



QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
RFP – SECURITY SCREENING SOLUTION
AUG. 13, 2019

Question 1:

Livescan Software

In mandatory requirement "M1", the requirement only asks for hardware and does not ask for Livescan software.

Can CMHC clarify the requirement to request that the proponent provide an RCMP 1.7.8 vendor-certified "Livescan System", certified with a FAP50 scanner block?

Since the RCMP is the authority, RCMP terminology is being used which can be found on the following link: <http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/en/businesses>

To be even more specific, the proponent needs to be certified for either: All MAP (Civil) application types or; minimally the Federal Government Application Type within the Federal Government agency profile. Without specifying this level of detail, a proponent's solution may not be usable by CMHC.

CMHC Response:

CMHC requires a complete solution which includes all necessary software. CMHC will not specify any particular software as this will be up to the Proponent to provide based on their solution.

Question 2:

The Solution must provide up to six (6) RCMP vendor-certified FAP50, "or equivalent or better"

FAP stands for Fingerprint Acquisition Profile. It is an FBI biometric NIST standard identifying the size of the fingerprint scanner's capture area sometimes referred to as "The Platen". It is an FBI biometric Appendix F certified standard supported by the RCMP and not a fingerprint brand.

Please refer to the table partway down the following FBI page for more detail: <https://www.fbi/foia/records/certifications/FAQ>

The rows on this table representing the FAP10 - FAP45 standard are not currently allowed to be used by the RCMP (since they are not Appendix F certified) and the RCMP only allows RCMP



scanner block certification for Appendix F certified scanners. Therefore, only the FAP50 or FAP60 standard is allowed by the RCMP.

To clarify the requirement, can CMHC remove "or equivalent or better" since it is not clear what would be better or equivalent than a FAP50 standard (with a Capture Dimension size of 3.2 x 2.0) since FAP50 offers the most portable solution that can be certified by the RCMP

CMHC Response:

The equipment can be equivalent or better as long as the equipment is RCMP certified. CMHC will not remove this criteria.

Question 3:

In M2: "The Solution must validate the information provided on identification documents such as drivers, license, etc. against the information submitted via a web service;"

Could CMHC better explain this requirement?

Could CMHC indicate which Deliverable in the deliverable section it relates back to?

It seems to be deliverables:

v) Forms Management on page 42 of the RFP: "Make demographic data available for importing by fingerprinting system"?

vi) Fingerprinting "Eliminate double entry and barcode scanning by reusing TBS form data"

If it does, could CMHC update the requirement accordingly?

Note that CMHC has not requested barcode scanners as part of the solution so there is no way to read the 2D barcode data from a driver's license. Data on these documents would therefore need to be keyed into the system unless the requirement is changed.

CMHC Response

CMHC is looking for a solution that validates data provided by an applicant from documents such as drivers' licenses or passports including DOB, name and addresses and then allows the data to be uploaded to the fingerprinting system. For example, if an applicant provides a driver's license with his/her name, CMHC must be able to compare that name (and other information) to the online web application (portal) and the fingerprinting system at the time the fingerprinting is done. There is no need for barcodes.

Question 4:

A. Under Section 4 - Proposal Requirements:



1. For Response item 4.6 - Pricing Proposal, the details below the list describe 4.6 as "Project Management Plan".

Is "Project Management Plan" an Additional Response Item or included in error? It is not in the Appendix E Checklist.

CMHC Response:

The numbering has been corrected in Amendment #01. All criteria in Section 4 is mandatory unless indicated otherwise.

Question 5:

2. For Response Item 4.7 - Financial Information

You are asking that the proposal be organized and submitted with Financial Information as a section but the description (listed as 4.8) states that the Proponent is not expected to submit confidential financial information with their proposal.

Can you confirm if you would like the proposal to include Financial Information as a section. If yes, can you confirm that it is acceptable to state the following under that section: "Although Gambit is not submitting confidential financial information with the proposal we understand and agree that CMHC reserves the right to conduct an assessment of the Lead Proponent(s) financial capacity".

CMHC Response:

Financial Information may be requested of Lead Proponent but is not mandatory when Proponent's at time of proposal submissions. This has been corrected in Amendment #01.

Question 6:

Section 4 included details for 4.9, 4.10, 4.11 but they are not on the main Response Item list.

Can you confirm that they are not required as part of the proposal response but are the details of the review that may be conducted and the documents that are required of the lead Proponent.

CMHC Response:

See response to Question 5.

Question 7:

B. In Appendix E - Mandatory Compliance Checklist

Can you confirm that all of the Mandatory Compliance Items are listed given the questions above?



CMHC Response:

The Mandatory Compliance Checklist has been revised in Amendment #01.

Question 8:

Can you please confirm whether proponents need to register on the CMHC web site in order to participate in this tender?

CMHC Response:

Proponents are not required to register on the CMHC web site.

Question 9:

Related to the CMHC Q&A response to Question 2:

"The equipment can be equivalent or better as long as the equipment is RCMP certified. CMHC will not remove this criteria."

Is it possible that CMHC believes that "FAP50" is a brand of fingerprint scanner when in fact it is an FBI standard approved by the RCMP?

Please refer to the FAP50 row in the table partway down the following FBI page for more detail: <https://www.fbibiospecs.cjis.gov/Certifications/FAQ>. According to this FBI page, a FAP50 scanner is: Appendix F Certified; has a capture dimension of 3.2 inches x 2.0 inches and can capture up to 4 fingerprints at a time.

Can CMHC confirm that they understand that FAP50 is a standard used by the FBI and the RCMP to certify vendors and not a brand of fingerprint scanner?

Given that "The Solution must provide up to six (6) RCMP vendor-certified FAP50, or equivalent or better", and "FAP50" is a standard, the only thing "equivalent" to a FAP50 can mean it is any FAP50 scanner. Can CMHC provide a definition of what they would define as "better" than a FAP50 given the definition of a FAP50 above?

For mandatory requirement - M1, the portion of the requirement indicating "The fingerprint FAP50 device must be certified for ruggedness based on the following tests...", can CMHC remove the second FAP50 reference in M1 for clarity (given that the scanner does not actually need to be a FAP50) such that this portion of the requirement would now be "The fingerprint device must be certified for ruggedness based on the following tests....". Alternatively, could CMHC add the term "or Equivalent or better" to this second reference?

A FAP60 scanner is similar to a FAP50 with the exception that the capture dimension of a FAP60 is 3.2 inches x 3.0 inches rather than 3.2 inches x 2.0 inches.



Can a vendor bid a FAP60 fingerprint scanner to satisfy this mandatory requirement assuming this scanner is RCMP-certified and satisfies the other part of M1 including:

"The scanners must resist abrasion and be able to capture quality fingerprints from hands that are dry, moist or dirty from both young and older subjects. The scanners must resist latent prints, meaning the platen does not need to be cleaned between captures. The scanners must be resistant to heat, humidity, sunlight and extreme cold typically encountered in Canada's weather profiles. The fingerprint device must be certified for ruggedness based on the following tests:

- a) Drop and Shock test - passed MIL-STD-810G 516.6 Procedure IV- Transit Drop (6 feet drop onto concrete surface and device still working);
- b) Water test on entire surface - sensor platen does not leak and scanner still functions normally after test;
- c) Operating temperature - -10C to +55C
- d) Storage temperature - MIL-STD 810G 501.5 Procedure 1 (80C) and 502.5 Procedure 1 (-40C)

CMHC Response:

The Solution must provide up to six (6) RCMP vendor-certified and FAP50 certified scanners which meet all the specifications and criteria described in the RFP.

The fingerprint scanners described above must satisfy all the criteria detailed in M1 as well as all other criteria outlined in the RFP.

Question 10:

For mandatory requirement M3: "The Solution must import configurable applicant data from an external cloud based as well as file based on CMHC's data and use it to automatically generate an email that includes a link to TBS330-23, Personnel Screening, Consent and Authorization Form. The email must be applicant specific;"

Could CMHC clarify this requirement? The first "based" may need to be removed.

What is the difference between importing configurable applicant data from an external cloud or from a file? In both cases, are they not still just files? Could CMHC indicate if the external cloud is SAP SuccessFactors? If it is, can the requirement also be interpreted as follows: The Solution must import configurable applicant data from an external file based on CMHC's data; and the solution must allow the external cloud to send configurable applicant data to the Solution based on CMHC's data".

Does CMHC need a way (such as a data entry screen) for the solution to initiate the applicant-specific email without depending on a file or an external cloud?

CMHC Response:



The Solution must import configurable applicant data from external files and cloud-based applications such as SAP SuccessFactors and send the configurable data to the Solution based on CMHC's data.

The Solution must work with SAP SuccessFactors.

Question 11:

General

Can CMHC indicate why the RFP closing date was delayed by 3 weeks?

CMHC Response:

CMHC is extending the closing date to allow time for translation of the RFP and Q&A's.

Question 12:

In paragraph 1.8 (page 5), reference is made to the "rated" items (C) in Appendix E. However, in Section 7, Appendix A, there are "M" items and an "R" item. Is it fair to assume that element "R" represents the elements of type "C" or does it represent the elements of type "I"?

CMHC Response:

There is one "Rated" criteria as shown in Appendix A - Section 2 – Rated Technical Requirements: Item #R1 – Product Demo - Max. Points 10

The "Rated" criteria is given a 60% weighting as per the Appendix C – Table 2 – Point Rating.

Question 13:

Paragraph 2.8 (page 8 and 9), last paragraph, states that "CMHC cannot guarantee a response to inquiries that it receives after the deadline for inquiries under paragraph 1.7". However, paragraph 1.7 (page 4) deals with "Mandatory, Quoted and Informative Requirements". Is it fair to assume that paragraph 2.8 refers instead to paragraph 1.6 (page 4) or is there another deadline?

CMHC Response:

The Schedule of Events is in Section 1.6, page 2.

Question 14:

Appendix "E" (page 62) states that the "Closing Date" is 2.3.1. We were unable to locate paragraph 2.3.1. Does this paragraph prevail or paragraph 2.7 (page 8)?

CMHC Response:

The closing date is in Section 2.7, page 8



Question 15:

In Annex "E" (page 62), it is stated that the "Proposal validity period" should be that of paragraph 2.7. However, paragraph 2.7 deals with the "closing date". Is it fair to assume that the "validity period of the proposal" is that indicated in paragraph 2.11 (page 9)?

CMHC Response:

The validity period is in Section 2.11, page 9.

Question 16:

The quote has been available to us since July 31 and as we are in the summer, some indispensable account managers of our suppliers are absent for their annual vacation. In order to provide CMHC with a refined proposal and an optimal price, we respectfully request a postponement of the closing date (we would be delighted by one week). Would it be possible for CMHC to grant us this stay?

CMHC Response:

CMHC has already extended the RFP and due to the need to implement in a timely manner, it is not possible to extend again.

Question 17:

CMHC wishes to lease the required equipment on Schedule A (item i). Does CMHC also wish to lease the software described in Appendix A (item ii) or wish to purchase user licenses?

CMHC Response:

CMHC can go either way whichever is more economical.

Question 18:

Does CMHC want fixed lease payments, transaction fees or a hybrid of both?

CMHC Response:

Fixed lease payments as well as transaction fees are fine so yes, a hybrid of both. Please ensure costs are itemized.

Question 19:

Does CMHC wish to pay the Federal RTI (RCMP) processing fee associated with the Fingerprint Verification Certificate (when applicable) or does it wish to pay for it through the "proposing" by transaction fees?

CMHC Response:



CMHC would like all in costs included so within the transaction fees.

Question 20:

Does CMHC want to pay for Equifax Canada / TransUnion Canada processing fees associated with credit checks or does it want to pay for them through the Transactional Fee "Proponent"?

If these processing fees are to be paid through the "Proponent", should transaction fees in Appendix B detail them?

CMHC Response:

Pricing by transaction fee should include all costs including credit check processing fees, RCMP fees, etc. and be included in Appendix B of the Pricing Proposal. Please itemize and separate each cost within the transaction fee, i.e. line item for RCMP processing fee, line item for credit check processing fees, etc.

Question 21:

CMHC wants the automatic verification of the study records as stipulated in Appendix A (item vii):

- a. Is it possible to specify the degree of automation required?
- b. Does CMHC wish to conduct these audits itself or should it be done by the "Proponent"?
- c. If the study file audits are to be conducted by the "Proponent":
 - i. Does the verification fee for the study files need to be detailed by transaction fees in Appendix B?
 - ii. Does CMHC wish to pay the processing fees for academic file audits to educational institutions (when applicable) or through the "Proponent"?

CMHC Response:

- a. If the Proponent wishes to backend the process manually and present on portal that is ok but the Proponent should estimate how long from request to presentation this would take.
- b. Done by the Proponent.
- c. Yes fees can be put in transaction fees
- d. Through the Proponent

Question 22:

CMHC requires some form of integration with its SAP Success Factors (M22) application. Is it possible to specify the degree of integration required (offline or real-time batch processing, import of HR data from SAP Success Factors into the verification solution, export of updated data from the verification solution to SAP Success Factors)?



CMHC Response:

CMHC is looking for the most efficient system and does not want to limit what is proposed. The proponent should present what they can do and what they believe will be the most optimal integration strategy that they can provide.

Question 23:

CMHC requires compatibility with the "CMHC Microsoft Email" (M22). Would it be possible to specify whether it is Microsoft Outlook client software, Microsoft Exchange server software or Microsoft Office 365 cloud software?

CMHC Response:

Microsoft Office 365 cloud software.

Question 24:

Even though we did not notice this requirement in the quote, does CMHC use and want to integrate this solution into a single sign-on system (SSO)?

CMHC Response:

It isn't a requirement at this time but can be included in submissions as an option.