



**RETURN BIDS TO:
RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:**

epost Connect only
Connexion postale 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.

Comments - Commentaires

**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 étage, 10, rue Wellington
Gatineau
Quebec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Enterprise Fraud Management	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation B7310-190250/B	Amendment No. - N° modif. 005
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client B7310-190250	Date 2020-05-27
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 2020-06-11	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
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:	

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	
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

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
AMENDMENT 005**

This amendment is raised for the following:

1. Amend the Solicitation Close Date (page 1) of the Request for Proposal

At Request for Proposal Page 1:

DELETE:

Solicitation Closes at 02:00PM on 2020-06-04

INSERT:

Solicitation Closes at 02:00PM on 2020-06-11

1. At Annex A – Statement of Work, Section 6.2 Deliverables:

DELETE:

Milestone / Deliverable	Description	Forecast (Business days from Contract award date)
Milestone	*Contract Award*	Day 0
Milestone	Technical Team engagement with Supplier	<i>Completed upon Contract Award</i>

INSERT:

Milestone / Deliverable	Description	Forecast (Business days from Contract award date)
Milestone	*Contract Award*	Day 0
Milestone	Technical Team engagement with Supplier	<i>Completed upon Contract Award</i> No later than 20 days from Contract Award

2. At Annex A – Statement of Work, Section 13.0 Limitations and Constraints:

DELETE:

All work performed will be subject to inspection and acceptance by the Project Authority. All draft and final documents will be approved by the Project Authority prior to distribution. Should the work not meet the expectations of the Project Authority, the Contractor must re-submit revised (acceptable) work at no additional cost to IRCC.

INSERT:

All work performed will be subject to inspection and acceptance by the Project Authority. The Project Authority will make every effort to complete inspection and acceptance within 5 working days of delivery, however should IRCC not meet this time frame corresponding extension of the project schedule will be permitted based on IRCC's delay. All draft and final documents will be approved by the Project Authority prior to distribution. Should the work not meet the expectations of the Project Authority, the Contractor must re-submit revised (acceptable) work at no additional cost to IRCC.

3. At Attachment 4.2 – Point Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria:

DELETE:

R02	<p>For each proposed resource identified in the Bidder's proposed workplan (R05) the Bidder should provide three (3) completed projects within the last five years demonstrating the proposed resource's experience similar to their proposed role and proposed tasks.</p> <p>For each completed project the Bidder must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Client b) Project Title c) Description of the project d) Role of the proposed resource e) Tasks performed by the proposed resource f) Level of effort of the resource for the specified project g) Start and end date of project (dates must include month and year) h) Name of client reference who can verify the completed work i) Contract information (current phone number and email address) for client reference who can verify the completed work 	Max 100	<p>A maximum of 10 points per resource's completed project as follows:</p> <p>10 points – the project exceeds the requirement</p> <p>7-9 points – the project meets the requirement</p> <p>4-6 points – the project meets some of the requirement</p> <p>1-3 points – the project meets little of the requirement</p> <p>0 points – the project meets none of the requirement</p> <p>A total maximum of 30 points per proposed resource (3 completed projects)</p> <p>Total Points Available = # of proposed resources x 30</p> <p>Score = $\frac{\text{Total Points Awarded}}{100} \times \text{Total Points Available}$</p>
-----	---	---------	--

INSERT:

<p>R02</p>	<p>For each proposed resource identified in the Bidder's proposed workplan (R05) the Bidder should provide three (3) completed projects within the last five years demonstrating the proposed resource's experience similar to their proposed role and proposed tasks.</p> <p>For each completed project the Bidder must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Client b) Project Title c) Description of the project d) Role of the proposed resource e) Tasks performed by the proposed resource f) Level of effort of the resource for the specified project g) Start and end date of project (dates must include month and year) h) Name of client reference who can verify the completed work i) Contact information (current phone number and email address) for client reference who can verify the completed work 	<p>Max 100</p>	<p>A maximum of 10 points per resource's completed project as follows:</p> <p>10 points – the project exceeds the requirement</p> <p>7-9 points – the project meets the requirement</p> <p>4-6 points – the project meets some of the requirement</p> <p>1-3 points – the project meets little of the requirement</p> <p>0 points – the project meets none of the requirement</p> <p>A total maximum of 30 points per proposed resource (3 completed projects)</p> <p>Total Points Available = # of proposed resources x 30</p> <p>Score = $\frac{\text{Total Points Awarded}}{100} \times \text{Total Points Available}$</p>
------------	--	----------------	--

4. At Attachment 4.2 – Point Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria:

DELETE:

R06	<p>The Bidder should provide a training and knowledge transfer approach and plan to meet requirements defined in SOW Section 3.9 Training (Wave 1). The response should consider how:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) The approach and plan are tailored to IRCC and the SOW.b) Proprietary tool sets and approaches are leveraged.c) The approach and plan are supported by examples from past experiences.d) All key milestones, activities, and deliverables are identified.	Max: 30	Marking criteria for this requirement is outlined in the Point Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria Summary Table above.
-----	---	---------	---

INSERT:

R06	<p>The Bidder should provide a training and knowledge transfer approach and plan to meet requirements defined in SOW Section 4.9 Training (Wave 1). The response should consider how:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) The approach and plan are tailored to IRCC and the SOW.b) Proprietary tool sets and approaches are leveraged.c) The approach and plan are supported by examples from past experiences.d) All key milestones, activities, and deliverables are identified.	Max: 30	Marking criteria for this requirement is outlined in the Point Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria Summary Table above.
-----	---	---------	---

5. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- 4.1. With reference to section 7.2.b. It is our understanding that SSC is prepared to accept Term or Subscription licensing model licensing in a current procurement for software and services and have actually procured many software licenses utilizing term/subscription licensing. The definition issued by PVR in a current procurement RFSA for Subscription licensing is as follows “Licensing wherein the purchaser pays a set annual fee for use of the software suite. The annual fee includes, uses of software, maintenance, support, and access to updates and upgrades”. For the purpose of evaluation, term/subscription licensing would spread the initial up-front cost of the software over the years of the contract. There would be no changes required to the pricing sheets as the subscription price could be added for each year and the support costs would be \$0 as that included in the subscription price. There would be absolutely no effect or change for the end-users.

Some of the benefits of subscription based pricing (term) are:

- Flexibility to adjust capacity (up or down) and/or configuration of the software as software and/or requirement evolves over time.
- Smaller up-front investment.
- Alignment of costs with the value being delivered by the software.
- Alignment of costs to infrastructure requirements especially as projects are moved to the Cloud (public or private) over time.
- Preference for operating versus capital expenditures

Most companies have moved on from offering perpetual licenses in favour of subscription based licensing models as customers demand better pricing and more flexible terms.

Please confirm that our bid utilizing Term/Subscription licensing would be acceptable for this procurement.

- 4.1. After careful consideration of the question, Canada confirms that we are seeking acquisition of a perpetual software license, with annual maintenance and support.
- 4.2. In the Annex A, table 3.8 - 3.8.12 - it is stated that the solution must be able to keep the records for at least 6 years. Is the data expected to be stored in a component of EFM solution, or does the Crown has a data store that the EFM solution should use? In either case does the Crown have a preferred data store vendor or product?
- 4.2. Microsoft SQL Server is the preferred Relational Database Management System (RDBMS).

4.3. Can network TAP (Netscout vStream models) be capable of sending mirrored application transaction traffic to SSLi solution that may in turn send to the proposed EFM solution? If not, can IRCC provide a dedicated mirrored traffic in an alternate way using a port mirror that can feed SSLi?

4.3. Netscout vStream can provide mirrored application transaction traffic through GRE tunnel landed on Netscout Packet Flow Switch (PFS). This PFS switch can deliver the traffic to any physical appliance by using copper or fiber link.

Depending on the network setting, if the traffic to be monitored is on a physical link, inline tap or switch mirror port can be used to provide a dedicated mirrored traffic to any appliance.

4.4. How many TAPs are available to capture end user transactions? Assumption is all web traffic for GRCC applications will be available at an aggregated TAP point? Will that be physical or virtual TAP? Can IRCC allow a physical network sensor to be deployed to capture end-user transactions? This information is needed to derive the bill of quantity as how many network physical & virtual sensors IRCC will need to monitor web application traffic.

4.4. At this stage, due to the unknown of how many virtual or physical links are to be monitored, it is hard to tell how many TAPs are needed for this project.

Shared Services Canada (SSC) will work with IRCC to cover all required physical TAPs. Virtual TAPs will require careful planning due to the cost.

SSC will use Netscout Packet Flow Switch to provide aggregated traffic from all the taps.

SSC is approved by IRCC to deploy network sensors. For other vendors, deployment approval is required from IRCC. SSC will also review the adding of third party vendors since the network infrastructure is supported by SSC.

4.5. Will IRCC be able to share the required certificate/keys to do SSLi decryption? Based on the previous responses, we understand that bidders will receive encrypted SSL data. If this is not the case, please clarify accordingly.

4.5. SSL decryption for IRCC application needs approval from both IRCC and SSC.

The required certificate/keys cannot be shared outside of the SSC network. The application appliance is suggested to be physically installed inside the IRCC/SSC network.

- 4.6. Rated requirement R02 states that: "For each proposed resource identified in the Bidder's proposed workplan (R05) the Bidder should provide three (3) completed projects within the last five years demonstrating the proposed resource's experience similar to their proposed role and proposed tasks".
- a. As the proposed workplan (R05) will identify only key resources, please confirm that the provision of three (3) completed projects under R02 applies specifically to only the key resources identified in the proposed workplan under R05.
 - b. Will Canada consider projects that are still ongoing within the last five years?

- 4.6.
- a. Yes the resources will be the same as those proposed under R05.
 - b. The criteria requires the Bidder provide 3 completed projects.

- 4.7. In response to Q2.45, IRCC confirmed that the proposed team needing to be submitted consisted of key resources. Please confirm that CVs need be provided for only the key resources identified in the bidder's team proposed under M02.

- 4.7. For M02 Bidders must include detailed CVs of each proposed resource that make up the proposed team performing the tasks and deliverables identified in SOW Section 4.0 – Wave 1 Solution Implementation.

- 4.8. Based on the 11 May addendum response to question 2.46, will the TAPS data, provided by SSC to the vendor's/Bidder's solution, be decrypted? If not, will IRCC provide the vendor/bidder with the private key to decrypt the data?

- 4.8. SSC will attempt to deliver unencrypted mirror traffic if it is available. As SSC does not currently know which physical or virtual link is to be monitored, a detailed plan cannot be provided at this time.

Decryption on IRCC application requires approval from both IRCC and SSC. This could be a long process.

Without knowing how the encryption will be implemented on the links to be monitored, it is hard to tell if the private key will need to be provided or not.

- 4.9. Canada is requesting certification that the proposed named resources will be available to perform the Work as required by Canada's representatives and at the time specified in the bid solicitation or agreed to with Canada's representatives. Understanding that the project start date is unknown, can Canada confirm that the date on which performance of services will begin will be mutually agreed by the parties?

- 4.9. Canada agrees that the performance of services by named resources will begin on a mutually agreed upon date, no later than 20 business days after contract award.
- 4.10. Section 13.0 of the SOW provides that all work performed is subject to inspection and acceptance. Since delays for acceptance/rejection of work can have a significant impact on project schedule, can Canada add text stating that acceptance/rejection will be done within 5 working days of delivery?
- 4.10. IRCC agrees to add text stating that acceptance/rejection of work will be completed by IRCC within five working days of delivery. Should IRCC not meet this time frame, allowances will be made for extension of the project schedule in line with any delays in inspection and acceptance beyond the five working day allowance caused by IRCC.
- 4.11. Regarding section 12.2 of the SACC 2030, considering the COVID 19 situation and not knowing the project start date, some of the work could be delivered from a consultant's home. Canada could not have access to consultant's private home. Would Canada consider deleting subsection 2 or make it applicable to Contractor only?
- 4.11. For the duration of the COVID-19 crisis, suppliers are responsible to manage the risks associated with telework for their employees as they are ultimately responsible for the safety of the information and assets provided, if any. Inspections may be carried out in telework locations however, these are only done on a case-by-case basis and only for specific parameters.
- 4.12. During warranty period, any failure not caused by the Bidder's solution but by other activities outside Bidder's solution, are we correct to assume that the time spent in helping finding/correcting the issue will be charged to IRCC?
- 4.12. The Bidder is correct in assuming that time spent correcting issues may be billed to IRCC should the failure result from activities outside the Solution and not be caused by the Solution.
- 4.13. Section 7.3 b) iii of the Resulting Contract is confusing since it refers to the "version of the software originally licensed under the Contract"; however, it is understood that such version will be maintained, and new releases will become available during the contract period. The Bidder will continue to maintain the most recent version of the software, but not necessarily the version "originally licensed". Is Canada agreeable to clarify this obligation and make it applicable to the current version of the software?
- 4.13. This has been addressed in **section X** of this amendment.

- 4.14. Section 7.7 b) includes an irrevocable option for Canada to extend the contract for 7 one-year period bringing the contract period to a total of 10 years. 10 years is a long-time in this industry, would Canada consider making the last 5 option year mutually agreeable between the parties?
- 4.14. Canada is not prepared to accept changes to Section 7.7 b) at this time.
- 4.15. For R06, can you please confirm the requirement should read “The Bidder should provide a training and knowledge transfer approach and plan to meet requirements defined in SOW Section 4.9 Training (Wave 1).”
- 4.15. This is addressed in **section X** IRCC confirms that R06 should refer to “SOW Section 4.9 Training” not to “3.9”.
- 4.16. With respect to Section 02 of the SACC 4004. Canada requires the Contractor to make a commitment to correct Software Errors within specific time frames, based on the severity level. However, given the complex nature of software development and operating environments, it is difficult for the Bidder to guarantee the time that it will take to resolve a problem. Would Canada consider replacing the commitment to correct software error with a response commitment?
- 4.16. It is understood that the complex nature of software development and operating environments may preclude certain software errors from being corrected within the identified time frames. However, it is expected that the Contractor will make all reasonable efforts to adhere to the prescribed time frames, and where the complexity of the software error prevents these time frames from being met, that the Contractor will continue such reasonable efforts to resolve the error in an expedient manner. These will be dealt on a case by case basis during the Contract Period.
- 4.17. Can IRCC provide individual descriptions (of the content and intended purpose) of each of the Deliverables given in Schedule A, Section 6.2?
- 4.17. Deliverables listed in Section 6.2 are intended as a high-level outline of expectations. Details may be negotiated upon contract award.

4.18. For R02 (i), IRCC is asking for “Contract information”, however it appears that it should state “Contact Information”. Please confirm.

4.18. This is addressed in section X. IRCC confirms that R02 (i) should state “Contact Information”.

4.19. For R02, the Bidder must provide client references (h) and Contact information (i). As it is a sensitive area of information within fraud management teams, we respectfully request that contact information be provided through a Bidder proxy to protect the confidentiality of client employees and respect privacy concerns. Can IRCC confirm that it would be acceptable to provide the contact information for a Bidder representative who can put IRCC in contact with a client reference, should it be required?

4.19. IRCC confirms that it would be acceptable to provide the contact information for a Bidder representative who can put IRCC in contact with a client reference.

4.20. We respectfully request a one week extension to Thursday June 11th. This will allow Bidders have sufficient time to review the most recent amendment and make appropriate adjustments to their response.

4.20. IRCC accepts an extension of the RFP period to June 11th. Note that this extension will not extend the bidder question period.