

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

**Invitation to Qualify/
Invitation à se qualifier**

Title - Sujet "HRP-RHP" ITQ - Gate 2 - HR and Pay Next Gen		
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 24062-190560/C	Amendment 3	Date 2018-12-28
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 24062-190560		GETS Ref. No. - N° de réf. de SEAG 24062-190560
File No. - N° de dossier 682xe.24062-190560	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME	
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2019-01-18		Time Zone Fuseau horaire Heure Normale de l'est (EST)
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>		
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Pelchat, Marco		Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 682xe
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 665-7128 ()		FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: Secrétariat Conseil du Trésor du Canada 90 Elgin Ottawa, ON K1A0R3		

Comments - Commentaires

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

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

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

Canada



NOTE FOR INTERESTED SUPPLIERS

This Solicitation Amendment 003 document will serve to:

- 1- Make modifications to the ITQ document Attachment 2
- 2- Provide the interested suppliers with the questions and answers received.

IMPORTANT REMINDER FOR INDUSTRY: To facilitate search for industry all current and future postings related to Stabilizing Phoenix innovations and the HR and Pay Next Generation solution will include “HRP-RHP” in the title. Please note that vendors can subscribe to tender notice updates (RSS, ATOM, e-mail) using the keyword “HRP-RHP”.

MODIFICATIONS

1- Modifications to the ITQ document - Attachment 2:

Delete – Evaluation Criteria R7.4 in its entirety
 Insert – Evaluation Criteria R7.4 as modified below:

R7.4. LANGUAGE CAPACITY

Requirement			
<p>The bidder must demonstrate how the proposed solution supports users working in either of Canada’s official languages (English and French) by allowing users to enter information in both official languages and allowing at a minimum, the use of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diacritics (accents on letters); • English and French special characters; and • English and French date/time, number, and financial formats. <p>To demonstrate how the proposed solution meets the requirement, the bidder can either provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A video of no more than 5 minutes demonstrating the proposed solution in action OR • A link and login credentials to a live environment in which the GC can perform information entry <p>The bidder may also provide accompanying explanations through either voice-over the video or a document of no more than 2 pages.</p>		Weighting	1%
		Evaluation Method	Bid
Evaluation Criteria			
Not Acceptable (0 pts)	Acceptable (5 pts)	Good (7 pts)	Excellent (10 pts)
The information provided does not, or insufficiently, demonstrate how the terminology in the solution supports users working in both	The information provided demonstrates how the proposed solution allows users to work in both official	Acceptable plus: The information provided demonstrates how the proposed solution allows users to toggle	Good plus: The information provided demonstrates how the proposed solution allows users to enter

of Canada's official languages.	languages (English and French), using Unicode and other technologies.	back and forth between languages without having to log out / log in.	data in both languages simultaneously, through localization support by design.
Bid Response			
Bid Self-Assessment			
Not Acceptable	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

TRACK LOG OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS PROVIDED TO DATE

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	PROVIDED ON DOCUMENT
Questions and Answers 1 to 3	Amendment 001
Questions and Answers 4 to 6	Amendment 002

Question #7 : Regarding question R.7.4 Language Capacity, we are asked for a video showing how the solution supports users working in either of Canada's official language. Given that this capacity was demonstrated in a French video in Gate 1, that users will be able to test the language capabilities during the User Experience sessions, and we will be able to demo that functionality live during the SME days, would the Government consider updating this requirement to remove the video requirement and instead evaluate this as part of the SME day and or UX evaluations? We believe that testing live would also be a more accurate reflection of language capabilities than a video.

Answer #7: The videos requested as part of Gate 1 asked bidders to demonstrate that the solution was available in both official languages. As part of Gate 2, we are now assessing the capacity of the solution to function in both official languages (e.g., special characters, formats, diacritics, toggle, etc), as described in the Gate 2 rating scale.

If a bidder feels that the video submitted in Gate 1 demonstrates the needed functionality and meets the requirement, they are free to resubmit the same video submitted in Gate 1, now as part of Gate 2.

If a bidder prefers to have the GC evaluate the requirement through a live environment - still through the bid evaluation - they can provide the link to the environment, with accompanying login credentials, to be used to evaluate if the proposed solution meets the requirement R7.4.

Criteria R7.4 is modified under this amendment (see above)

Question #8: When we met with you in the vendor 1-1's, we suggested a focus on HR and Pay in order to prioritize pay impacting, high-usage functionality in order to maintain momentum and rebuild trust with your users. In an organization of your size, typically the customer selects the best combination of vendors to meet their needs, and then we work together to integrate and build out the best possible solution. There was an action for the team to review whether or not vendors would need to bring forward their own partners to meet the breadth requirements in R2.1. Business Capabilities, or if whether GC would change the weighting to focus on the

critical Pay, Time and HR areas, and whether GC would create a requirement to make it clear where the primary vendor's functionality sits on the map, and where they are leveraging partners.

We ask for clarification because we have partners ready and available and we need to quickly finalize those agreements in order to provide a complete solution. If the government will select its own best combination, then we would move forward highlighting only the capabilities of our solution. If you could provide further guidance, we would appreciate it.

Answer #8: From a business capability roadmap standpoint, the GC is indeed prioritizing pay impacting, high-usage functionality, while clearly recognizing the key linkage between HR and Pay. The business capabilities identified as primary are Core HR & Pay capabilities and normally ones included in a payroll renewal initiative. The GC will therefore not modify the weighting as it feels it is already focusing on the critical Pay, Time and HR areas.

From a solution standpoint, the GC is seeking a Core Human Capital Management (HCM) Solution that can serve as the System of Record (SoR) for its post-modern Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Strategy. Expanding on the Core HCM SoR, the goal is indeed to result in a final proposed solution that is loosely coupled, differentiated and made up of fit-for-purpose and best solutions for each business capability while ensuring they adequately integrate and interoperate with each other. This would indeed result in a best combination of vendors to meet the suite of business capabilities, and require vendors to work together to integrate and build out the best possible solution for public servants and Canadians.

From a vendor management standpoint, the GC is seeking to partner with a software publisher as prime. That said, the GC has also publicly stated and recognizes that, given the proposed (post-modern) ERP solution architecture, vendors would likely benefit from partnering with a suite of vendors to put forth the best possible solution.

Throughout the Agile Procurement Process, the term "proposed solution" is referring to exactly that: the overall solution, made-up of a suite of best-in-breed vendor solutions that are integrated, that the bidder is proposing to the GC to help solve the current HR & Pay situation and set the GC on a path for long-term success. Bidders are therefore encouraged to bring forward their own partners to meet the breadth of requirements stated in R2.1.

The information regarding where the primary vendor's functionality sits on the map of business capabilities, and where they are leveraging partners, should be made available either in the response to R2.1 or R4.1.

Question #9: R.5.6 Certifications - Canada is requesting in R5.6 Certifications, Bidders to obtain ISO27018 certification for the proposed solution. We encourage Canada to also consider BS 10012 which is an auditable standard from the British Standards Institute (bsi). This standard addresses Personal Information Management and aligns to the requirements of the European General Data Protection Regulation (EU GDPR). As such it should be considered a leading global standard. Would Canada please add BS 10012 as an applicable standard to address Personal Information management in lieu of ISO 27018?

Answer #9:

As outlined in the [Direction on the Secure Use of Commercial Cloud Services](#), the GC is seeking third-party industry certifications and audit reports such as ISO/IEC 27018 which is an international code of practice to support with managing Personally Identifiable Information (PII) on public clouds. While BS 10012 is recognized from the UK National Standards Body, it is not an internationally recognized organization such as ISO is in Canada.

Question #10: R.8.2 Approach to Planning Pilots – Canada is requesting in R8.2 a document or presentation of 10 pages. Is this document to be submitted on the due date (11 January 2019)

Solicitation No. - N° de l'offre
24062-190560/C
N° de réf. du client - Client Ref. No.
24062-190560/C

N° de la modif - Amd. No.
003
File No. - N° du dossier
682xe. 24062-190560/C

Id de l'acheteur - Buyer ID
682xe
N° CCC / CCC No./ N° VME - FMS

along with the written response or is it to be handed out during the SME Challenge day as it is presented and discussed?

Answer #10: Please refer to [Amendment 001](#) for clarifications on R8.2.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED