SHARED SERVICES CANADA

Amendment No. 005
to the Request for Proposal for Information Technology
Service Management (ITSM) Tool Solution

Solicitation No.	30190	Date	February 28, 2019
GCDocs File No.		GETS Reference No.	PW-19-00841613

This Amendment is issued to extend the RFP closing date and answer questions 96-107,109-130, 133-155, 157-180, 182, 184-186, 188-234, 237, 239-241, 244-245, 247-250, 252-253. Except as expressly amended by this document, the RFP remains unchanged.

<table>
<tr><td>

THIS RFP AMENDMENT IS ISSUED TO:

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

1. Extend the closing date of the RFP
2. Publish Canada's Responses questions 96-107,109-130, 133-155, 157-180, 182, 184-186, 188-234, 237, 239-241, 244-245, 247-250, 252-253

</td></tr>
</table>

1. EXTEND THE CLOSING DATE OF THE RFP

This solicitation amendment is issued to extend the closing date of the RFP from **March 12, 2019** to **March 26, 2019.**

2. PUBLISH CANADA'S RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

QUESTION 96:

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ANSWER 96:

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

QUESTION 97:

1.3.2.i - Can you please define/clarify "Core Team Member"?

ANSWER 97:

To clarify, the Core Team refers to the companies including the Bidder (i.e. Prime Contractor) and the sub-contractor organizations that it will utilize to deliver the scope of work under the Contract. For example, the Bidder might be a System Integrator (SI) organization and it has a Software Vendor as a subcontractor. In this example the "Core Team" is the SI organization and the Software Vendor organization.

QUESTION 98:

1.3.2.iii - How did you arrive at the importance of a $6 to $12 million implementation cost?

ANSWER 98:

See Answer 53 and Modifications 10 and 11 contained in RFP Amendment No. 003.

QUESTION 99:

1.3.2.iii - Are you equating dollar value to success?

ANSWER 99:

See Answer 53 and Modifications 10 and 11 contained in RFP Amendment No. 003.

QUESTION 100:

1.3.2.iii - One of the major pillars of a successful implementation is to lower the cost of implementation to the organization. Can the government please explain why more points are allocated to a higher dollar value contract versus a contract that delivers measurable business value and positive business outcomes to the organization, especially given the static number of 100,000 employees?

ANSWER 100:

See Answer 53 and Modifications 10 and 11 contained in RFP Amendment No. 003.

QUESTION 101:

1.3.2.iv.b – SSC is awarding rated requirement points based on implementation of the following solutions: Service Asset Configuration Management including CMDB design, Incident Management, Request Fulfillment, Change Management, Service Catalogue Management including Service Catalogue design, Service Level Management, Event Management, Knowledge Management, Problem Management, Release and Deployment Management. You are also awarding rated requirement points based on the dollar size of the implementation. There appears to be a mismatch, as $6 to $12 million seems an excessive amount of money to spend implementing the listed processes. Can you please explain how you arrived at these values?

ANSWER 101:

See Answer 53 and Modifications 10 and 11 contained in RFP Amendment No. 003.

QUESTION 102:

1.3.2.iv.b – Can you please reduce the dollar value to $500,000 to $1.5 million?

ANSWER 102:

The request has been reviewed. The requirement remains unchanged.

QUESTION 103:

If only implementation services are being requested, why is the government requiring that the core team and vendor demonstrate high costs of implementation ($6 million+ for minimum rated points and $12 million+ for maximum rated points)?

ANSWER 103:

See Answer 53 and Modifications 10 and 11 contained in RFP Amendment No. 003.

QUESTION 104:

Should the government not value lower complexity and costs to implement the solution?

ANSWER 104:

See Answer 53 and Modifications 10 and 11 contained in RFP Amendment No. 003.

QUESTION 105:

Would the government not consider qualifications like "success of implementation," "customer satisfaction," and "return on investment" as criteria and remove a simple requirement that favours legacy vendors that bleed governments dry on PS to implement simple processes?

ANSWER 105:

See Answer 53 and Modifications 10 and 11 contained in RFP Amendment No. 003.

QUESTION 106:

2.3 R-2.1 – Can you please clarify how the following requirement relates to the current solicitation requirements: "The Customer Reference Project was deployed to support an IT Service Provider supporting multiple external customer organizations"? Please provide a use case as illustration.

ANSWER 106:

Refer to Attachment 1 – ITSM Project Background Information and Context, section 2.4.3 Onboarding of Additional Departments.

QUESTION 107:

2.3 R-2.2 – Can you please clarify how the following requirement relates to the current solicitation requirements: "The Customer Reference Project was deployed to support multiple tenants supported on a single instance of the ITSM Tool software"? Please provide a use case as illustration.

ANSWER 107:

See answer 106.

QUESTION 109:

2.4 R-3 – Can you define "support partner"?

ANSWER 109:

To clarify, the criteria is related to "Partners" (i.e. formal business relationships) that the ITSM Tool Software Publisher has established with other organizations to provide "implementation and support" professional services for the ITSM Tool.

QUESTION 110:

2.4 R-3 Do these partners need to provide implementation AND support or can each partner provide implementation OR support?

ANSWER 110:

It may be implementation or support services, the Bidder should elaborate as to what services the Partner does provide.

QUESTION 111:

2.6 R-5 – Can you please clarify precisely how you will score these requirements given that the attributes are subjective ("concise" "easy to understand") rather than objective?

ANSWER 111:

As set out in the point rated criteria points will be awarded based on the number of attributes demonstrated.

To clarify, a concise response uses brief and to the point sentences and avoids repetition while including relevant material to ensure completeness of the message.

QUESTION 112:

2.7 R-6 – Can you please clarify precisely how you will score these requirements given that the attributes are subjective ("concise" "easy to understand") rather than objective?

ANSWER 112:

See answer 111.

QUESTION 113:

2.8 R-7 – Can you please clarify precisely how you will score these requirements given that the attributes are subjective ("concise" "easy to understand") rather than objective?

ANSWER 113:

See answer 111.

QUESTION 114:

Attachment 4.2, Table #1 - As part of the Functional Requirements Mandatory Response Form in the column asking for "Reference to Product Documentation," should the bidder provide a description of how the software fulfills 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 114:

See Answer 57 contained in RFP Amendment No. 003.

QUESTION 115:

RFP Section 3.4, Question a – the "Financial Evaluation Pricing Tables" are not included in Appendix 1 to Attachment 4.3. In addition, Attachment 4.3 is not available on the Buy and Sell Canada website. When will these documents be provided, as we cannot prepare our response without them?

ANSWER 115:

These documents were published with RFP Amendment No. 002.

QUESTION 116:

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 the government consider adding the other IT service management processes – such as demand management, application portfolio management, financial management and IT project and portfolio management – to this RFP to provide a full picture of the "operational" and "grow/transform" work that goes into delivering IT services?

ANSWER 116:

See Answer 48 contained in RFP Amendment No. 003.

QUESTION 117:

In our experience with large organizations and government entities that have embarked on digital transformation, we have found that when these organizations expand beyond basic ITSM functionality is when they begin to realize extensive value. Can you please explain why functionality beyond traditional ITSM is not included in this RFP?

ANSWER 117:

See Appendix 2 to Annex A, – ITSM Tool Functional Requirements, for the following FRs relating to Support for Business Line Services: FR-2.2, FR-3.10, FR-3.13 The scope of the contract has been carefully defined to align with SSC's current level of maturity, deployment plan and in alignment with other SSC initiatives that are expected to further support evolution of SSC's ITSM practice. See also answer 48.

QUESTION 118:

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 (for example, to include mobile experiences, chatbots, machine learning and AI to support automation)?

ANSWER 118:

See Answer 117.

QUESTION 119:

If not, can you please explain the expected, quantified benefit after the effort and cost of transitioning for no apparent increase in benefit to service delivery and SSC's customers?

ANSWER 119:

See Answer 48 contained in RFP Amendment No. 003.

QUESTION 120:

Configuration management and a healthy and accurate CMDB are central to successful ITSM. Through the previous procurement, SSC stated that the current CMDB solution (TADDM) was costly to configure and maintain, required manual effort, and therefore impacted accuracy and usefulness of the data. Why, now, has the government chosen to remove the solution requirement to provide an automated, accurate and up-to-date CMDB and service mapping capabilities to address this core issue?

ANSWER 120:

Service Asset and Configuration Management (SACM) configuration and automation requirements (including CMDB data model) are the responsibility of the Process Maturity Solution Contractor. Also refer to Appendix 2 to Annex A – ITSM Tool Functional Requirements, section 8 Service Asset and Configuration Management (SACM) which contains functional requirements that support SACM, including the CMDB itself.

QUESTION 121:

The requirements, as they read, are to integrate with the legacy CMDB (FR 8.12 – Auto Discovery) to make the information, as it is, available to the incident and change processes. By not addressing the quality of the CMDB, ITSM improvements will be limited at best. Please explain why the government has not asked for an automated CMDB discovery and service mapping (which is best practice) in the RFP to improve the health and accuracy of the CMDB and therefore all other ITSM processes?

ANSWER 121:

To clarify, FR-8.12 refers to integrating with SSC's current discovery tools as well as other discovery tools. The ITSM Tool will be using its own CMDB for configuration management.

QUESTION 122:

Different software solutions 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." 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 and our country. Can SSC explain why you have not considered valuing a) the amount spent on R&D by the vendor and/or b) the upgrade cycle (that is, how often new versions are being introduced to provide enhancements to the underlying capabilities) in the scored portion of the response? It is recommended that the government set a standard for the amount of R&D investment expected by the software vendor (at least 1 or 2 upgrades should be offered each year) and include this as a rated requirement.

ANSWER 122:

The request has been reviewed. The requirement remains unchanged.

QUESTION 123:

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. Is the government looking for any process design in the professional services being requested or simply implementation services?

ANSWER 123:

Process design is outside the scope of this RFP/contract. Refer to Attachment 1 – ITSM Project Background Information and Context, section 2.4.3 Onboarding of Additional Departments for additional information.

QUESTION 124:

If the current solution being requested is to allow SSC to implement out of the box, simple core ITSM processes, wouldn't it be prudent to also ask for the ability to upgrade to more advanced ITSM capabilities when the government is ready to adopt these enhancements?

ANSWER 124:

The Contractor must provide Software Maintenance and Support services, including Maintenance Releases and Upgrades, for the ITSM Tool as set out in Annex A, SOW, section 3.1 h). The Bidder's proposed solution may exceed the mandatory requirements set out in the Appendix 1 to Annex A –ITSM Tool Functional Requirements SOW. The Bidder, at its' discretion, may include additional functionality in its' Technical Proposal and associated Financial Proposal. Bids will be evaluated as set out in Attachments 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3

QUESTION 125:

The government should also expect that these enhancements can be introduced without impacting business users or introducing complex re-implementations. Please explain why SSC has not included mandatory or rated criteria concerning ease of expansion into additional applications without reimplementation or release of another/recompeting the RFP for expanded functionality.

ANSWER 125:

The request has been reviewed. The requirement remains unchanged.

QUESTION 126:

It appears that the requirement for an incident deflection mechanism, which includes automatic search and presentation of knowledge articles and similar issues as the incident is being created by the end user or technician, is not called out as a requirement. This, however, is important to most service delivery organizations today. Please explain why SSC has not asked how each solution meets these requirements?

ANSWER 126:

See Appendix 2 to Annex A – ITSM Tool Functional Requirements, # FR-5.18 Knowledge Access.

QUESTION 127:

SSC presumably wants to ensure that the solution does not require client software or browser plugins, as this complicates solution access. Please explain why SSC has not challenged bidders to demonstrate how their solution meets this requirement?

ANSWER 127:

See Appendix 1 to Annex A – ITSM Tool Non-Functional Requirements, requirement # NFR-11.1, Multi-Platform Support (Web)

QUESTION 128:

The requirements ask for the solution to integrate with an SSC BI tool for reporting purposes rather than providing any native capabilities or KPIs in this regard. Would it not be more valuable for the solution to have in-platform reporting and analytics capabilities embedded in the service management workflow and to not require third-party reporting tools and the costs associated with maintaining this integration (people, process, and technology)?

ANSWER 128:

Appendix 2 to Annex A – ITSM Tool Functional Requirements stipulates the FR that the proposed ITSM Tool must meet, including historical trending (see # FR-4.14). SSC has made significant investments in enterprise BI tools and plans to leverage these where appropriate.

QUESTION 129:

BI tools provide incomplete information and you cannot click into records to research the results of the reports. Please explain why SSC has not included the requirement for native KPIs, reporting and analytics so that IT service managers do not have to leave the solution to view reports or investigate the underlying records?

ANSWER 129:

Refer to Appendix 2 to Annex A – ITSM Tool Functional Requirements, section 4. Performance Reporting (PR).

QUESTION 130:

The reference qualifications unfairly favour legacy technology that have been in the Canadian government for decades and exclude newer and more modern technologies. This is not in the government's best interest. The Canadian government lags behind the rest of the world and has yet to adopt newer technology on this scale. 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 scale reference from the Canadian bilingual reference so as to not limit references to incumbent legacy software implementations.

ANSWER 130:

See Answer 56 contained in RFP Amendment No. 003.

QUESTION 133:

It is important to leverage trusted third-party and industry evaluations like Gartner, IDC and Forrester to give preference solutions that are proven leaders in ITSM ability to execute and completeness of vision.

Would this not show more propensity for success than having pre-existing references in bilingual Canada at scale?

ANSWER 133:

The request has been reviewed. The requirement remains unchanged.

QUESTION 134:

The current evaluation criteria appears to unfairly advantage incumbent legacy solutions versus proven leaders that could future-proof Shared Services Canada. Please explain why SSC has not included requirements to show leadership qualities per industry evaluations (Gartner and others).

ANSWER 134:

See answer 133.

QUESTION 135:

If the solution could show that a cloud delivery model could provide a more secure, available and cost-effective solution for the Crown, would the government be open to a cloud delivery model immediately versus as a long-term migration strategy?

ANSWER 135:

No. See Annex A, SOW, section 3. ITSM Tool Software Requirements.

QUESTION 136:

How does this procurement support the government of Canada's cloud-first strategy?

ANSWER 136:

Canada's cloud-first strategy is supported by the inclusion of provisions in the RFP for other departments to negotiate the Contractor's SaaS offering, or acquire licenses to be installed on cloud infrastructure acquired through SSC's Cloud Brokering Service. See Annex A, SOW, section 3. ITSM Tool Software Requirements, requirement 3.1 j).

QUESTION 137:

Due to the volume of questions and work required to deliver this response, we are requesting a 4 to 6 week extension of the close date.

ANSWER 137:

See Amendment 005.

QUESTION 138:

In the RFP subsection 1.4 The Bidder states a) Definition of Bidder: In the solicitation, "bidder" means the person or entity (or, in the case of a joint venture, the persons or entities) submitting a bid. It does not include the parent, subsidiaries or other affiliates of the bidder, or its subcontractors. Given the importance of this initiative and a healthy competitive process to achieve best value, we recommend the

definition of Bidder be expanded to include its parent and affiliates. How we are structured should not be a determining factor during this competitive process.

ANSWER 138:

Please refer to Amendment 002, response to Question 8

QUESTION 139:

In the RFP M-2 Corporate Experience, ITSM Tool Software Configuration and Implementation states: The Bidder must provide two Customer Reference Contracts that demonstrate experience in the configuration and implementation of the proposed ITSM Tool COTS software. To be compliant, each Customer Reference Contracts provided must:

i) Have been delivered by the same Core Team Member proposed to lead the delivery of the ITSM Tool Implementation and Integration services for SSC (as described in SOW SOW 2, 4-9, 11 and 12)

Please confirm that the Core Team Member is the bidding firm identified as the Prime.

ANSWER 139:

No, See answer 97.

QUESTION 140:

This question is a follow-up to Amendment 2 – Question 8.

The Solicitation includes a strict definition of Bidder, excluding Parent, affiliates, subsidiaries and subcontractors. For tax, accounting and legal reasons, global firms operate their global business through local, country specific operating companies. Our ownership structure rolls up to one Global entity, however, by limiting the definition of bidder to our Canadian entity, the Crown is effectively limiting us to only using references from our Canadian operating company to meet the requirements of the RFP. Given the size of the references being requested in the mandatory and rated requirements, and the complexity of the implementation SSC is requesting, leveraging Global References of comparable size will be far more meaningful than smaller Canadian based examples.

The Crown has generally allowed the use of the experience of the bidder's "Affiliates". Two (2) examples illustrate this practice: the Canadian Food Inspection Agency's recent ESDP procurement and CBSA's Accounts Receivable Ledger (ARL) procurement. By way of example, the following language would be acceptable to the Bidder, and is taken from one of the above noted RFPs:

"The experience of affiliates will be accepted for evaluation purposes in response to these criterion. For the purpose of this evaluation, everyone, including but not limited to organizations, bodies corporate, societies, companies, firms, partnerships, associations of persons, parent companies, and subsidiaries, whether partly or wholly-owned, as well as individuals, and directors, are Bidder's affiliates if:

a) directly or indirectly either one controls or has the power to control the other, or

b) a third party has the power to control both.

Indicia of control, include, but are not limited to, interlocking management or ownership, identity of interests among family members, shared facilities and equipment, common use of employees, or a

business entity created following the acts or convictions specified in this section which has the same or similar management, ownership, or principal employees, as the case may be.

ANSWER 140:

The request has been reviewed. The requirement remains unchanged.

QUESTION 141:

itsm_attach_1-3_en, 2.1, The Enterprise Service Desk is currently supported by an ITSM Toolset comprised of IBM's Enterprise Control Desk (ECD) and other secondary tools. What is the full list of tools planned to be replaced either completely or partially by the new ITSM solution besides the IMB ESD?

ANSWER 141:

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

QUESTION 142:

itsm_attach_1-3_en,2.4.2, Onboarding of the first Tenant (customer department) as a tenant on SSC's multi-tenant instance of the ITSM Tool, including migration of customer department data from current departmental tools to the new ITSM Tool and integration of the new ITSM Tool with the customer department's enterprise applications and tools. Can more details be provided on the first tenant?

ANSWER 142:

The first Tenant will be confirmed after contract award. This information is not required for the purposes of bid response.

QUESTION 143:

General - Attachment 1 describes 2 phases, SOW does not make mention of phases specifically + does not mention the onboarding of a first tenant besides SSC.

ANSWER 143:

See Attachment 1 – ITSM Project Background Information and Context. Section 2.4.2 c) states that the first Tenant (customer department) will be on boarded as a tenant on SSC's multi-tenant instance of the ITSM Tool.

QUESTION 144:

itsm_annex_a_sow_en, 6.1, The legacy ITSM system (IBM Control Desk) and new ITSM Tool will co-exist for an indeterminate period of time. Does it mean then that we need to build an ''e-bridge" between the 2 tools? Again – Why?

ANSWER 144:

This will be determined after contract award. This information is not required for the purposes of bid response.

QUESTION 145:

General - Attachment 4.3, Financial Evaluation will be provided in a separate attachment in a subsequent amendment. Have this been released yet?

ANSWER 145:

Yes. See RFP Amendment No. 002.

QUESTION 146:

itsm_annex_a_sow_en, 3.1, The Contractor must provide an ITSM Tool (i.e. perpetually licensed COTS software), Could you please explain what is meant by perpetually licensed COTS software?

ANSWER 146:

To clarify, a perpetual (or permanent) license allow the customer to use the licensed software indefinitely.

QUESTION 147:

itsm_annex_a_sow_en, 3.1, The Contractor must provide an ITSM Tool (i.e. perpetually licensed COTS software), Does this mean licenses will be charged once throughout the life of the contract?

ANSWER 147:

Yes. See answer 146.

QUESTION 148:

itsm_annex_a_sow_en, 3.1, The Contractor must provide ISTM Tool licenses to support three classes of users as follows: Number of concurrent users?

ANSWER 148:

See answer 28.

QUESTION 149:

itsm_annex_a_sow_en, 3.1, The Contractor must provide ISTM Tool licenses to support three classes of users as follows: Should the contractor bid for only the active users mentioned in the RFP?

ANSWER 149:

See answer 28.

QUESTION 150:

itsm_annex_a_sow_en, 8.2, Integrations between the ITSM Tool Solution and other SSC and GC applications must be delivered by the Contractor, as and when requested. Development needed by integrating tools will be performed by SSC?

ANSWER 150:

To clarify, the Contractor is not responsible for development on the remote GC application, but will be required to collaborate with technical and business teams responsible for those remote GC applications

QUESTION 151:

itsm_annex_a_sow_en, 11, Ad-hoc professional services, if requested, would be limited to the resource categories listed in SOW section 2.12. Since the scope of Ad-hoc professional services were not defined in the RFP, will SSC be billing this using a rate card or a separate project?

ANSWER 151:

Task Authorizations will be developed using the Per Diem Rates set-out in the Basis of Payment. To further clarify, Bidder must propose Per Diem rates at time of RFP in accordance with the requirements set out in Attachment 4.3, Appendix 1 – Financial Evaluation Pricing Tables (see Amendment 2).

QUESTION 152:

itsm_annex_a_sow_en, 12, TRANSITION OUT SERVICES REQUIREMENTS. As per RFP the contractor must support the ITSM tool going forward for L3 and L4 support. How does SSC see the transition process work including L2 support?

ANSWER 152:

As set out in Annex A, SOW, section 12.1, the Contractor must, as and when requested, develop a Transition Plan. It is intended to transition responsibility for 3rd Level application management support from the Contractor to SSC.

QUESTION 153:

itsm_annex_a_sow_en, 12, TRANSITION OUT SERVICES REQUIREMENTS. As per RFP the contractor must support the ITSM tool going forward for L3 and L4 support. Is there a defined roadmap?

ANSWER 153:

See answer 152.

QUESTION 154:

itsm_annex_a_sow_en, Appendix 2-1, Voice Recognition, Does SSC have an existing IVR system that ITSM tool can integrate with?

ANSWER 154:

This information is not required for the purposes of bid response.

QUESTION 155:

itsm_attach_1-3_en, 2.1 (a), Replace SSC's current ITSM Toolset (including, but not limited to ECD) with a modern, scalable, ITSM Tool solution; Since the RFP states replace SSC's current ITSM toolset including but not limited to ECD, what other tools will the contractor assess to replace in the proposal?

ANSWER 155:

Assessment of other tools as candidates for replacement will be addressed after contract award.

QUESTION 157:

itsm_rfp_en, 4.3 c), Financial evalution, Can rates be adjusted on an annual basis?

ANSWER 157:

See answer 156.

QUESTION 158:

itsm_rfp_en, 4.3 c), Financial evalution, Will eventual required professional services (outside of the initial scope) be outsourced to a 3PP not awarded with the main business?

ANSWER 158:

Refer to Attachment 1 – ITSM Project Background Information and Context, section 2.4 ITSM Tool Solution Implementation Strategy for the Project including the expansion of the ITSM Tool Solution to GC customer departments.

QUESTION 159:

itsm_rfp_en, 4.4, SCSI Assessment Process, As part of the assessment process is expected to have a shortlisted set of vendors for a potential 2nd round?

ANSWER 159:

Refer to Attachment 4.1 – Evaluation Framework and Process (RFP Amendment No 002) for details the selection process.

QUESTION 160:

itsm_rfp_en, 5.5.2 Grant of License, Do you have an expected/forecasted number of installations and locations where the SW will be deployed?

ANSWER 160:

See answer 28.

QUESTION 161:

itsm_rfp_en, 5.5.2 Grant of License, Do you have an expected/forecasted number of documents, transactions, data and events that will be processed?

ANSWER 161:

See answer 28.

QUESTION 162:

itsm_rfp_en, 5.6.2, Software Maintenance, Will L1 support must be provided by selected vendor?

ANSWER 162:

The question is unclear; please restate and resubmit.

QUESTION 163:

itsm_rfp_en, 5.13.3, Optional Additional Software Licenses, Is there an expectation to have an unlimited ("all you can eat") license model?

ANSWER 163:

That is an option; refer to Attachment 4.3, Appendix 1 - Financial Evaluation Pricing Tables provided in RFP Amendment No 002.

QUESTION 164:

itsm_rfp_en, 5.13.3, Optional Additional Software Licenses, or do you have a forecasted/expected number of licenses/instances/concurrent users for this opportunity?

ANSWER 164:

See answer 28.

QUESTION 165:

itsm_rfp_en, 5.13.14.1 Payment Credits, Would you consider a milestone approach model where ahead of time delivery is rewarded in a similar fashion as delay delivery is penalized?

ANSWER 165:

The request has been reviewed. The clauses remain unchanged.

QUESTION 166:

SCC is requiring the industry to respond with an off-the-shelf on-premise, perpetual license ITSM solution. This requirement is prohibiting industry leading ITSM Cloud Service Providers (SaaS) from responding, but the RFP (Annex I) has a provision to allow the winning on-premise vendor to convert to SaaS. Can SSC provide under which draft terms SSC will be using to convert perpetual licenses into subscriptions?

ANSWER 166:

No. Terms will be negotiated post contract award. See Annex A, SOW, section 3.1 j).

QUESTION 167:

How does SSC intend to account for the conversion of licenses to subscriptions in order to move from capital expenditures (CAPex) to operating expenditures (OPex) as outlined in Annex I?

ANSWER 167:

See answer 166.

QUESTION 168:

Has SSC secured the annual appropriation of funds for this conversion and if so, what is the length of time the subscriptions/operating costs have been budgeted for?

ANSWER 168:

This information is not required for the purposes of bid response.

QUESTION 169:

In reviewing Annex I, SAAS NEGOTIATION PROCEDURES, it is our understanding that SSC requires that the winning supplier credit the full value of all perpetual licenses acquired under the contract towards SaaS subscriptions for the full term of the contract. Can SSC confirm that we have understood this requirement correctly?

ANSWER 169:

To clarify, a credit would be required for those licenses transferred to a SaaS model as applicable and not necessarily all licenses purchased under the contract. See also answer to Q166.

QUESTION 170:

In reviewing Annex I, SAAS NEGOTIATION PROCEDURES, it is our understanding that SSC requires that the winning supplier credit the full value of all perpetual licenses, workload migrations costs and ongoing IaaS costs for the term of the contract. Can SSC confirm that we have understood this requirement correctly?

ANSWER 170:

See answer 166.

QUESTION 171:

In reviewing the RFP, SSC has outlined requirements for reference projects to be significant in deployment size (i.e. 100,000+ organizations) and reuse specific project resources. Can SSC outline how these references will be evaluated from a future SaaS deployment scenario since the references only account for on-premise deployments?

ANSWER 171:

The evaluation criteria is set out in Attachment 4.2 – Technical Evaluation.

QUESTION 172:

Will the lack of SaaS deployments that meet the current reference requirements be taken into consideration in the upfront selection?

ANSWER 172:

See answer 171.

QUESTION 173:

Due to the amount of work and effort needed to properly respond to this RFP, we respectfully request a 4 week extension to the closing date.

ANSWER 173:

See Amendment 005.

QUESTION 174:

SSC has included the following mandatory requirement: "The ITSM Tool must include the ability to extend the use of the portal to external partners (e.g. provincial partners, airport authority, etc.) and Canadian public." Can SSC outline what features/functionality it expects the winning vendor solution to provide the Canadian public under this contract?

ANSWER 174:

All portal functionality could, in theory, be provided to the Canadian public but this information is subject to the requirements of the GC Department in question. No further information is available at this time.

QUESTION 175:

Does the proponent's Quality Management Plan need to be included in the RFP response?

ANSWER 175:

No. The Quality Management Plan is deliverable #3 during the Contractor Onboarding. Refer to Annex A – SOW, section 5.1.3.

QUESTION 176:

Does the proponent's Risk Management Plan need to be included in the RFP response?

ANSWER 176:

No. The Risk Management Plan is deliverable #4 during the Contractor Onboarding. Refer to Annex A – SOW, section 5.1.4.

QUESTION 177:

Annex A – SOW, Section 3, 3.1 g) please confirm that the specified ITSM tool documentation can be provided as late as the Go-Live date.

ANSWER 177:

No, SSC may require some documentation for the ITSM Tool prior to the go-live date.

QUESTION 178:

Annex A – SOW, Section 3, 3.1 h), please confirm that for all severity levels provision of a work-around is satisfactory to solve the problem.

ANSWER 178:

Work-arounds would be considered on a case by case basis.

QUESTION 179:

Annex A – SOW, Section 3, 3.1 h), please confirm that for all severity levels provision of a permanent fix may be incorporated into the software by software publisher as per their standard release cycle.

ANSWER 179:

Confirmed.

QUESTION 180:

For the ITSM Tool Orientation Sessions: must be classroom-based in the National Capital Region (NCR - Ottawa and Gatineau),with a virtual option for off-site staff. Each session must be provided in English or French as requested by SSC. The Contractor must provide all course materials which can be retained by attendees for future reference. Will SSC provide classroom space or will that be the responsibility of the contractor?

ANSWER 180:

Yes, the GC will provide facilities for the classroom training.

QUESTION 182:

RFP Section 1.5: SSC has named 5 companies in this section. Is a proponent precluded from proposing resources under contract to these companies that may be subcontracted from another company?

ANSWER 182:

Please refer to section 1.22 of SSC's Standard Instruction 1.4.

QUESTION 184:

If a proponent's FSC is in progress with PSPC CISD is that sufficient for a viable bid?

ANSWER 184:

As stipulated in RFP section 4.5, Security Clearance, requirements apply at time of contract award. SSC will verify that the selected Bidder meets all the security requirements prior to award of the contract.

QUESTION 185:

Is it Canada's intention to acquire all licenses at the start of the contract or is a staged procurement under consideration?

ANSWER 185:

Staged.

QUESTION 186:

Please clarify the number/type of licenses to be procured by SSC over the course of the contract.

ANSWER 186:

See answer 28

QUESTION 188:

Regarding instructions outlined in the RFP instructions document, a few required documents have still not yet been posted to the GETS site. A program of this magnitude will require bidders to have all the materials accessible asap to produce a competitive response to the RFP and ensure a fair and competitive bidding process. We ask that SSC please post the following missing documents to the GETS asap:

Attachment 3.2 – Supply Chain Security Information Form

ANSWER 188:

Please refer to Amendment 003.

QUESTION 189:

Based on the timeline provided in the RFP, there is no set date for SSC to provide responses to clarification questions. The direction of the bidder's solution is largely dependent on how SSC responds to specific clarification questions. We ask that SSC please respond to the bidder's questions by 2/26/19, which would allow bidders the time needed to consider the answers and develop a solution that addresses the needs of SSC.

ANSWER 189:

Refer to amendment 2, specifically, to the answer to question number 23.

QUESTION 190:

What is the anticipated contract award date?

ANSWER 190:

The RFP schedule targets contract award in May-June, 2019.

QUESTION 191:

The response sections in Attachment 4.1 and Attachment 4.2 seem to be duplicate. Could SSC please confirm that bidders are only required to provide their responses in Attachment 4.2.

ANSWER 191:

Please refer to RFP Amendment No. 001 which contained replacements documents for Attachment 4.1 – Evaluation Framework and Process & Attachment 4.2 – Technical Evaluation.

QUESTION 192:

Does SSC have a preference for the format/layout of proposal responses?

ANSWER 192:

Refer to amendment 2, answer to question number 25**.**

QUESTION 193:

Are bidders required permitted to use their branded template documents for their responses?

ANSWER 193:

Refer to amendment 2, answer to question number 26.

QUESTION 194:

Regarding section 10.5 – Classroom training, can bidders assume that SSC will provide the training facilities including classroom/lab environment, required computer hardware to allow each attendee to access the application?

ANSWER 194:

Yes.

QUESTION 195:

Could SSC please clarify how many attendees will be in each training session, as requested in SOW sections 10.2, 10.3, and 10.4 respectively?

ANSWER 195:

As stipulated in Annex A, SOW, section 10.5 a) "Each classroom training session may include up to a maximum of 20 students".

QUESTION 196:

Regarding section 12.1.2, can bidders assume that any certification courses suggested, as part of the transition plan, are not included in the bid price? If bidders must include this they need to know how many people will need certification, which really depends on when SSC plans to transition and how mature the system is when the transition occurs.

ANSWER 196:

That is correct.

QUESTION 197:

Regarding section 7, the assumption is that the contractor will be able to guide SSC on Level of Effort to implement GC packages. The requirement states "The Contractor must, as and when requested, implement the package into the Testing Environment of the ITSM Tool Solution within the cost and schedule parameters identified by SSC." It's difficult for the contractor to agree to the cost and schedule if our level of effort estimates is not aligned. Could SSC provide additional detail?

ANSWER 197:

To clarify, the cost and schedule parameters for the implementation work will be negotiated between SSC and the Contractor and set-out in future Task Authorizations.

QUESTION 198:

With regards to integration with 3rd party applications, does SSC plan to provide middleware tools? If so what tools are standards within SSC?

ANSWER 198:

No, Canada will not be providing middleware tools.

QUESTION 199:

With regards to integration with 3rd party applications, does SSC plan to provide middleware tools? If not, should bidders include the costs of our preferred middleware in the bid?

ANSWER 199:

See answer 198.

QUESTION 200:

Is GC Service Bus (Oracle Bus) the required integration mechanism for all integrations to Partner ITSM systems, business applications, tools, etc.?

ANSWER 200:

See answer 75.

QUESTION 201:

If GC Service Bus is required integration mechanism, is SSC providing Subject Matter Experts to aid with the integrations?

ANSWER 201:

See answers 75 and 202.

QUESTION 202:

Is SSC providing Subject Matter Experts to assist with integrations to non-vendor partner systems, tools and business applications?

ANSWER 202:

Yes.

QUESTION 203:

If GC Service Bus is not the required integration mechanism for all integrations to Partner ITSM systems, business applications, tools, etc., does SSC require vendor to include and provide alternate solution?

ANSWER 203:

See answer 75.

QUESTION 204:

Attachment 4.2, subsection 1.3.2. item i. – please clarify if the core team member proposed to lead the delivery of the Tool implementation and Integration services for SSC must have been the same Delivery lead in either or both Customer References provided?

ANSWER 204:

No, there is no such limitation.

QUESTION 205:

Similarly, please clarify if all members of the proposed core team in the delivery of the Tool implementation and Integration services for SSC must have been active members of the Delivery of either or both Customer References provided?

ANSWER 205:

No.

QUESTION 206:

Should expenses be included in per Diem rates of resources or be provided as a separate line item?

ANSWER 206:

Refer to RFP Part 3.4 Financial Bid, Per Diem rates must be firm all-inclusive pricing. Expenses will not be paid separately.

QUESTION 207:

In Attachment 4.3, are we allowed to add the following Professional Services Resource Categories:

- Senior Consultant
- Principal Consultant

ANSWER 207:

No. The Bidder must provide Per Diem Rates for the categories identified in Table #1 of Attachment 4.3, Appendix 1 – Financial Proposal Pricing Tables.

QUESTION 208:

Does SSC use or have access to a Learning Management System of Learning portal to host web-based training content and/or videos?

ANSWER 208:

SSC does not currently have access to a Learning Management System.

QUESTION 209:

Are bidders permitted to provide course materials in an electronic format instead of paper?

ANSWER 209:

Bidders are permitted (and required) to provide course materials in an electronic format instead of paper. The file format must be agreed between both parties and SSC must be able to review, edit and provide comments (i.e. track changes).

QUESTION 210:

Could SSC please confirm the estimated number of Process administrators and Tool administrators that will require training?

ANSWER 210:

It is unknown at this time. However, per the section 10.1 of the SOW, Bidders should assume the session will be offered at least four times.

QUESTION 211:

Does SSC intend to conduct training both in person and virtually at the same time?

ANSWER 211:

Yes. See Annex A, SOW, section 10.1

QUESTION 212:

Should bidders assume that all training content should be available in English and French?

ANSWER 212:

See answer 181.

QUESTION 213:

What would be the maximum number of concurrent "Service Desk staff at Customer Departments" out of the 1,500 using the ITSM system at any given time?

ANSWER 213:

See answer 28.

QUESTION 214:

What would be the maximum number of concurrent "SSC Users" out of 4,500 using the ITSM system at any given time?

ANSWER 214:

See answer 28.

QUESTION 215:

How many end-users/customers (i.e. Service Consumers) are there that would need access to the Self-Service Portal (SSP)?

ANSWER 215:

See answer 28.

QUESTION 216:

Are these all ~6,000 SSC personnel and/or 1,500 "Service Desk staff at Customer Department" or all of Canada ~350,000 personnel, please specify?

ANSWER 216:

See answer 31.

QUESTION 217:

FR-1.4 – Shared Ticket Visibility: Could SSC please confirm that the term "shared ticket" in this context means a related ticket (e.g. incident, problem, change) which is related to the original ticket (which itself could also be an incident, problem, change)?

ANSWER 217:

See answer 32.

QUESTION 218:

If this is not the case can you please clarify the requirement by providing an example.

ANSWER 218:

See answer 32.

QUESTION 219:

FR-6.10 - Automation Override: Could SSC please provide clarification on this requirement as well as an illustration?

ANSWER 219:

See answer 33.

QUESTION 220:

FR-7.30 – Link to Projects: Could SSC please explain where are the "project" records stored (in which software/solution) and what type of "link" do you require (ex: referencing a unique identifier…)

ANSWER 220:

See answer 34.

QUESTION 221:

FR-12.13 – Self Service Portal Integration: Should Bidders interpret according to ITIL best practices where, as part of the problem management process, once a known error has been identified, the known error can also be published in the self-service as a knowledge article (i.e. using knowledge management)?

ANSWER 221:

See answer 35.

QUESTION 222:

In other words, could the answer to this question be the same as for FR-12.17?

ANSWER 222:

See answer 35.

QUESTION 223:

Regarding Service Requests: Could SSC please provide the following information:

a. Description of what constitutes a service request (perhaps top 5 most common request)

ANSWER 223:

See answer 37.

QUESTION 224:

Regarding Service Requests: Could SSC please provide the following information: Break down of service requests by vehicle of submission:

i.% phone

ii.% email

iii. % other

ANSWER 224:

See answer 38.

QUESTION 225:

Regarding Service Requests: Could SSC please provide the following information: Average resolution time for a service request

ANSWER 225:

See answer 37.

QUESTION 226:

Regarding Incidents, Is a password reset classified as an incident?

ANSWER 226:

See answer 37.

QUESTION 227:

Regarding Incidents, Break down of incidents by vehicle of submission:

i. % phone

ii. % email

iii.% other

ANSWER 227:

See answer 41.

QUESTION 228:

Regarding Incidents, Average resolution time for an incident.

ANSWER 228:

See answer 37.

QUESTION 229:

Regarding Attachment 4.2, 3.9, R-9 Ease of Configuration of the Proposed ITSM Tool, would SSC please clarify which format do we have to submit the response to R-9?

ANSWER 229:

The Bidder should provide a narrative response to each item #R-9.1 to R-9.6 which describes the configuration effort in terms of:

   a) Which permission and license type or role is required to complete the change
   b) The actions / or activities required to complete the change
   c) If there is a commercially available User Guide to assist in completing the required configuration
   d) If the change is guaranteed to be automatically preserved during future ITSM Tool software upgrades.

QUESTION 230:

Would the following example be acceptable? Example for R-9.1 (not the actual answer)

a) Permissions Required:

15 points Can be completed by a Client technical resource that has completed applicable vendor provided training Action Required:

25 points - The required configuration can be completed through Configuration

c) User Guide

0 points

d) Change Preserved

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

TOTAL = 60 points

ANSWER 230:

The Bidder must provide sufficient details to substantiate its response and not merely restate the criteria without any substantiating information.

QUESTION 231:

For project references, SSC has focused on requiring references with $6,000,000 of professional services to demonstrate the scale of the implementation and the capability of the proponent. This might have been a good measure of capability in the past but new technologies and agile development and deployment methodologies enable organizations to implement large scale advanced systems in much less time at much lower cost while still producing a better outcome for the customer. We submit that a proponent able to deliver a deployable solution with all of the required change/business transformation and other professional services as documented in the RFP as well as the related license costs for between CAD$2,000,000 and 2,500,000 should not be unfairly penalized and found non-compliant. Through experience with other large complex multi-year ITSM contracts on a scale with SSC, we know that we have a winning solution that could save GC dollars while still delivering a viable and comprehensive solution. In the interests of reducing GC spend on this project we request that all references be changes from a $6M minimum to $2M for both licenses and professional services. If GC wishes to add other criteria to demonstrate ability to deliver on this scale, we suggest that reference projects should specify number of licenses deployed or number of users, or total number of employees in the organization.

ANSWER 231:

See Modifications 10 and 11 contained in RFP Amendment No 003.

QUESTION 232:

Should we assume that when the contract is signed all licenses will be purchased immediately or within 6 months of contract signing?

ANSWER 232:

No, the licenses will be acquired as required to deploy the ITSM Tool across the GC. Refer to Attachment 1 – ITSM Project Background Information and Context, section 2.4 ITSM Tool Solution Implementation Strategy. Also see Attachment 4.3, Appendix 1 - Financial Evaluation Pricing Tables provided in RFP Amendment No 002.

QUESTION 233:

Different solutions require differing infrastructure to support the operational environment. We request that SSC include and score in some manner the cost of the underlying infrastructure required to support the operational solution since this has a very real impact on the total cost of ownership for SSC.

ANSWER 233:

Responses will be evaluated in accordance with the Technical and Financial evaluation criteria set out in Attachments 4.2 and 4.3 respectively.

QUESTION 234:

For the resources that must be named in the bid please confirm that it is acceptable that they did not all work on the same reference project.

ANSWER 234:

Confirmed.

QUESTION 237:

Will SSC accept that none disclosure agreements (NDA's) are in place for referenced contracts

ANSWER 237:

All bids (including references) will be treated as confidential, subject to the provisions of the Access to Information Act (R.S. 1985, c. A-1) and the Privacy Act (R.S., 1985, c. P-21).

QUESTION 239:

In regards to Table #1; FR-3.4 Service Definition, "The ITSM Tool must include functionality that provides configurable service definition templates out of the box." As many clients differ on their interpretation of service templates, can SSC provide a definition or example of 'service template'.

ANSWER 239:

In the context of Service Catalogue Management, the ITSM tool is required to provide a template, or standard set of attributes, to describe a Service. This information can then be published on the self-service portal to provide information to customers about the Service.

QUESTION 240:

In regards to Table #1, FR-5.14 Alert Capability, " The ITSM Tool must include functionality to send incident management notifications using a variety of methods including e-mail, mobile device notification, pager or SMS text messaging." Does SSC utilize these types of notifications today and if so, is a 3rd party notification system (e.x. PagerDuty, xMatters, EverBridge) being used, and; if so, will such a system be available to bidders to incorporate into their solution?

ANSWER 240:

SSC's current Enterprise ITSM Tool currently supports email notifications only. A 3rd party notification system is not leveraged.

QUESTION 241:

In regards to Table #1; FR-13.16 Release Readiness, "The ITSM Tool must support the establishment and governance of release readiness criteria." Can SSC provide examples or a definition of release readiness criteria?

ANSWER 241:

See answer 36.

QUESTION 244:

While the Crown has given hard deadlines for industry to submit questions, there is no such guarantee that responses will arrive in time for industry to make resulting amendments to their responses.

SSC has also just released the pricing tables, which after review, do require some clarification before a proper response can be assembled. March break is typically a very difficult time for partners to travel to collectively participate in bid responses. Given the complexity required and terms and conditions that need legal review and acceptance, as well as the inevitable dialogue required between integrators an software publishers after questions are answered, we strongly request a three week extension to ensure maximum participation in this RFP and the ability to mitigate risk to both suppliers and the Crown.

ANSWER 244:

See response to question 137.

QUESTION 245:

On Page 72 of the RFP under the heading Attachment 3.2 – Supply Chain Security Information Form, it is stated that Attachment 3.2 – Supply Chain Security Information Form is attached as a separate attachment. Can the Crown please confirm that this attachment has been provided in the bid package as we have been unable to locate it.

ANSWER 245:

Please refer to Amendment 004.

QUESTION 247:

Given the large number of integration types requested in R.9.3.2 and as many ITSM Toolset Implementation projects can last a number of years and resources assigned to those projects are often on them for long durations, would the Crown consider allowing one of the projects referenced for a minimum duration of six months within the ten years preceding the issuance date of this RFP?

ANSWER 247:

Please note that R-8.3.2 assesses experience on one project and there is no minimum pass marks associated with individual resources. The request has been reviewed. The requirement remains unchanged.

Note: It is assumed that the question relates to point-rated criteria # R-8.3.2 Proposed Integration Specialist; it this is not the case please amend the questions and resubmit.

QUESTION 248:

In Part 5, Section 5.35.1, the Crown states "The Contractor agrees that, in the period leading up to the end of the Contract Period, it will make all reasonable efforts to assist Canada in the transition from the Contract to a new contract with another supplier. The Contractor agrees that there will be no charge for these services." Can the Crown please specify the transition requirements mentioned by this clause, and explain how they are different from the Transition Out Plan specified in requirement M-6 and as mentioned in section 4 of the Annex A - SOW?

ANSWER 248:

SSC will issue a TA for Transition Out Services as set out in Annex A, SOW, section 12.

QUESTION 249:

Regarding R-9.3.2:   Most organizations including, Federal Government clients, have specifically declined bi-directional Integrations between ITSM tools and "source" systems such as Active Directory, Network Discovery Tools, and Organizational data feeds, as these 'Source' systems represent their source of truth and are not in the ITSM tool's domain area of responsibility. As a result, they are unidirectional into the ITSM tool only. Can the Crown amend the requirement to accept experience with unidirectional integrations to be considered compliant?

ANSWER 249:

The request has been reviewed. The requirement remains unchanged. Please note there is no minimum pass marks associated with individual resources.

Note: It is assumed that the question relates to point-rated criteria # R-8.3.2 Proposed Integration Specialist; it this is not the case please amend the questions and resubmit.

QUESTION 250:

After review of the SSC pricing tables, we require further time to perform a proper analysis before a response can be provided. Given that the Crown has given hard deadlines for industry to submit questions, there is no such guarantee that responses will arrive in time for industry to make resulting amendments to their responses. We strongly request a three week extension to ensure maximum participation in this RFP and the ability to mitigate risk to both suppliers and the Crown.

ANSWER 250:

See response to question 137.

QUESTION 252:

As per M1 – If specific resources from the subcontractor organizations that form part of the core team are named in the bid and they hold a secret personnel clearance is the bid compliant even though the subcontractor organization does not have a Secret FSC?

ANSWER 252:

The Contractor may hold the Secret Security clearances for sub-contractor's resource if necessary. See also answer 183, 184 and 251.

QUESTION 253:

Question: is a bid compliant if different core team members worked on different referenced projects?

ANSWER 253:

Yes