of Respondent): Please clarify what Security Clearance Level information Canada is requesting be included in the Response Submission Form. Our understanding is that there are no clearances required as part of the ITQ submission.</p> <p>b) ITQ 2.4 Security Clearance Requirement (A Respondent must meet the security clearance requirements contained in Annex A in order to become a Qualified Respondent). Upon review, it's our understanding that Annex A does not specify any security clearance requirements. Can you please confirm?</p>	<p>No clearances are required at this stage of the solicitation. Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically Section 2.4 and Annex F.</p>
129	<p>Section 1.2 states: "As the GC continues its efforts to expand its adoption of cloud-based services, an increasing demand is emerging for a source of supply capable of fulfilling public cloud services requirements above the unclassified data level".</p> <p>We understand that GC has entered into contracts for software or hardware that were competitively procured, and further that GC has entered into sole source arrangements for cloud services. Will Canada confirm that it will not intermingle existing contracts with the resulting contracts that flow from this competitive procurement process?</p>	<p>At this time, it is anticipated that the vehicle being established will be the primary source of supply for Commercial Available Public Cloud Services requirements. As stated in the ITQ, this process will not preclude SSC or Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) from using another method of supply for any of its clients with the same or similar needs, unless a subsequent solicitation for this Project expressly indicates otherwise.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
130	<p>Section 3.3 content states: “Confirmation of registration for the Cloud Service Provider Information Technology Security Assessment (STREAM 1 ONLY) (Mandatory at ITQ Closing for Stream 1): The response must include documentation confirming that the Cloud Service Provider of the proposed cloud services is registered for the Cloud Service Provider Information Technology Security Assessment Process as described in Annex B.”</p> <p>Would Canada consider rewording this requirement to the following: “The response must include documentation confirming that the Cloud Service Provider has the appropriate registration for the CSP Information Technology Security Assessment, as described in Annex B, for its regional entity and data centers located within Canada?”</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically Section 3.3, Annex A and Annex B. Canada has clarified in Section 3.3 and Annex A the specific requirements a Respondent must complete for the proposed Commercially Available Pubic Cloud Service.</p>
131	<p>Would SSC respectfully consider creating a "Question Period 2" with a new deadline as was incorporated into the Workload Migration (WLM) ITQ? With the size, scope and complexity of the Government of Canada Cloud Service Procurement Vehicle (GC Cloud). It would be in SSC's best interest to allow Vendors another intake for questions and answers for such an important initiative.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 23.</p>
132	<p>Would SSC respectfully consider a two week extension to the October 11th deadline as this is the same deadline for the WLM ITQ?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 3.</p>
133	<p>As SSC can appreciate, given the size and scope of our project references and given that NDAs have been signed, our clients from the Intelligence community are reluctant to grant permission to submit these projects as references for our organization. We trust SSC can assure the highest level of security-cleared people in a reading room which has the appropriate facility clearance, in order to evaluate the ITQ responses such that Vendors are not penalised in this regard. Please confirm?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically Section 3.3.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
134	Will qualified CSP's who have been awarded a procurement vehicle be able to determine which client requirements they wish to propose cloud services for.	The precise structure of the procurement vehicle will be determined at subsequent stages of this process.
135	Since ISO 27017:2015 Information technology is a Code of Practice, and not an auditable standard. Given the requirement for certification against ISO 27001 which is the broader standard would Canada accept other supporting documents regarding security controls for cloud services?	Canada will not consider alternatives to the certifications identified in Annex A.
136	Would a SSAE-18 SOC II audited Supplier Compliance Management process be considered equivalent, to the listed Supply Chain Risk Management alternatives?	Please see Canada's response to Question 135.
137	Since ISO 27018 is a Code of Practice, and not an auditable standard, and BS10012 is an auditable standard for personal information management please confirm that Canada would accept this certification as compliant.	Please see Canada's response to Question 135.
138	Assuming a compliant response to all aspects of this requirement is there a level of security screening above the CSP's personnel security standards.	Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically Section 2.4.  Additional security screening requirements may be required at the discretion of the Crown.
139	Canada has not provided detail on what types of cloud services will be considered through this procurement. Will this be solely for Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) offering?	Please see Canada's response to Question 1.

Question Number	Question	Response
140	<p>Recently PSPC has announced that they will be engaging industry in consultation for Software as a Service (SaaS) procurement instruments. Please describe in the view of Shared Service Canada how these two separate and distinct procurement approaches will be governed and positioned to Government Departments.</p>	<p>Canada's departments and agencies are focused on establishing sources of supply that will improve access to cloud services to GC departments. Several departments, including PSPC, are engaged in various activities related to this GC initiative.</p> <p>With regards to the PSPC led solicitation, given the state of the referenced procurement, Shared Services Canada is not in a position to provide any information publically at this time. Any additional questions related to the referenced engagement activities should directed to PSPC.</p> <p>With regards to the SSC led solicitation, the aim is to qualify and categorize cloud suppliers based on their ability to meet the requirements in the ITQ. This solicitation has considered the ever-changing manner in which cloud services are delivered today, and has avoided specifying specific service models within its scope. The goal of this portion of the GC initiative to yield a procurement vehicle that establishes a sustainable relationship between the GC and qualified suppliers, who offer a vast list of qualified Services.</p>
141	<p>Section 1.3 Overview of Anticipated Procurement Process. Given the Wave approach to awarding procurement vehicles, can SSC confirm what the difference is in the Cloud requirements for Wave 1 versus Wave 2 or 3? Are they all the same requirement, or different by workload, department, volume, value, etc.?</p>	<p>Each wave identifies an opportunity that a Qualified Respondent will have to submit a proposal to Canada for evaluation and consideration. The waves are contained within the same solicitation and as such have the same requirements and evaluation procedures outlined in the solicitation.</p> <p>The aim of the proposed multiple waves is to provide Qualified Respondents an opportunity to submit a proposal within the solicitation timeframe, based on when they deem their proposal ready for consideration and evaluation by Canada. Qualified Respondents who successfully submit a proposal prior to a wave's deadline, will have an opportunity to have procurement vehicle awarded at the end of the specific wave period, provided they successful meet all the solicitation's requirements and receive GC approval for award.</p>



Question Number	Question	Response
142	<p>SSC is requesting that our company provide ISO 27001, ISO 27017 and SOC2 Type II certifications as part of the bid. As you are aware, these documents contain highly sensitive information regarding our solutions. An NDA is required for the release of this information to SSC. Furthermore, it is unclear within this ITQ if these sensitive documents would be subject to an Access to Information request. Can SSC please confirm the following:</p> <p>a) Are you willing to sign a mutual NDA with our organization?            b) Is CSE the sole entity that will review these documents?            c) Will the documents be subject to an ATIP request?            d) Are you willing to accept a SOC 3 report (which doesn't require an NDA)?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically Section 3.3.</p> <p>Please also see Canada's response to Question 135.</p>
143	<p>SSC is requesting compliance to ISO 27018 and copies of the certifications. Our organization is currently in the process of seeking the certification. Customers turn to our organization to understand and improve their security posture. We practice what we preach. We are dedicated to keeping your data secure and private. We are committed to adhering to global and industry compliance initiatives, including GDPR. We can provide detailed documentation on these practices while we continue through the ISO 27018 certification process. Can SSC provide guidance on equivalency for substantiation to this requirement?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically Section 3.3.</p> <p>Please also see Canada's response to Question 135.</p>
144	<p>Annex A, Appendix 1 M10 and Annex A, Appendix 2 M9 require disclosure of our SOC2 report. While possible, the terms of our audit require that the report be disclosed to the requesting client (e.g. SSC) and only to a specific list of people - it cannot be disclosed to most Company X employees or to SSC "in general".</p> <p>That said, would it be acceptable to SSC if the report is submitted directly to the contract authority under separate cover before the ITQ close (so its authenticity can be validated); and, then to a specific list of evaluators during the ITQ evaluation, if required?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically Section 3.3.</p>



Question Number	Question	Response
<p>145</p>	<p>Annex A, Appendix 1 M14 requires our ISO27018 assessment report which violates one of our internal security policies. Instead of the assessment report, will SSC accept an ISO Consolidated Statement of Applicability (SOA)? The SOA identifies the controls selected to address the risks that were identified in the risk assessment process, explains why those controls have been elected, states whether or not they have been implemented, and explains why any controls have been omitted if any. As with the SOC2 report, the SOA could be submitted directly to the contract authority under separate cover before the ITQ close (so its authenticity can be validated); and, then to a specific list of evaluators during the ITQ evaluation, if required.</p> <p>Is the SOA acceptable in place of the assessment report?</p>	<p>Canada requires the requested documentation identified in Annex A.</p> <p>Please also see Canada`s response to Question 135.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
146	<p>“The wording of the ITQ appears to be related to qualifying Protected B Cloud Vendors however mandatory requirement M7b limits a world-class protected B SaaS vendor from responding simply based on the assumption regarding how this service is being asked to be procured. Is this ITQ related only to cloud services that can be procured through a website with a credit card? Many cloud solutions, particularly enterprise-class solutions, require more than ordering from a catalog and spinning up architecture. There can be sales and professional services involvement in procuring and implementing an enterprise class protected B SaaS and procurement automation is not relevant to qualify as a protected B cloud vendor in our opinion.</p> <p>Company X has two asks</p> <p>a) Remove M7b all together as the requirement does not have anything to do with protected B data classification or certification, it relates specifically to how potential customers acquire the Cloud service (via a website and credit card transaction).</p> <p>b) Remove the M7b and amend the ITQ to have each vendor describe how a Potential customer would acquire their cloud service to ensure the RFP is clear as to not confuse government employees to the validity of storing protected B data in cloud services not qualifying under these terms.</p> <p>If the mandatory requirement is not removed this results in this ITQs result being “Protected B Cloud Vendors with Procurement Automation through their website”. We would expect the government to then release a second procurement vehicle for “Protected B Cloud Vendors where you have to talk to someone”. Vendors not fulfilling the M7b procurement method mandatory has nothing to do with that vendor being a fully compliant protected B cloud vendor in all other respects.</p> <p>Please clarify the title/intention of this ITQ or remove M7b.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically to Annex A.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
147	<p>Annex G appears to repeat these 3 lines.</p> <p>Complete Legal Name of the Respondent Respondent's Address Respondent's Procurement Business Number (PBN)</p> <p>Please confirm this is intentional.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically to Annex F. Canada confirms it requests the information listed Annex F from Respondents.</p>
148	<p>In order to send you the security certificates you require, I need for you to sign a non-disclosure agreement (NDA).</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the RFP and specifically the revised version of Annex B.</p>
149	<p>With regards to the subject solicitation, Company X has the following request:</p> <p>Reference 1: Last day for questions and ITQ closing date</p> <p>Question 1: Our technical experts have done an in-depth review and still require some clarifications. In order to submit the most comprehensive and competitive response possible to meet the requirements of the ITQ, we request a 2 week extension to both the period for questions (October 4th) and ITQ closing date (October 25th)?</p> <p>We appreciate your consideration of our request and look forward to your response.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 3.</p>
150	<p>We recently came across ITQ #32099 for GC Cloud. We are very interested in this opportunity and are reviewing the documents thoroughly.</p> <p>Would the Crown consider extending the Question deadline October 2nd?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 3.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
151	<p>Although the period for accepting questions for the Secure Cloud Procurement ITQ Stream 1 expired on September 21, please consider the following:</p> <p>Company X Question: SSC has only permitted one week for Proponents to consider all of SSC's answers to questions before the closing date on October 11 . Will SSC please extend the closing date for Stream 1 responses to October 25?</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 3.
152	<p>Reference the GC Cloud Vehicle, Section 2.3 (b), it highlights that all successful Stream 1 ITQ respondents 'will automatically qualify for Stream 2'. Will SSC reconfirm that no Steam 2 response is required for successful Stream 1 ITQ Respondents to successfully qualify for both?</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 60.
153	<p>Will the Crown please extend the closing date of the ITQ from October 25th to November 8th? We have several divisions from different LOBs that need to be consulted in order to fully answer all required questions and fields in this ITQ including, but not limited to, Company X Sales, Legal, Security, Content as well as Company X Sales, Legal, Security. While we are working toward completion, we still need to coordinate and accommodate multiple schedules of key internal stakeholders.</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 3.
154	<p>Could the Crown please a copy of SSC's current Public Cloud Services contracts so that our legal teams can review the standard key terms and conditions we will be asked to agree to? (Shared Services Canada General Information, ITQ No. 32009, 2.2 b) If this is not available, may we have a copy of a standard contract to review?</p>	Please see Canada's response to Question 5.

Question Number	Question	Response
155	<p>Could the Crown please provide additional detail with respect to Section 1.3 Overview of Anticipated Procurement Process? Specifically:</p> <p>a) What is the timing of Wave 2 and Wave 3?</p> <p>b) What is the expected duration between the completion of Wave 1 and Wave 2?</p> <p>c) What is the expected duration between the completion of Wave 2 and Wave 3?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 60.</p>
156	<p>With regard to M10 Annex A, Appendix 2, while there is a partial listing of nations with bilateral agreements on the PWGC website (<a href="https://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/esc-src/international-eng.html">https://www.tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca/esc-src/international-eng.html</a>), are there others not listed?</p>	<p>Canada confirms that the list of countries and international organizations listed in the referenced website is considered complete at the present time. As per the reference in the ITQ, the list of countries is periodically updated as required.</p>
157	<p>With regard to M10 Annex A, Appendix 2, if primary data storage facilities reside in approved locations, would the Crown give consideration to a vendor that may have one or more data storage facilities located in nations without bilateral agreements on the PWGC website?</p>	<p>The proposed Services must meet the Data Protection requirements for the applicable Stream.</p>
158	<p>The Government of Canada stated that this new cloud service procurement vehicle will be in effect for an indeterminate number of years. Would the government of Canada kindly explain why this vehicle is not limited to a specific number of years?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 60.</p>
159	<p>Given the ever evolving cloud services market place, what vision does the Government of Canada have for a future vehicle that would be used to add or replace providers?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 60.</p>
160	<p>Would the Government of Canada please provide clarification on what it considers to be included in "Commercially Available Cloud Service"? What aspects of Infrastructure as a Service, Platform as a Service, Software as a Service, Strategy and Roadmap Work, Architectural and Engineering Work, Integration and Migration Work, Normalization and Managed Services Work are included in the definition of "Commercially Available Cloud Service"?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modification to the ITQ and specifically Section 1.2. Please see Canada's response to Question 1.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
<p><b>161</b></p>	<p>With reference to 2.3 Submission of Only One Response per Respondent for a proposed Commercially Available Cloud Service</p> <p>c) A Respondent (including related entities as defined in subsection (d) below) will be permitted to qualify only once per Procurement Stream for a proposed Commercially Available Cloud Service (CSP).</p> <p>Question Will Canada please confirm that this requirement means that a Respondent can only qualify once for a procurement stream and may not qualify multiple times with different Cloud Service Providers for the same procurement stream.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modification to the ITQ and specifically Section 2.3.</p>
<p><b>162</b></p>	<p>With reference to ANNEX C – COMMON RESULTING CONTRACT TERMS Note to Respondents: SSC anticipates providing the proposed contract clauses for the resulting contract later in the ITQ process.</p> <p>With reference to ANNEX D – OVERVIEW OF THE SSC CLOUD BROKERING SERVICE Note to Respondents: SSC anticipates providing the proposed contract clauses for the resulting contract later in the ITQ process.</p> <p>(a) Question - With significant items to be provided at a later date would SSC delay the ITQ until all items are available for review and consideration?</p> <p>(b) Question - Given the complex nature of many of the questions within this ITQ and the amount of detail required to assemble would Canada consider extending the closing date to November 9th to ensure our answers are concise and can reflect the full responses to the questions being submitted.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 3 and the publication of Annexes C &amp; D in Amendment 3.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
163	<p>With reference to M2</p> <p>Question: It is not clear what the difference is between an Alternative Services Provider and a Cloud Reseller.</p> <p>Could you please further explain the note – For item (c) (ii) listed above, the word “access” is defined in accordance with NIST SP800-32 which states “Ability to make use of any information system (IS) resource”</p>	<p>Please see Canada’s modification to the ITQ and specifically Annex E.</p>
164	<p>With reference to M5</p> <p>Question: With respect to the location of the published SLA’s, it is not clear if these are to be located on the service provider or the cloud provider’s documentation and website or a combination of both.</p> <p>Could you please clarify if this documentation is to be provided on the service provider’s website / documentation, the Solution Providers or a combination of both?</p>	<p>The onus is on the Respondent to provide Canada with a response that reflects the manner in which the proposed Services are provided by the Respondent. Depending on the nature of the proposed Services by the Respondent, the Commercially Available published SLAs can be either the Cloud Service Provider’s, the Alternate Service Provider’s or both.</p>
165	<p>With Reference to M6</p> <p>Question: With respect to users being able to choose the preferred language of their choice, French or English, could you please clarify if this is to be a setting in their personal profile and stored for future visits or an options to select upon logging into or browsing the various components of the solution being provided that may (or may not) be reset when they leave the sites or applications associated to the solution</p>	<p>Canada has no preference with respect to the two proposed options as long as the proposed Commercially Available Services provide consumers the ability to choose one of the two official languages (French and English).</p>
166	<p>Can SSC please confirm which cloud services (e.g., IaaS, PaaS, SaaS) this ITQ covers? For those not covered, can you please outline when these services will be tendered and by whom?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's Response to Question 1.</p>



Question Number	Question	Response
167	<p>Can SSC please clarify why there are two streams? As outlined in the ITQ, all respondents who qualify for Stream 1 will automatically qualify for Stream 2. In addition, any service (Tier 1 or 2) a potential client user might request, could then be provided by the Stream 1 respondents.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modification to the ITQ and specifically Section 1.2 and Section 2.3.</p>
168	<p>It is mentioned on Page 5 of the ITQ that only non-Cloud Service Providers can apply directly for Stream 2 and that for Stream 1, the Respondent must be the Cloud Service Provider of the proposed Commercially Available Cloud Service. The partner network of the Cloud Service Providers are able to provide the exact same service, SLAs, security requirements and at the same price as the Cloud Service Provider. In fact, there is no difference between the Cloud Service Provider and its partner network/resellers.</p> <p>Can SSC please clarify why the Government of Canada is limiting non-Cloud Service Providers to only respond to Stream 2 and not allowing them to respond to Stream 1?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modification to the ITQ and specifically Section 2.3</p>
169	<p>Can SSC please clarify the role of the Cloud Service Providers' partner/reseller network in the future bid solicitations resulting from the Stream 1 ITQ process? Many Cloud Service Providers rely heavily on their partners/reseller/cloud solution providers to both sell the cloud services and provide the professional services. As it is outlined now in the ITQ, it appears that only the Cloud Service Providers can provide these services, especially for Stream 1.</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modification to the ITQ and specifically Section 2.3.</p>
170	<p>Per the SSC Standard Instructions for Procurement, section 1.8 a) Bids – Submission in Sections, SSC is requesting a Technical Bid, Financial Bid, and Certifications Bid.</p> <p>When no financial information is requested at this time, what information should be included in the Financial Bid?</p>	<p>Canada confirms that we have not specified any requirements that request financial information from Respondents in this stage of the solicitation.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
171	Can the respondent respond proposing more than one CSP in a single response to Stream 2? Under section 2.3 only one response is accepted. Please confirm SSC's direction on how best to support multiple CSP's proposed by a respondent.	Please see Canada's modification to the ITQ and specifically Section 2.3.
172	Our firm is technically classified as a CSP under our partnership with Company X. Is SSC's definition of CSP limited to direct bids from the likes of Company X, Company Y, Company Z, etc.?	Please see Canada's modification to the ITQ and specifically Section 2.3 and Annex E.
173	Reference: Last day for questions and ITQ closing date  Question: Our technical experts have done an in-depth review and still require some clarifications. In order to submit the most comprehensive and competitive response possible to meet the requirements of the ITQ, we request a 2 week extension to both the period for questions (October 4th) and ITQ closing date (October 25th)?	Please see Canada's response to Question 3.
174	<p>“SSC initiated a competitive procurement process to establish an initial (and interim) source supply of cloud services for unclassified data. The solicitation process concluded in the spring of 2018 with the establishment of twenty-six contracts with qualified vendors offering public cloud services from eight different Cloud Service Providers (CSPs).”</p> <p>Our company represents several Cloud Service Providers (CSP) that currently offer cloud services for unclassified data through the 26 contracts referenced. Cloud services for unclassified data will be offered through Stream 2 Contracts resulting from this ITQ (and subsequent procurement).</p> <p>What is the relationship between the current 26 contracts and Stream 2 Contracts resulting from this ITQ (and subsequent procurement)?</p>	This solicitation has been issued as a standalone procurement that is separate from any and all previous GC procurement solicitations. The existing contracts established in the Public Cloud Services procurement were established as an interim source of supply for the GC with a finite expiry date. Once established, existing Services procured through those contracts will be migrated to the new procurement vehicle.

Question Number	Question	Response
175	<p>“SSC initiated a competitive procurement process to establish an initial (and interim) source supply of cloud services for unclassified data. The solicitation process concluded in the spring of 2018 with the establishment of twenty-six contracts with qualified vendors offering public cloud services from eight different Cloud Service Providers (CSPs).”</p> <p>Our company represents several CSPs that currently offer cloud services for unclassified data through the 26 contracts referenced. Cloud services for unclassified data will be offered through Stream 2 Contracts resulting from this ITQ (and subsequent procurement).</p> <p>What are the pain points with the current Contracts that will be solved through Stream 2?</p>	<p>The Public Cloud Services procurement was established as an interim source of supply. The ITQ aims to establish a procurement vehicle that will have a more flexible structure and be better suited to public cloud services.</p>
176	<p>“Respondents who qualify for Stream 1 will automatically qualify for Stream 2.”</p> <p>Respondents who qualify for Stream 1 may be invited to participate in the RRR process. After participating in the RRR process, respondents who qualify for Stream 1 may determine that they will need to respond only to Stream 2.</p> <p>Can Stream 1 respondents designate an authorized Reseller to respond to Stream 2 during the Bid Solicitation Phase?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the RFP and specifically to Section 2.3.</p>
177	<p>“Qualified Respondents will be required to demonstrate in the bid solicitation phase that the CSP of the proposed cloud service has successfully completed the CSP IT Security Assessment.”</p> <p>The instructions on page 12 indicate that the CSP IT Security Assessment only pertains to Stream 1.</p> <p>Will CSPs responding to Stream 2 through Authorized Resellers (or equivalent) need to successfully complete the CSP IT Security Assessment during the Bid Solicitation Phase?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically to Annex B.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
178	<p>Please note: For both Stream 1 and Stream 2, the role and qualification requirements for any CSP's Alternative Service Providers and Cloud Resellers will be addressed by Canada in a subsequent phase of the procurement process.</p> <p>Respondents who qualify for Stream 1 will automatically qualify for Stream 2.</p> <p>Respondents who qualify for Stream 1 will automatically qualify for Stream 1. Per the ITQ, role and qualification requirements for any CSP's Alternative Service Providers and Cloud Resellers will be addressed by Canada in a subsequent phase of the procurement process.</p> <p>Can qualified Stream 1 respondents designate an authorized Reseller to respond to Stream 2 during the Bid Solicitation Phase if the Reseller has not responded to the ITQ Phase?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the RFP and specifically to Section 2.3.</p>
179	<p>A Respondent must meet the security clearance requirements contained in Annex A in order to become a Qualified Respondent.</p> <p>Can SSC clarify which specific requirements in Annex A pertain to the security clearance requirements referenced in the ITQ?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's response to Question 49.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
180	<p><b>Confirmation of registration for the Cloud Service Provider Information Technology Security Assessment (STREAM 1 ONLY) (Mandatory at ITQ Closing for Stream 1):</b> The response must include documentation confirming that the Cloud Service Provider of the proposed cloud services is registered for the Cloud Service Provider Information Technology Security Assessment Process as described in Annex B.</p> <p>The instructions on Page 8 indicate that Qualified Respondents will be required to demonstrate in the bid solicitation phase that the CSP of the proposed cloud service has successfully completed the CSP IT Security Assessment.</p> <p>Will CSPs responding to Stream 2 through Authorized Resellers (or equivalent) need to successfully complete the CSP IT Security Assessment during the Bid Solicitation Phase?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically Section 3.3 and revised Annex B.</p> <p>Canada has clarified in Section 3.3 that specific Respondents must complete at a minimum the onboarding process of CSP IT Security Assessment Program outlined in Section 2 of Annex B prior to solicitation closing.</p>
181	<p>The physical locations of the proposed Commercially Available Cloud Service (which may contain Canada's data) must be located in either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A country within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO);</li> <li>b) A country within the European Union (EU); or</li> <li>c) A country with which Canada has an international bilateral industrial security instrument</li> </ul> <p>Can SSC confirm that physical locations of the proposed Commercially Available Cloud Service must be located in a country within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or a country within the European Union?</p>	<p>Canada confirms that for Stream 2, the requirements for physical location of the proposed Commercially Available Public Cloud Service are specified in Annex A, Appendix 2, Part A under Data Protection Requirements (M9).</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
182	<p>The physical locations of the proposed Commercially Available Cloud Service (which may contain Canada's data) must be located in either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d) A country within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO);</li> <li>e) A country within the European Union (EU); or</li> <li>f) A country with which Canada has an international bilateral industrial security instrument</li> </ul> <p>Can SSC confirm that the United Kingdom is concerned to part of the European Union?</p>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the ITQ and specifically modifications to Annex A, Appendix 2. Additional information has been provided to assist Respondents with identifying countries within North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Union (EU).</p>
183	<p>ITQ Section 2.3 b) ii) Submission of Only One Response per Respondent for a proposed Commercially Available Cloud Service</p> <p>The ITQ document states that Respondents who qualify for Stream 1 will automatically qualify for Stream 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) In the event that a Respondent submits a response for Stream 1 and does not qualify for Stream 1, will Canada then evaluate the Respondent's Stream 1 submission as consideration for Stream 2?</li> <li>b) If the CSP qualifies under Stream 1 and automatically qualifies for Stream 2, please confirm that the CSP may also support multiple Alternative Service Providers, or Cloud Resellers that are submitting for Stream 2.</li> </ul>	<p>Please see Canada's modifications to the RFP and specifically to Section 2.3.</p>
184	<p>Annex A, Appendix 2 M7 Section g) requires substantiation of "maintaining audit logs of physical access". Can Canada please clarify what constitutes an "audit"?</p>	<p>Respondents should consider this to refer to the log components that are generated by the access control system, which can be reviewed or audited as per personnel access and move throughout a facility.</p>

Question Number	Question	Response
185	<p>Annex A, Appendix 2 The M4 requirement states that “The Respondent must demonstrate compliance by providing documentation outlining examples that demonstrate the proposed Commercially Available Cloud Service’s ability to provide pricing (in Canadian dollars) for services, billing and support including but not limited to consumption reporting”.</p> <p>Can Canada please confirm if it intended to state that the Respondent must demonstrate compliance by providing documentation outlining examples that demonstrate the Respondent’s ability to provide pricing...? “?”</p>	<p>Please see Canada’s modification to the ITQ and specifically Annex A and Annex J.</p>



=====

The following is a summary of Attachments/Amendments issued to date for this solicitation:

Document	Distribution	Date	Description
ITQ	Buyandsell.gc.ca	September 7, 2018	<p><b>PDF Version</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 32099 - GC Cloud Vehicle - ITQ - ENGLISH</li> <li>2. 32099 - ITQ Annex A Appendix 1 - ENGLISH</li> <li>3. 32099 - ITQ Annex A Appendix 2 - ENGLISH</li> <li>4. 32099 - ITQ Annex B - CSP ITS Assessment Program Onboarding Process - ENGLISH</li> <li>5. SSC Standard Instructions for Procurement Documents - ENGLISH</li> <li>6. 32099 - GC Cloud Vehicle - ITQ - FRENCH</li> <li>7. 32099 - ITQ Annex A Appendix 1 - FRENCH</li> <li>8. 32099 - ITQ Annex A Appendix 2 - FRENCH</li> <li>9. 32099 - ITQ Annex B - CSP ITS Assessment Program Onboarding Process - FRENCH</li> <li>10. SSC Standard Instructions for Procurement Documents - FRENCH</li> </ol>
Amendment 1	Buyandsell.gc.ca	October 5, 2018	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extend qualification period for Stream 1 and Stream 2.</li> <li>2. Provide information on when Canada's responses will be published.</li> <li>3. Provide information on when Annex C &amp; Annex D will be published.</li> </ol>
Amendment 2	Buyandsell.gc.ca	October 5, 2018	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide updated information on when Canada's responses will be published.</li> <li>2. Provide updated information on when Annex C &amp; Annex D will be published.</li> </ol>
Amendment 3	Buyandsell.gc.ca	October 23, 2018	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extend qualification period for Stream 1.</li> <li>2. Provide updated information on when Canada's responses will be published.</li> <li>3. Provide updated information on when Annex C &amp; Annex D will be published.</li> </ol>
Amendment 4	Buyandsell.gc.ca	October 26, 2018	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide updated information on when Canada's responses will be published.</li> <li>2. Provide updated information on when a revised copy of the ITQ (including Annex C &amp; Annex D) will be published.</li> </ol>
Amendment 5	Buyandsell.gc.ca	October 29, 2018	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Publish Canada's Response for Questions 1 to 185</li> <li>b) Publish Annex C and Annex D</li> <li>c) Publish Modifications to the ITQ</li> </ol> <p><b>PDF Version (Clean and Mark-up versions)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) 32099 - GC Cloud ITQ – (EN) - Amend 005</li> <li>b) 32099 - GC Cloud ITQ – Annex A App 1 (EN) - Amend 005</li> <li>c) 32099 - GC Cloud ITQ – Annex A App 2 (EN) - Amend 005</li> <li>d) 32099 - GC Cloud ITQ – Annex A App 3 (EN) - Amend 005</li> </ol> <p><b>MS-Word Version (Clean and Mark-up versions)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) 32099 - GC Cloud ITQ – (EN) - Amend 005</li> <li>b) 32099 - GC Cloud ITQ – Annex A App 1 (EN) - Amend 005</li> <li>c) 32099 - GC Cloud ITQ – Annex A App 2 (EN) - Amend 005</li> <li>d) 32099 - GC Cloud ITQ – Annex A App 3 (EN) - Amend 005</li> </ol>