



## SHARED SERVICES CANADA

### **Amendment No. 004 to the Request for Proposal for Information Technology Service Management (ITSM) Tool Solution**

Solicitation No.	30190	Date	February 25, 2019
GCDocs File No.		GETS Reference No.	PW-19-00841613

This Amendment is issued to publish documents and answer questions 43-95. Except as expressly amended by this document, the RFP remains unchanged.

**THIS RFP AMENDMENT IS ISSUED TO:**

1. Publish Canada's Responses questions 43-95
2. Modifications
3. Delete and replace Attachment 4.2 – Technical Evaluation
4. Delete and replace Annex A – Statement of Work
5. Delete and replace Appendix 1 to Annex C – ITSM Security Classification Guide

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

**QUESTION 43:**

Can you please confirm that Bidder's resources with no access to controlled data would not require a security clearance?

**ANSWER 43:**

No. See answer #42.

**QUESTION 44:**

Can SSC please provide the pricing template?

**ANSWER 44:**

Please refer to Amendment 002.

**QUESTION 45:**

References: (R1.1) Can SSC reduce the Customer Reference Contract threshold for the amount billed from \$12m to \$5 million maximum. The amount billed does not represent the scale of the project. Based on Industry standards \$5 million is a more realistic threshold.

**ANSWER 45:**

The minimum financial threshold has been reduced for each of the Customer Reference Contracts provided in response to criteria #M-2 Corporate Experience, ITSM Tool Software Implementation and the associated point-rated evaluation criteria #R-1.1. See RFP changes 10 and 11 below.

**QUESTION 46:**

References: (R1.3) Can SSC review the requirement for the integrations to be from one reference only. Our main references may not have covered some of those particular integrations but we still have experience implementing these particular integrations elsewhere. Therefore please remove the stipulation that all integrations listed must be from one reference in that they can be from multiple references.

**ANSWER 46:**

The criteria set-out in R-1 Corporate Reference Contracts, ITSM Tool Software Configuration and Implementation applies only to each of the two reference contracts provided in response to #M-2

Corporate Experience, ITSM Tool Software Implementation. There is no minimum pass mark on R-1. The request has been reviewed. The requirement remains unchanged.

**QUESTION 47:**

It would appear as though the scope of the solution requirements have been significantly reduced since the last bid that was originally intended to improve SSC service management. The scope of the requirements here only include the basic operational processes for IT services and will only provide a limited picture of the resourcing and financials that go into delivering IT modern services. Would SSC consider including the other IT service management processes like demand management, application portfolio management, financial management and IT project and portfolio management to provide a full picture of the “operational” and “grow/transform” work that goes into delivering IT services?

**ANSWER 47:**

The Scope of Work reflects SSC’s current strategy and approach for implementation and support of an ITSM Tool Solution. There are separate related initiatives underway at SSC, as well at the GC level, that address APM, PPM and Financial Mgmt. The request has been reviewed. The requirement remains unchanged.

**QUESTION 48:**

By asking for only basic ITSM operational process capabilities, it would appear as though there is nothing in the solution requirements that offers any capabilities beyond what SSC is able to offer today with their current solution(s). Would SSC consider expanding the solution requirements beyond legacy capabilities (ex. mobile experiences, chatbots, machine learning and AI to support automation, etc)? If not, why go through all the trouble and cost of transitioning for no benefit to service delivery?

**ANSWER 48:**

See answer #47

**QUESTION 49:**

Different software products offer different upgrade cycles. Obviously, a software that is receiving significant R&D investment will provide more modern capabilities, stay ahead of the competition and provide more value to SSC and their “customers”.

Would SSC consider valuing 1. The amount spent on R&D by the vendor and/or 2. The upgrade cycle (i.e. how often new versions are being introduced to provide enhancements to the underlying capabilities)?

The pace of technology change is ever increasing and to lock in on a solution for the foreseeable future that will see limited R&D and upgrades would be unfortunate for SSC. It is recommended that the SSC set some a standard for the amount of R&D investment expected by the software vendor and at least 1 or 2 upgrades should be offered each year.

**ANSWER 49:**

The request has been reviewed. The requirement remains unchanged.

**QUESTION 50:**

Availability of the solution will be paramount, and it would be in the government's best interest to challenge bidders to describe how their solution allows the administrator to apply configuration changes and feature release upgrades with zero downtime. Will SSC please include this in the requirements?

**ANSWER 50:**

The request has been reviewed. The requirement remains unchanged.

**QUESTION 51:**

It is understood that SSC had previously competed and awarded the ITSM process and data architecture design. The output of which, presumably, would be used in the implementation of the solution using the technology being competed here. Will SSC make available the documentation from this work?

**ANSWER 51:**

Yes. Refer to Annex A – SOW, section 7.1 Approach and Attachment 1 – ITSM Project Background Information and Context, section 2.6 Process for Configuration of the ITSM Processes in the ITSM Tool for and explanation of the role of the ITSM Process Maturity Solution Contractor. As stated in Annex A – SOW, section 5.1 Contractor Onboarding Requirements, “a) Within 10 business days of Contract Award, SSC will provide the Contractor with Enterprise ITSM Tool Project plans and ITSM Process Maturity Solution contractor deliverables” for review and feedback.

**QUESTION 52:**

If only implementation services are being requested, why is SSC requiring that the core team and vendor demonstrate high costs of implementation (i.e. \$6 million+ and providing full points to \$12 million+)? Should SSC government not value lower complexity and costs to implement the solution?

**ANSWER 52:**

Refer to Attachment 1 – ITSM Project Background Information and Context, section 2.4 ITAM Tool Solution Implementation Strategy for of the Project including the expansion of the ITSM Tool Solution to GC customer departments. See RFP changes 10 and 11 below..

**QUESTION 53:**

If the current solution being requested is to allow SSC to implement out of the box, simple core ITSM processes, SSC should also ask for the ability to upgrade to more advanced ITSM capabilities when SSC is ready to adopt these enhancements. SSC should also expect that these enhancements should be able to be introduced without impacting business users or introducing complex re-implementations. Will SSC include requirements to challenge vendors to describe how their solution meets these requirements?

**ANSWER 53:**

The request has been reviewed. The requirement remains unchanged.

**QUESTION 54:**

SSC presumably wants to ensure that the solution does not require client software or browser plugins. Please include a requirement to show how their solution meets this requirement

**ANSWER 54:**

The request has been reviewed. The requirement remains unchanged.

**QUESTION 55:**

The reference qualifications unfairly favour legacy technology that have been in the Canadian government for decades and excludes newer and more modern technologies. This, presumably, is not in SSC's best interest. The bidders should not be limited, therefore, to those that have implemented the English/French Canadian versions of their software at this scale (1.4.3 - M3). It is agreed that it is important that the software should be shown to support scale and this requirement is acceptable. Technically the software should show that it can support both official languages however this is a technical requirement and should not limit the reference regarding scale. Please disconnect the need for the scale reference to also be the Canadian bilingual reference so as to not limit references to incumbent legacy software implementations.

**ANSWER 55:**

To clarify, only one of the three Customer Reference Projects from the Software Publisher (provided in response to M-3 Corporate References, ITSM Tool Software) must have been "deployed as part of a bilingual implementation (i.e. any two languages)". Please note this is not limited to English/French Canadian versions as stated in the question. The request has been reviewed. The requirement remains unchanged.

**QUESTION 56:**

As part of the Functional Requirements Mandatory Response Form (Attachment 4.2, Table #1) in the column asking for "Reference to Product Documentation", should the bidder provide a description of how the software fulfils the requirement AS WELL AS the cross-reference citing the relevant product document, section number, section title, and page number where the required information appears OR should no description to be included at all, requiring only the pointer to the product documentation?

**ANSWER 56:**

As stated in the instructions provided "Under column F titled "Reference to Product Documentation", for each associated Functional Requirement listed under column C, the Bidder must substantiate its' claim that the proposed ITSM Tool software meets the Functional Requirement by providing a cross-reference to substantiating product documentation. The cross reference should cite the section number, section title, and page number where the required information appears. To clarify, a cross reference to the product documentation is sufficient, however the onus is on the Bidder to provide the section number, section title, and page number so that the evaluation team can easily locate the information. The Bidder may, at its' discretion, also include a narrative response in addition to the reference to the substantiating product documentation.

**QUESTION 57:**

As the government of Canada's environment is fairly unique in it size and scope we request that the project duration for the PM role be reduced from 12 months to 6 months?

**ANSWER 57:**

To clarify, under M-9.1 Proposed Contractor Project Manager, the two required Customer Reference Projects are not limited to experience on Government of Canada (GC) projects. Similarly, the point rated requirements under R-8.1 Proposed Contractor Project Manager are not limited to experience on GC projects. Please note that the duration of the resource on a project is not limited to full-time engagements. The request has been reviewed. The requirement remains unchanged.

There were corrections made to the point-rated criteria for the Contractor's Project Manager. See RFP change 12 below.

**QUESTION 58:**

For the proposed Architect R8.2.2, will SSC please reduced the requirement from 12 months to 3 months.

**ANSWER 58:**

The minimum duration associated with the point rated criteria has been reduced to six months in accordance with the mandatory criteria for this resource category. Please note that the duration of the resource on a project is not limited to full-time engagements. See RFP change 13 below.

**QUESTION 59:**

For the Integrations Specialist R8.3.1 and R8.3.2, be reduce from 6 months to 2-3 months.

**ANSWER 59:**

Please note that the duration of the resource on a project is not limited to full-time engagements. The request has been reviewed. The requirement remains unchanged.

**QUESTION 60:**

In our world wide ITSM offering, the industry standard is for the integrations specialist role to be engaged for 1 to 2 months. The integrations typically take less than 1-2 months to develop. Will SSC consider reducing the requirements?

**ANSWER 60:**

See answer 59.

**QUESTION 61:**

What is the scope of the CMDB/AMDB Design included in Release Package A given that SSC already has a CMDB Enhancement project underway?

**ANSWER 61:**

The CMDB data model and design is the responsibility of the Process Maturity Solution Contractor.

As stated in Annex A – SOW, section 5.1 Contractor Onboarding Requirements, “a) Within 10 business days of Contract Award, SSC will provide the Contractor with Enterprise ITSM Tool Project plans and ITSM Process Maturity Solution contractor deliverables” for review and feedback.

**QUESTION 62:**

How many CMDB/AMDB data sources are envisioned? Please provide a list.

**ANSWER 62:**

Refer to Attachment 1 – ITSM Project Background and Context, section 2.3.2 Future State.

**QUESTION 63:**

Does SSC intend to leverage the ITSM tool for Discovery?

**ANSWER 63:**

SSC owns a separate Discovery Tool. See also Attachment 2 – ITSM Tool Functional Requirements, # FR-8.12 Auto Discovery and FR-8.13 Reconciliation.

**QUESTION 64:**

What classes will SSC be bringing into the ITSM tool? Please list all unique types (Server types (Windows, Unix, Aix, etc.))

**ANSWER 64:**

See answer 61.

**QUESTION 65:**

Is the pricing of the three release packages (A,B,C) to be done using the Task Authorization process or is SSC expecting these packages to be priced as part of bid response? RFP section 5.7

**ANSWER 65:**

No, Bidders are not required to price the Work associated with the Tool Implementation Process, as set out in section 7 of the SOW, at the time of RFP. For the pricing requirements at time of RFP, refer to Attachment 4.3, Appendix 1 - Financial Proposal Pricing Tables (provided in RFP Amendment No. 002), and more specifically see Table #2 - Firm Fixed Price Work/Deliverables.

**QUESTION 66:**

Are the Optional Processes to be considered in scope and priced out as part of the initial implementation?

**ANSWER 66:**

See answer 65.

**QUESTION 67:**

Can SSC provide an updated timeline for the delivery of the 10 configuration-ready processes?

**ANSWER 67:**

For additional details refer to Annex A – SOW, section 5.1.1, Deliverable #1: Review and provide feedback to SSC ITSM Process Maturity Solution draft documents.

**QUESTION 68:**

How has the timeline been estimated? Based on our experience of implementing many ITSM Solutions can we modify the proposed timeline provided by SSC?

**ANSWER 68:**

At time of RFP the Bidder is required to provide a proposed schedule for the Contractor Onboarding work only (i.e. initial 90 days). Refer to Annex A – SOW, section 5. Contractor Onboarding Requirements. During the Onboarding stage, the Contractor will develop an “overall schedule for the completion of the required work” (see SOW sections 2.5 and 5.1.8), SSC will look to the Contractor’s expertise to enhance any SSC plans and develop the implementation WBS.

**QUESTION 69:**

What release package does SSC intend to deploy the Self-Service entry point? (end user Portal)

**ANSWER 69:**

Refer to Attachment 1 – ITSM Project Background and Context, section 2.6.4 ITSM Process Requirements which identifies that SSC is responsible for prioritizing SSC Tool requirements at any given time over the course of the contract. Final Release package plans are not available at this time but will be provided during Contractor Onboarding. Please note that this information is not required for the purposes of bid response.

**QUESTION 70:**

Will Knowledge Management be implemented at the same time or prior to implementing the Self-Service portal?

**ANSWER 70:**

See answer 69.

**QUESTION 71:**

How many request types are in scope for the initial release as defined in Package B?

**ANSWER 71:**

See answers 65 and 69.

**QUESTION 72:**

Can SSC provide a level of complexity (Simple, Standard, Complex) and provide a quantity of each type?

**ANSWER 72:**

See answers 65 and 69.

**QUESTION 73:**

Will the integrations be priced and scoped as part of task authorization process?



**ANSWER 73:**

Yes.

**QUESTION 74:**

Is there an order to implementing the integrations?

**ANSWER 74:**

This will be determined during the development of the integration strategy, refer to Annex A – SOW, section 8.2 Integrations with SSC Applications.

**QUESTION 75:**

Are the integrations to be scoped and priced in to the phase 1 and 2 implementation price?

**ANSWER 75:**

See answers 73 and 74

**QUESTION 76:**

Please provide current architecture landscape diagrams of SSC including all other integration tools and or systems, including SSC's clients internal architecture landscape diagrams.

**ANSWER 76:**

See Attachment 1 – ITSM Project Background Information and Context, section 2.3 ITSM Tool Integration for available information. Further details are not required for the purposes of bid response and will not be provided.

After contract award architecture diagrams will be provided on an as-needed basis as the Contractor provides Infrastructure Capacity Specifications (SOW Section 4), fulfills Application Management Services (SOW 13.3.1), and installs the ITSM software in various environments (SOW 3.1).

**QUESTION 77:**

Please provide current Physical design Diagram of SSC including all other integration tools and or systems, including SSC's clients internal physical design and integration to SSC

**ANSWER 77:**

See Answer 76.

**QUESTION 78:**

Is Migration of historical data in scope? Such as exiting requests, incidents, change requests?

**ANSWER 78:**

See Annex A – SOW, section 6. Data Migration Requirements, section 6.1 for an explanation of the envisioned Approach. As detailed in section 6.2.2, the Contractor will develop the Data Migration Plan.

**QUESTION 79:**

If the answer is yes to above, then please explain what is the purpose of moving the historical data? Best practice is to leave the historical data in a auditable format and not compromise the new ITSM tool.

**ANSWER 79**

See answer 78.

**QUESTION 80:**

Does SSC anticipate making modifications to Release Package A as part of Phase 2.

**ANSWER 80:**

See Answer 69.

**QUESTION 81:**

For Phase 1 and Phase 2 implementation, is the expectation that they will be priced out as part of task authorization process?

**ANSWER 81:**

Yes.

**QUESTION 82:**

Can SSC please provide a definition of fit testing.

**ANSWER 82:**

See Attachment 1 – ITSM Project Background Information and Context, section 2.6.5 Lifecycle for Configuration of ITSM Processes in the ITSM Tool, for the definition/description of FIT, SIT and UAT.

**QUESTION 83:**

For SIT testing, can SSC provide a list of stress and load testing criteria?

**ANSWER 83:**

This information is not required for the purposes of bid response and will not be provided.

**QUESTION 84:**

What level of support does SSC anticipate for UAT?

**ANSWER 84:**

This information is not required for the purposes of bid response and will not be provided.

**QUESTION 85:**

Can SSC clarify who will be managing the hardware (section 13.3.3 Hypercare)?

**ANSWER 85:**

SSC is responsible for the infrastructure. Please see RFP Amendment No. 002 for changes to Annex A – SOW, section 13.2 Hypercare Support Services

**QUESTION 86:**

Given that the infrastructure will all be based in SSC data centres and SSC is accountable for the infrastructure how can the Contractor be responsible for the SLOs such as Application Performance Response times? (SLO1.4-1, SLO1.4-2)

**ANSWER 86:**

References to SLOs have been removed. See answer 85.

**QUESTION 87:**

Can SSC please provide a copy of the SLOs?

**ANSWER 87:**

See answer 86.

**QUESTION 88:**

If the Contractor does not manage the hardware and does not own the software, how can the Contractor be responsible for the SLOs? The Contractor will be managing the software but have no control over the underlying code.

**ANSWER 88:**

See answer 86.

**QUESTION 89:**

Can SSC define what it means by ITSM Solution Architecture Diagram (s) (p52, SOW)? Does this encompass the all hardware and software components?

**ANSWER 89:**

Refer to Annex A – SOW, section 12.1.4 “a) Solution architecture diagram(s) depicting the entire ITSM Tool Solution, including integrations with upstream and downstream systems, hardware and software components, network connectivity, High Availability infrastructure, security devices, etc.”

**QUESTION 90:**

Is SSC asking the Contractor to lead Capacity planning activities?

**ANSWER 90:**

Yes. See Annex A – SOW, section 4, Infrastructure Capacity Specification Requirements.

**QUESTION 91:**

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

**ANSWER 91:**

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

**QUESTION 92:**

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

**ANSWER 92:**

Please refer to Amendment 002, response to Question 8

**QUESTION 93:**

Can SSC please clarify the requirement for help desk? Currently IBM holds the contract for the help desk for SSC. Does SSC anticipate and another help desk will be required for ITSM?

**ANSWER 93:**

As stipulated in Annex A – SOW, section 13.1 Post-implementation Support Model, “2nd level support will be provided by SSC’s Enterprise Service Desk”. The Contractor must provide 3<sup>rd</sup> Level, Application Management Services (AMS), as set out in section 13.1 and 13.3 of Annex A – SOW until such time as AMS is transitioned to SSC.

**QUESTION 94:**

ITSM RFP article 5.13.11 Method of Payment Professional Services. This article states Canada’s position regarding the Contractor’s obligation to provide individuals with stated qualifications however it does not indicate when invoices will be paid by Canada for Professional Services. Can you please clarify?

**ANSWER 94:**

See RFP Part 5, Resulting Contract Clauses, articles 5.13.9 and 5.3.10 for the Method of Payment related to Task Authorizations for Professional Services.

**QUESTION 95:**

Can SSC please confirm that SSC will manage the Hardware required for the ITSM solution?

**ANSWER 95:**

Yes, confirmed.

## 2. MODIFICATIONS

10) Reference: Attachment 4.2 – Technical Evaluation, criteria #M-2 Corporate Experience, ITSM Tool Software Configuration and Implementation

**DELETE:**

iii) Have billed a minimum of \$6M (Canadian, including taxes) in professional services under the Customer Reference Contract as of the issuance date of this RFP; and

**INSERT:**

iii) Have billed a minimum of **\$5M** (Canadian, including taxes) in professional services under the Customer Reference Contract as of the issuance date of this RFP; and

11) Reference: Attachment 4.2 – Technical Evaluation, criteria #R-1 Customer Reference Contracts, ITSM Tool Software Configuration and Implementation, Item # R-1.1 & R-1.7

**DELETE:**

- **10 points** - Over \$12,000k
- **8 points** - \$9,000k to \$11,999k
- **5 points** - \$6,000k to \$8,999k

**INSERT:**

- **10 points** - Over \$12,000k
- **8 points** - \$9,000k to \$11,999k
- **5 points** - **\$5,000k** to \$8,999k

12) Reference: Attachment 4.2 – Technical Evaluation, criteria # R-8.1 Proposed Contractor Project Manager

**DELETE:**

<b>R-8.1.2</b>	The Bidder should demonstrate, using project descriptions, that the resource has experience, on one project for a minimum duration of twelve months, within the five years preceding the issuance date of this RFP, as a Project Manager managing system implementation within a highly collaborative environment involving another Contractor.	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>15 points</b> – The project (maximum 2) demonstrates the desired experience.</li> </ul>
<b>R-8.1.3</b>	The Bidder should demonstrate, using project descriptions, that its proposed Contractor Project Manager resource has experience, on one project for a minimum duration of twelve months, within the five years preceding the issuance date of this RFP, as a Project Manager responsible for implementing the proposed ITSM tool solution.	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>15 points</b> – The project (maximum 2) demonstrates the desired experience.</li> </ul>

**INSERT:**

<b>R-8.1.2</b>	The Bidder should demonstrate, using project descriptions, that the resource has experience, on one project for a minimum duration of twelve months, within the five years preceding the issuance date of this RFP, as a Project Manager managing system implementation within a highly collaborative environment involving another Contractor.	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>30 points</b> – The project (maximum <b>1</b>) demonstrates the desired experience.</li> </ul>
<b>R-8.1.3</b>	The Bidder should demonstrate, using project descriptions, that its proposed Contractor Project Manager resource has experience, on one project for a minimum duration of twelve months, within the five years preceding the issuance date of this RFP, as a Project Manager responsible for implementing the proposed ITSM tool solution.	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>30 points</b> – The project (maximum <b>1</b>) demonstrates the desired experience.</li> </ul>

13) Reference: Attachment 4.2 – Technical Evaluation, criteria # R-8.2 Proposed Solution/Application Architect

**DELETE:**

<p><b>R-8.2.2</b></p>	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate, using project descriptions, that its proposed Solution/Application Architect resource has experience, on up to two projects for a minimum duration of twelve months each, within the five years preceding the issuance date of this RFP, as an Application / Software Architect responsible for the end-to end (i.e. from project start-up to solution accepted into production) architecture for a project incorporating the proposed ITSM Tool software:</p>	<p>30</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>15 points</b> – The project (maximum 2) demonstrates the desired experience.</li> </ul>
<p><b>R-8.2.3</b></p>	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate, using project descriptions, that its proposed Solution/Application Architect resource has experience, on one project for a minimum duration of twelve months, within the six years preceding the issuance date of this RFP, developing architectures for a solution consisting of multiple tenants supported on a single instance of the proposed ITSM Tool software.</p>	<p>30</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>15 points</b> – The project (maximum 2) demonstrates the desired experience.</li> </ul>
<p><b>R-8.2.4</b></p>	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate, using project descriptions, that its proposed Solution/Application Architect resource has experience, on one project for a minimum duration of twelve months, within the six years preceding the issuance date of this RFP, developing technical architectures for a solution integrating the proposed ITSM Tool software with the following technologies:  a) Other ITSM Tools by means of an application programming interface (API)  b) Active Directory  c) SAP Financial system  d) Discovery Tool for asset Management</p>	<p>25</p>	<p>Up to 25 points as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>10 points</b> – For each ITSM Tool (max. 2 tools) by means of an API</li> <li>• <b>5 points</b> – Active Directory</li> <li>• <b>5 points</b> – SAP Financial system</li> <li>• <b>5 points</b> – Discovery Tool for Asset Management</li> </ul>

**INSERT:**

<p><b>R-8.2.2</b></p>	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate, using project descriptions, that its proposed Solution/Application Architect resource has experience, on up to two projects for a minimum duration of <b>six</b> months each, within the five years preceding the issuance date of this RFP, as an Application / Software Architect responsible for the end-to end (i.e. from project start-up to solution accepted into production) architecture for a project incorporating the proposed ITSM Tool software:</p>	<p>30</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>15 points</b> – The project (maximum 2) demonstrates the desired experience.</li> </ul>
<p><b>R-8.2.3</b></p>	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate, using project descriptions, that its proposed Solution/Application Architect resource has experience, on one project for a minimum duration of <b>six</b> months, within the six years preceding the issuance date of this RFP, developing architectures for a solution consisting of multiple tenants supported on a single instance of the proposed ITSM Tool software.</p>	<p>30</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>30 points</b> – The project (maximum 1) demonstrates the desired experience.</li> </ul>
<p><b>R-8.2.4</b></p>	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate, using project descriptions, that its proposed Solution/Application Architect resource has experience, on one project for a minimum duration of <b>six</b> months, within the six years preceding the issuance date of this RFP, developing technical architectures for a solution integrating the proposed ITSM Tool software with the following technologies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other ITSM Tools by means of an application programming interface (API)</li> <li>Active Directory</li> <li>SAP Financial system</li> <li>Discovery Tool for asset Management</li> </ol>	<p>25</p>	<p>Up to 25 points as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>10 points</b> – For each ITSM Tool (max. 2 tools) by means of an API</li> <li>• <b>5 points</b> – Active Directory</li> <li>• <b>5 points</b> – SAP Financial system</li> <li>• <b>5 points</b> – Discovery Tool for Asset Management</li> </ul> <p><b>Note: Separate projects may be used to demonstrate each technology</b></p>



- 14) Reference: Appendix 1 to Annex A – ITSM Tool Non-Functional Requirements, requirement # NFR-12.3, Web Accessibility

**DELETE:**

The ITSM Tool must comply with the Standard on Web Accessibility. The standard is designed to provide uniform application of a high level of web accessibility across Government of Canada websites and web applications.

The Standard on Web Accessibility can be found at:

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

**INSERT:**

The ITSM Tool must comply with WCAG 2.0. The WCAG 2.0 requirements can be found at: [www.w3.org/WAI/standards-guidelines/wcag/](http://www.w3.org/WAI/standards-guidelines/wcag/)

All documents have been attached separately.

**3. DELETE AND REPLACE ATTACHMENT 4.2 – TECHNICAL EVALUATION**

All documents have been attached separately.

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

All documents have been attached separately.

**5. DELETE AND REPLACE APPENDIX 1 TO ANNEX C – ITSM SECURITY CLASSIFICATION GUIDE**

All documents have been attached separately.