Public Works and Government Services Canada

Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada

RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

epost Connect only
Connexion postel seulement

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT
MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

Title - Sujet Enterprise Fraud Management	

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation B7310-190250/B	**Amendment No. - N° modif.** 004

Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client B7310-190250	**Date** 2020-05-19

GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG
PW-$$EE-067-37544

File No. - N° de dossier 067ee.B7310-190250	**CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME**

Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à **02:00 PM** on - le **2020-06-04**	**Time Zone** **Fuseau horaire** Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT

F.O.B. - F.A.B.
Plant-Usine: ☐   Destination: ☐   Other-Autre: ☐

Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Pignat, Michael	**Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur** 067ee

Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (873) 354-4163 ( )	**FAX No. - N° de FAX** ( ) -

Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:
Destination - des biens, services et construction:

Comments - Commentaires

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

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	**Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée**

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

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution
Systems Software Procurement Division / Division des achats des logiciels d'exploitation
Terrasses de la Chaudière
4th Floor, 10 Wellington Street
4th etage, 10, rue Wellington
Gatineau
Quebec
K1A 0S5

Telephone No. - N° de téléphone
Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur

Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm (type or print)
Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)

Signature   **Date**

Canada

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
AMENDMENT 004

This amendment is raised for the following:

- Answer Bidder Questions

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

3.1.   Can IRCC confirm whether the data from the network TAPs (to be integrated with the EFM solution) is NATed or not?

3.1.   There is a choice as to whether the data received from the TAP is NATed or not.

3.2.   Based on our understanding of the Netscout technology, the output of the Netscout virtual and physical taps is processed data, which means it's already organized in such a way that it can be ingested by other solutions, and therefore the data is not in its raw form. Can IRCC confirm that the ask is to specifically use that output for the EFM solution?

3.2.   Yes. IRCC would like the solution to use the data sent from the Netscout TAPs. Data flow with clear text in its raw form can be sent to specific devices for further analysis. Additional vlan tags can be inserted in the Q-in-Q format on the packet. It is also possible to filter on the packet payload for a specific text stream, however, IRCC's tool does not change other content of the packet.

3.3.   Part 2 Section 2.1 – Would the Government consider allowing resale of software, through a standard resale agreement which flows through the software vendor's terms and conditions to the government?

3.3.   The Government of Canada will accept bid submissions from software reseller(s) where a completed and signed Software Publisher Authorization Form is submitted as part of the bid submission with the publisher's confirmation that solely the resulting contract terms and conditions set out in this solicitation will apply to Canada's use of the software.

3.4.   Sections 4.2.2 and 7.1 – Would the Government consider allowing the software vendor's warranty of 30 days, followed by maintenance support for the software, and allow the software vendor's warranties in its standard license terms to govern the software warranties?

3.4.   Per SACC 4003 Licensed Software the Government of Canada is seeking a Software Warranty Period of 90 days.

3.5.   Section 7.7 , 7.1 b, 7.2(b) and(c) – Considering the government has set a contract term of up to 10 years, and has reserved the right to provide the solution to other government entities, and considering that commercial software offerings change over a ten year period, would the government consider the ability for the parties to meet and negotiate any changes to the software license terms and conditions, and functionality, features, pricing, at specified intervals during the 10 years, with an option for either party to terminate if a mutual agreement cannot be reached.

3.5.   No. The Government of Canada expects that the software license terms and conditions will remain the same for the duration of the contract period. The Government of Canada expects that the Client will receive maintenance releases during the Software Support Period. The Government of Canada expects that pricing for the period of the contract will be per the Basis of Payment that will be derived from the Bidder's completed Attachment 3.2 Financial Proposal Requirements as part of its Bid Submission.

Please note: The EFM Solution is being procured for the sole use of IRCC. IRCC will not be providing the Solution to other government entities. Should other government entities wish to procure the Solution for their own use, the contract will allow them to do so through exercising an amendment for optional additional software licences.

3.6.   Attachment 3.2 – Financial Proposal Requirements, Table 1.2.2 Professional Services (on an as and when requested basis) has a list of the roles and levels under the "Service Category" column however, not every role has every level. For example: Training Specialist is at the Intermediate level only. Project Manager, EMF Solution Architect, EFM Policy Specialist, System Administrator and Technical Architect are at the Senior and Intermediate levels only. Please confirm this is intentional and that IRCC will not request Senior or Junior Training Specialists or resources at the Junior level for the list above in the second bullet

3.6.   IRCC confirms that this distribution of roles and levels is intentional.

3.7.   Attachment 3.2 – Financial Proposal Requirements has a number of tables with a blank column for "Estimated Usage" (table 1.2.1) or "Estimated Usage Multiplier (A)" (tables 1.2.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2). How will these columns be used? Are Bidders expected to complete them or will IRCC?

3.7.   This question was addressed in Amendment 003, section 1.

3.8.   In Section I. Technical Bid. Draft Project schedule (work plan) indicates that draft project schedule should address the proposed Wave 1 Implementation approach, all the activities required to deliver and deploy the proposed EFM Solution, the establishment of the Service Desk and transition of On-going Support Services. Can IRCC provide with details on the expected outcome related to the "establishment of the Service Desk"?

3.8.   Upon transition from implementation to ongoing operations, IRCC would no longer be communicating with the vendor project team and would be dealing with the vendor's Service Desk. It may not be necessary to establish a Vendor Service Desk if one already exists. Protocols and procedures will need to be established for communication between the Vendor Service Desk and IRCC.

3.9.   Is it possible that we ask IRCC the total number of servers that contain sensitive data that they want to perform employee activity monitoring? On page 70, they said they have about 600 Windows + 200 Linux production servers in their whole environment. But we do not think all contains sensitive data servers. Is there any way to ask to get clarification?

3.9.   Monitoring will be conducted on session traffic to and from 13 servers that end-users communicate with.

3.10.   From the RFP, it is our understanding that the combination of EFM Analytics and Visibility Fabric will be deployed as an Out-Of-Band solution (i.e. the EFM Analytics will be working on a copy of the data and not be in an Active-Inline deployment)?

3.10.   Yes, this understanding is correct.

3.11.   As the IRCC Servers/Databases seem to be located at the SSC Datacenter Borden/Barrie, we would suggest deploying a combination of Network Taps (to send a copy of the traffic) and a Network Packet Broker that would Aggregate, Filter and Condition the traffic to be sent to the EFM Analytical tool, is this what IRCC envisioned for the solution ? If so,
    a. How many Network Taps should be deployed at the SSC Datacenter/Borden ? What about link speeds (1G/10G/Fiber/Copper) and technology (Multi-Mode/Single-Mode for fiber)?
    b. How many Network Taps should be deployed at the SSC Datacenter/Barrie ? What about link speeds (1G/10G/Fiber/Copper) and technology (Multi-Mode/Single-Mode for fiber)?
    c. Would there be multiple EFM solution deployed at both the Borden and Barrie Datacenters ? Or would you centralize a single tool at one of the Datacenters?
    d. Any other strategic network points that you would want to deploy Network Taps?
    e. Will you also want to deploy Network Taps close to the LDAP Server or would you expect the EFM Analytical tool to create requests to the LDAP Server for IP Address to User Identification who is making the request?

3.11.
    a. Accommodations can be made with SSC for 1G/10G/Fiber/Copper and Multi-mode or Single-mode fiber depending on vendor specifications. A minimum of two SSC provided virtual taps will be required with additional taps being made available by SSC.
    b. Accommodations can be made with SSC for 1G/10G/Fiber/Copper and Multi-mode or Single-mode fiber depending on vendor specifications. A minimum of two SSC provided virtual taps will be required with additional taps being made available by SSC.
    c. Borden as the primary with the potential of Barrie as a backup.
    d. As required, network taps will be provided by SSC.
    e. This can be decided based on the vendor requirements. Both are valid options. Taps are already present.

3.12. If the Network Taps are deployed in several strategic points in the network, would you expect that there might be duplicate packets being received by the EFM Analytical tool? If so, would you like the traffic to be deduplicated before reaching the tool?
    a. If advanced features such as deduplication, header stripping and others are not needed, we can deploy an aggregation Network Packet Broker which can still filter at Layer2-4 and is more cost effective.

3.12. SSC packet broker can address packet duplication.
    a. SSC Network Packet Broker would be the most appropriate option.

3.13. As the payload of the user request will be SSL encrypted, this seems to be a blind spot in the solution. The EFM Analytical tool will know who the user is but not what they are requesting as records (as Agents will not be allowed on the Application Servers). Our Visibility fabric can handle, as an extra hardware and software module the ability to decrypt actively payload (including ephemeral based ciphers) and send clear text payload to the EFM Analytical tool. If this additional equipment is needed we would add an additional Inline component which would comprise Bypass Switches and Hardware/Software module to decrypt the traffic. Would this additional functionality be needed? If so, how many network links would we need to intercept going to the servers (typically a set amount of links are targeted which provide access to the servers)

3.13. Vendor functionality will not be immediately required. Decryption and interception will be performed by SSC.

3.14. The technical bid should address clearly and in sufficient depth the points that are subject to the evaluation criteria against which the bid will be evaluated.

Question: Would the Crown please confirm that the evaluation criteria being referred to in the technical bid is limited to Attachment 4.1 - Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria and Attachment 4.2 - Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria?

3.14. The technical evaluation criteria is Attachment 4.1 - Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria and Attachment 4.2 - Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria. There will also be a Use Case and Demonstration Evaluation as part of this solicitation process.

3.15. Page 42:"2.0 Scope of work ... In order to perform its functions (e.g. monitoring, capturing, alerting, importing, and reporting), the solution must not require the modification, re-factoring or re-coding of any IT applications being monitored. Moreover, the solution must not require an agent to be installed on user end-points to gather End-User transactional activity. As such, managed network TAPs (Terminal Access Points) (physical and virtual) will be leveraged to gather End-User transactional activity (session data)."

Question: Will the crown accept solution which monitors local/remote privileged users transactional activities on source-database level (including session data and detailed privileged users SQL activities)?

3.15. Yes, such a solution would be acceptable as long as the solution does not require placing an agent on the database servers.

3.16. Page 45: "3.2.10 -- If an End-Point agent is installed, the EFM solution should be able to capture session recordings of End-User activities."

Page 45: "3.4.1 -- The EFM solution must be able to capture transactional activity from the network TAPS (Terminal Access Point) between the End-User point and the client IT application, without the need to have anything installed on end-point devices."

Page 42: "2.0 Scope of work ... In order to perform its functions (e.g. monitoring, capturing, alerting, importing, and reporting), the solution must not require the modification, re-factoring or re-coding of any IT applications being monitored. Moreover, the solution must not require an agent to be installed on user end-points to gather End-User transactional activity. As such, managed network TAPs (Terminal Access Points) (physical and virtual) will be leveraged to gather End-User transactional activity (session data)."

Question: Statement from 3.2.10 and the statements from 3.4.1 and 2.0 appears to be contradictory. Can IRCC clarify which statement is correct? Is an end-point solution envisaged and if not, for example, is a data activity monitoring solution without end-point device agent be compliant with the crowns requirement?

3.16. 2.0 from page 42 is the correct statement.
An end-point solution is not envisaged for this monitoring, as IRCC does not control a significant percentage of the end-points. As such, IRCC would not be able to install an agent.

3.17.   Page 57: The following professional services categories must be available through the TA process for all estimating activities and subsequent performance of the Additional Professional Services:
a) Project Manager b) EFM Solution Architect c) EFM Policy / Business System Analyst d) System Administrator e) Technical Architect f) Programmer / Developer g) Database Analyst h) Training Specialist i) QA Analyst j) Testing Specialist.

Question: Would the Crown please confirm if a detailed Curriculum Vitae for a resource in all Professional Services categories, listed in a - j, that is not otherwise covered in Section 4 – Wave 1 EFM Solution Implementation, must be included as part of the technical bid?

3.17.   No. The Bidder is not required to submit a Curriculum Vitae for resources in all professional services categories.

3.18.   Page 70: Section 3 - GCMS Environment -- Production is said to have 600 Windows and 200 Linux servers.

Question: How many of which production servers contain actual sensitive data (or databases) that may be exposed to potential cases of malfeasance and misuse of information by end-users?

3.18.   There are 13 servers that end-users interact with that contain or process sensitive data.

3.19.   Page 129: "The EFM solution should have the ability to integrate with other security data analysis and reporting tools (i.e. SIEM, DAM/DAP, DLP). The Bidder should identify all security data analysis and reporting tools that the proposed solution integrates with and provide a description of the level of integration possible."

Question: Does IRCC have an existing Database Activity Monitoring (DAM) solution and if so, please elaborate.

3.19.   IRCC does not currently have a Database Activity Monitoring (DAM) solution.

3.20.   Page 131: All requirements under section Case Management

Question: Does IRCC have an existing case management tool that may be expected to integrate with the proposed solution? If so, which case management tool? For example, ServiceNow ticketing system?

3.20.   Currently IRCC does not have a case management system that may be expected to integrate with the proposed solution. Remedy ARS is leveraged for ticketing.

3.21.   Page 138: Use case "2k) -- Manually assign the file to an existing case"

    Question: Can an integration with existing ticketing system be sufficient for case management functionality stated in use case 2k on page 138.

3.21.   No, an integration with the existing ticketing system is not sufficient for case management functionality stated in use case 2k on page 138. Event content must be limited to a need to know.

3.22.   Page 139: Use case "4a) Create a business rule for End-Users searching for their own name"

    Question: Would the crown consider this requirement met if a solution provided the capability to report on who/when/where/how sensitive data is being accessed or queried, and the capability to report on queries on names column in sensitive table?

3.22.   No. IRCC is looking for a solution that will identify to IRCC, in near real time, when an end-user is accessing a case belonging to someone with the same name or family name.

3.23.   Page 139: Use case "2c) Create nested rule 2: End-Users taking a screenshot of the System of Record"

    Question: Preventing the user from taking a screen shot may be accomplished through configuration of the end point operating system. In any case, nothing will prevent the user from taking a picture of the screen with a personal device. An alternative way could be to disable screenshot feature from approved end-user / employee devices. Given the alternatives to accomplish the end goal, would the crown consider removing this requirement.

3.23.   The reference to Screen Shot is not referring to the end-point Operating System Screen Shot function. The Use Case refers to the Screen Shot function within the GCMS application.

3.24.   Would the Crown please advise if a contract was awarded as a result of solicitation B7310-190250/A, and if so, provide the name of the successful supplier. If a contract was not awarded, is it possible for the Crown to inform suppliers interested in solicitation B7310-190250/B as to the reason why? Was the procurement canceled after bid closing or did the Crown not receive any viable responses from industry?

3.24.   No contract was awarded as a result of B7310-190250/A. The solicitation did not result in any responsive bids.