



## SHARED SERVICES CANADA

### **Amendment No. 002 to the Request for Proposal for Information Technology Service Management (ITSM) Tool Solution**

Solicitation No.	30190	Date	February 13, 2019
GCDocs File No.		GETS Reference No.	PW-19-00841613

This Amendment is issued to publish documents, update documents and answer questions 1-19. Except as expressly amended by this document, the RFP remains unchanged.

**THIS RFP AMENDMENT IS ISSUED TO:**

1. Publish Canada's Responses questions
2. Delete and replace Attachment 4.2 – Technical Evaluation
3. Publish Attachment 4.3, Appendix 1 – Financial Proposal Pricing Tables
4. Publish Attachment 4.3 – Financial Evaluation
5. Delete and replace Annex A – Statement of Work

**1. PUBLISH CANADA'S RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS**

**QUESTION 1:**

Whether companies from Outside Canada can apply for this? (Like, from India or USA)

**ANSWER 1:**

As stipulated in Annex A, Statement of Work (SOW), the professional services must be delivered on-site at an SSC location in Canada (see SOW 2.3 and 2.4). In addition, any (optional) SaaS must be situated and hosted in Canada (see SOW 3.1 j.). Further, refer to sections 1.2 National Security Exemption and 1.6 Security Requirements (pages 6 - 8 of 82) of the RFP as well as Annex C, Security Requirements Check List (SCRL) for detailed requirements related to security.

**QUESTION 2:**

Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

**ANSWER 2:**

Please refer to the response to Question 1.

**QUESTION 3:**

Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside Canada? (like, from India or USA)

**ANSWER 3:**

Please refer to the response to Question 1.

**QUESTION 4:**

Can we submit the proposals via email?

**ANSWER 4:**

Please refer to the RFP Section 3.2 Electronic Submission of Bids by Email.

**QUESTION 5:**

Today's Buyandsell posting shows an Amendment date of 01.29.2019, however looking at the list of addenda, they are all dated 01.24.2019. Could the Crown please advise what amendment was made today; and please attach same at your convenience.

**ANSWER 5:**

Please refer to Amendment 001.

**QUESTION 6:**

I was checking for amendments on Buy and Sell today and I saw that the above solicitation number had an amendment listed for today. However, when I scrolled down to see the postings there wasn't anything with a date being added today. The only difference I can see is there may have been a mistake regarding the submission date as my printout from January 24th has a submission date of March 13th, whereas now I see listed per the RFP for March 12th. Could you kindly confirm that no actual amendment was posted today and the reason for showing an amendment today?

**ANSWER 6:**

Please refer to the response to Question 5.

**QUESTION 7:**

The NPP on Buy and Sell indicates an amendment on today's date but there are no new documents attached to the site since its posting on 24 January 2019. Could you please clarify?

**ANSWER 7:**

Please refer to the response to Question 5.

**QUESTION 8:**

For reference project purposes, can SSC please confirm that the definition of bidder can include the bidder, its parent or a subsidiary.

**ANSWER 8:**

Please refer to SSC Standard Instructions 1.4, Section 1.4 The Bidder for the definition.

**QUESTION 9:**

Due to the complex nature of this RFP we are asking for a 2 week extension.

**ANSWER 9:**

SSC acknowledges this request, however there will be no extension to the closing date at this time.

**QUESTION 10:**

In Attachment 4.3 Financial Evaluation, there is a note to bidders that Attachment 4.3 and Appendix 1 to Attachment 4.3, Financial Evaluation Pricing Tables will be provided in a subsequent amendment. When will these amendments be provided?

**ANSWER 10:**

Attachment 4.1 Financial Evaluation and Appendix 1 to Attachment 4.3, Financial Evaluation Pricing Tables are provided in this Amendment, being Amendment 002.

**QUESTION 11:**

Will the Crown consider extending the bid submission date by the same duration these amendments (Attachment 4.3 and Appendix 1 to Attachment 4.3, Financial Evaluation Pricing Tables) are delayed from the release date of January 23, 2019?

**ANSWER 11:**

Please refer to the response to Question 9.

**QUESTION 12:**

In document RFP\_SSC\_ITSM\_30190\_Atch 4.2 Tech Eval\_Amend 1 section M-5, (f) part iii there is a reference to Deliverable #6: Deliverable Review and Acceptance Process, yet Deliverable #6 in the SoW section 5 is the Release Management Strategy. Please clarify this requirement.

**ANSWER 12:**

The reference to Deliverable #6 should read Deliverable #5, see Modification 1 below.

**QUESTION 13:**

Document RFP\_SSC\_ITSM\_30190\_Atch 4.2 Tech Eval\_Amend 1 refers to a requirement #M-12 in M-5 and M-6. As this requirement does not currently exist in the RFP, please clarify this requirement.

**ANSWER 13:**

The reference to #M-12 should read #M-9, see Modifications 2 and 3 below.

**QUESTION 14:**

R-5 indicates that there are 8 applicable attributes in the Points Awarded, the list provided indicates 9 possible attributes. Please clarify this requirement.

**ANSWER 14:**

The scoring criteria has been corrected, see Modification 4 below.

**QUESTION 15:**

For R-8.2.4, the scoring allows for 35 points (10 points for each tool) yet maximum points of 25 is documented. Please confirm the maximum scoring for this requirement.

**ANSWER 15:**

To clarify, a maximum of 25 points will be awarded for this criteria.

**QUESTION 16:**

R-9.1 through R-9.6: Scoring is for several separate points (a through d). Item c (User Guide) and d (Change Preserved) have different titles but the same descriptions for the award of the points "There is a commercially available User Guide to assist the client in completing the required configuration". Please clarify this requirement.

**ANSWER 16:**

The scoring criteria has been corrected, see Modification 5 below.

**QUESTION 17:**

Can the Crown confirm that requirement R-5 is asking for the equivalent of a Software Development Lifecycle that the proponent would use design, configure, and deploy ITSM software to SSC ( i.e. a Systems Implementation Development Lifecycle), and NOT the Software Development Lifecycle that the software publisher uses to develop their COTS ITSM product?

**ANSWER 17:**

Yes, confirmed.

**QUESTION 18:**

In Requirement R-5, item #7 makes reference to the proponent including "...a toolset that clearly adds value to support the SDLC". As the SOW (section 2.4 c) states "All information must remain on SSC-owned hardware and hard copy documents must remain on-site at SSC. Information must be properly safeguarded," can the Crown please clarify it's intent to either provide an applicable accredited tool for this purpose, or to facilitate the necessary steps to accredit a tool proposed by the successful proponent, for use on SSC secured networks?)

**ANSWER 18:**

In the event the selected bidder has identified an applicable tool, SSC will work collaboratively with the selected bidder to facilitate the necessary steps to accredit the proposed tool for use on SSC networks or work together to find a mutually acceptable path forward.

**QUESTION 19:**

In document RFP\_SSC\_ITSM\_30190\_Atch 4.2 Tech Eval\_Amend 1 Table #1 part b, refers to a requirement #M-13. As this requirement does not currently exist in the RFP, please clarify this requirement.

**ANSWER 19:**

The reference to #M-13 should read #M-10, see Modification 6 below.

\*\*\*\*\*

## 2. DELETE AND REPLACE ATTACHMENT 4.2, Technical Evaluation Criteria

All documents have been attached separately.

## 3. MODIFICATIONS

- 1) Reference: ATTACHMENT 4.2, Technical Evaluation Criteria (Amendment No. 001), criteria #M-5 Detailed Work Plan for Contractor Onboarding

**DELETE:**

- f) iii. Deliverable #6: Deliverable Review and Acceptance Process

**INSERT:**

- f) iii. Deliverable #5: Deliverable Review and Acceptance Process

- 2) Reference: ATTACHMENT 4.2, Technical Evaluation Criteria (Amendment No. 001), criteria #M-5 Detailed Work Plan for Contractor Onboarding

**DELETE:**

- d) Resource plan which details the Bidder's personnel required to complete the deliverables, including the level of effort (LOE) (in days) by individual resource. The resource plan must clearly identify the proposed LOE of Contractor's Core Delivery Team resources proposed in response to requirement #M-12 and the Contractor Project Management Team resources versus other additional resources the Bidder deems necessary to complete Contractor Onboarding;

**INSERT:**

- d) Resource plan which details the Bidder's personnel required to complete the deliverables, including the level of effort (LOE) (in days) by individual resource. The resource plan must clearly identify the proposed LOE of Contractor's Core Delivery Team resources proposed in response to requirement #M-9 and the Contractor Project Management Team resources versus other additional resources the Bidder deems necessary to complete Contractor Onboarding;

- 3) Reference: ATTACHMENT 4.2, Technical Evaluation Criteria (Amendment No. 001), criteria #M-6 Detailed Work Plan for Development of Transition Out Plan

**DELETE:**

- d) Resource plan which details the Bidder's personnel required to complete the deliverables, including the level of effort (LOE) (in days) by individual resource. The resource plan must clearly identify the proposed LOE of Contractor's Core Delivery Team resources proposed in response to requirement #M-12 and the Contractor Project Management Team resources versus other additional resources the Bidder deems necessary to complete Contractor Onboarding;

**INSERT:**

d) Resource plan which details the Bidder's personnel required to complete the deliverables, including the level of effort (LOE) (in days) by individual resource. The resource plan must clearly identify the proposed LOE of Contractor's Core Delivery Team resources proposed in response to requirement #M-9 and the Contractor Project Management Team resources versus other additional resources the Bidder deems necessary to complete Contractor Onboarding;

- 4) Reference: ATTACHMENT 4.2, Technical Evaluation Criteria (Amendment No. 001), criteria #R-5 Proposed SDLC

**DELETE:**

Points will be awarded as

- **100 points – Excellent:** The proposed SDLC demonstrates all 8 attributes;
- **75 points – Very Good:** The proposed SDLC demonstrates at least 6 out of 8 attributes;
- **50 points – Acceptable:** The proposed SDLC demonstrates at least 4 out of 8 attributes; or
- **0 points – Unacceptable:** The proposed SDLC demonstrates three or fewer attributes.

**INSERT:**

Points will be awarded as

- **100 points – Excellent:** The proposed SDLC demonstrates all 9 attributes;
- **75 points – Very Good:** The proposed SDLC demonstrates at least 7 out of 9 attributes;
- **50 points – Acceptable:** The proposed SDLC Plan demonstrates at least 5 out of 9 attributes;
- **0 points – Unacceptable:** The proposed SDLC demonstrates four or fewer attributes.

- 5) Reference: ATTACHMENT 4.2, Technical Evaluation Criteria (Amendment No. 001), criteria #R-9 Ease of Configuration of the Proposed ITSM Tool, sub-criteria R-9.1 to R-9.6 inclusive

**DELETE:**

**d) Change Preserved**

- **20 points** - There is a commercially available User Guide to assist the client in completing the required configuration.

**INSERT:**

**d) Change Preserved**

- **20 points** - If the change is guaranteed to be automatically preserved during future ITSM Tool software upgrades.

- 6) Reference: ATTACHMENT 4.2, Technical Evaluation Criteria (Amendment No. 001), Table #1 – ITSM Tool Software, Mandatory Response Table

**DELETE:**

b) Under column E titled "Part #", for each associated Functional Requirement listed under column C, the Bidder must insert the part number associated with the currently available version of the ITSM

Tool Software proposed in response to criteria #M-13 which provides the mandatory Functional Requirement.

**INSERT:**

b) Under column E titled "Part #", for each associated Functional Requirement listed under column C, the Bidder must insert the part number associated with the currently available version of the ITSM Tool Software proposed in response to criteria #M-10 which provides the mandatory Functional Requirement.

**4. PUBLISH ATTACHMENT 4.3, APPENDIX 1 - FINANCIAL PROPOSAL PRICING TABLES**

All documents have been attached separately.

**5. PUBLISH ATTACHMENT 4.3 – FINANCIAL EVALUATION**

All documents have been attached separately.

**6. DELETE AND REPLACE ANNEX A – STATEMENT OF WORK**

All documents have been attached separately.