



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -
TPSGC

Place du Portage, Phase III
Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2
11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776

**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

Shared Systems Division (XL)/Division des systèmes
partagés (XL)
Terrasses de la Chaudière
4th Floor, 10 Wellington Street
4th étage, 10, rue Wellington
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Processing Software Solution	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 24062-180627/D	Amendment No. - N° modif. 005
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 24062-180627	Date 2020-08-10
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$XL-138-38306	
File No. - N° de dossier 138xl.24062-180627	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2020-09-28	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
F.O.B. - F.A.B.	
Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Weinberger, Beth	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 138xl
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 576-5319 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (000) 000-0000
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

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation 24062-180627/A	Amd. No – N° de la modif. 005	Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur 138XL
Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client 24062-180627	File No. – N° du dossier	CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

Solicitation Amendment 005 is raised to: (1) extend the bid solicitation closing period; and (2) answer questions from the Industry.

PART 1:

The Closing Date of the Bid Solicitation is hereby EXTENDED from September 10th 2020 at 2:00 PM EST to September 28th 2020 at 2:00 PM EST.

PART 2:

Question 13: The RFP outlines a request for an implementation plan, however Professional Services are identified as optional.

(a) Can Canada kindly elaborate on the expectation for professional services to configure the RPSS for the first department?

(b) Further, can Canada please confirm how it will be determined which of the four qualified vendors will implement the RPSS solution to the first department?

Answer 13:

(a) Each department will have the operational discretion to identify their professional service requirements; these services are optional. It is expected that the first department will rely on professional services from the contractor to provide both implementation and training services.

(b) Canada (the departments) will have the operational discretion to identify its requirements and the appropriate tier of functionality from which to source its requirements. For each tier and based on a client's requirements, Canada will initially contract with the top ranked contractor. Once the top ranked contractors in each tier are issued contracts, it will be at the discretion of other departments to onboard on these contracts or contract with the 2nd ranked contractors (where available). Once all contractors in each tier have a contract in place, all other departmental requirements will be onboarded to anyone of the contracts at Canada's discretion and in consideration of Canada's operational requirements.

Question 14: It is expected that each of the potential 265 departments that may use RPSS will have unique configuration requirements and business processes. Can Canada kindly elaborate on the expectation of the contractor to configure unique business process workflows and other software configuration for each subsequent department.

Answer 14:

It is not expected of the contractor to configure unique business processes, workflows and other configurations as this will be done through Software Administrators (power users) that will have been trained by the contractor to process these configurations. First line support may however be required from the contractor to guide the institutions in processing these configurations.

Question 15:

Can Canada please confirm how future departments will be eligible to select an RPSS from either the Tier 1 group or the Tier 2 group of solution providers? Further, can Canada please confirm how a department will select between two vendors in the respective tiers?

Answer 15:

A bilingual response is forthcoming. Another Solicitation Amendment will be posted.

Question 16: In reference to:

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation 24062-180627/A	Amd. No – N° de la modif. 005	Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur 138XL
Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client 24062-180627	File No. – N° du dossier	CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

- ANNEX A – Section 7.3.1, vii, b), iii "Integration with the GC ATIP Online Request Service (AORS) web tool"
- ANNEX A – Section 7.6 "INTEGRATION WITH THE GC ATIP ONLINE REQUEST SERVICE (AORS)"
- Mandatory requirements: M4, M17, M34
- Rated requirements: R2, R14

As stated in the different RFP sections and requirements referenced, we understand integration to GC AORS system, both for transferring the intake of ATIP requests and for publication of ATIP response packages, is critical to the GC ATIP process. In order for the Contractor to evaluate the integration methodology and efforts required, can you provide a more comprehensive and detailed description of the AORS system, including system's architecture, data reference models, technologies used for storage of requests, security mechanisms used, access methods and/or APIs available, ... ?

Answer 16:

A bilingual response is forthcoming. Another Solicitation Amendment will be posted.

Question 17: In reference to: Mandatory requirement: M3

Can you provide a yearly volumetric of ATIP requests, overall and per departments (for the 265 institutions), on each type of ATIP requests per intake channels (AORS, fax, paper, email, or any other methods) with a ratio comparing each incoming channel?

Answer 17:

The vendors question is in reference to M3 which states that *the RPSS must allow a User to intake and capture all request related information independent of the method of request submission (i.e. paper form or electronic delivery)*. In other words, institutions must be able to capture all request related information into the proposed solution. The method of request submission could actually be stricken through for the requirement statement. For now, simply stated is that the proposed product must work for all institutions, small medium and large, regardless of volumes and regardless of ratios.

Question 18: In reference to: Mandatory requirement: M10

The mandatory requirement states that "*The RPSS must preserve and dispose of information in accordance with the GC Directive on Record Keeping (link provided for in Section 12 - Reference Documents of this Annex A)*". The link provided in Section 12 of Annexe A (page 57 of 154) for "GC Directive on Record Keeping" (<https://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=16552>) points to document in an archived state (2020-03-31) and mentioning that "*The Directive on Record keeping is no longer in effect.*"

(a) Please advise on how to interpret this requirement based on a directive that is no more in effect?

(b) Should it be removed from the Mandatory requirements list?

Answer 18:

The GC Directive on Recordkeeping has been replaced by the GC Directive on Service and Digital (<https://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=32601>).

Question 19: In reference to: Mandatory requirement: M17

The mandatory requirement states that "*The RPSS must have the functionality to respond to a request for access to government records or personal information with: 2- the option of securely exporting these packages in reusable digital format (.pdf, other); and*". Can you specifically define what other types of reusable digital format the bidder must have to support to be declared compliant to this Mandatory requirement?

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation 24062-180627/A	Amd. No – N° de la modif. 005	Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur 138XL
Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client 24062-180627	File No. – N° du dossier	CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

Answer 19:

Other than PDF file format, the GC is looking for the bidder to demonstrate what other reusable formats they may use to export digital documents.

Question 20: In reference to: Mandatory requirement: M35

The mandatory requirement states that "The RPSS must comply with must comply with the Mandatory Procedures for Enterprise Architecture Assessment, found in Appendix C of the Directive on the Management of IT (<https://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=15249>). The referenced link points to document in an archived state (2020-03-31) and mentioning that "The Directive on Management of Information Technology is no longer in effect." Please advise on how to interpret this requirement based on a directive that is no more in effect? Should it be removed from the Mandatory requirements list?

Answer 20:

The Directive on Management of Information Technology has been archived however the information pertaining to the Enterprise Architecture Assessment can be found through the following link: https://wiki.gccollab.ca/GC_Enterprise_Architecture/Framework

Question 21: In reference to:

- Mandatory requirement: M38
- ANNEX A – Section 6.1 "Server"
- Solicitation Amendment 001 – updated Section 6.1 "Server"

The mandatory requirement M38 asks for the solution to "operate on standard server components and specifications as detailed in Section 6 - Current State of Annex A". Per description found in section 6.1, could you clarify what type of processors (and how many cores total), would the referenced operational servers runs on (similar to specification found in section 6.2 for Desktop/ Laptop)?

Answer 21:

A bilingual response is forthcoming. Another Solicitation Amendment will be posted.

Question 22: In reference to:

- Mandatory requirement: M39
- ANNEX A – Section 6.1 "Server"
- ANNEX A – Section 6.2 "Desktop / Laptop"
- ANNEX A – Section 6.3 "Tablets"

The mandatory requirement M39 asks for the solution to "operate on standard desktop, laptop and tablet components and specifications as detailed in Section 6 - Current State of Annex A". Per description found in section 2.1, we understand the solution must "utilize innovative web technologies for integrated and cost-effective solution", hence should be accessed by web browsers. The information provided in section 6.1 states the web browsers support from a "server perspective", not considering the bidder's solution.

Could you clarify what type of web browsers will be used specifically on GC's Desktops / Laptop (section 6.2) for Windows 7 & above (and per OS version please, as it could be different), and on Tablets (section 6.3) for Android, Windows 10 & iOS (for each tablet OS types and versions) to evaluate our solution compliance with GC's "web clients" (sections 6.2 & 6.3)?

Answer 22:

The web browsers commonly used within the GC are listed in section 6. as being:

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation 24062-180627/A	Amd. No – N° de la modif. 005	Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur 138XL
Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client 24062-180627	File No. – N° du dossier	CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

- Internet Explorer (IE) 11 or higher, and Edge;
- Firefox version 60 or above;
- Chrome version 48 or above

Each institution may my running one or a combination of these browsers on their desktop, laptop or tablets.

Question 23: In reference to: Mandatory requirement: M43

The mandatory requirement states that "The RPSS must support controlled access (2 form user authentication)".

(a) If the bidder proposed solution can interact with this type of controlled access method, could you confirm that the GC will provide the 2 form user authentication platform?

(b) If so, provide detailed information on the technology used for the 2 form user authentication and the available integration methods that would be available?

Answer 23:

The GC wants to know if the proposed solution will allow users to have a separate login other than the one for the device/network. If so what type of authentication will be required, i.e. username& password, application authentication, token authentication, etc.

Question 24: In reference to: Mandatory requirement: M44

The mandatory requirement states that "The RPSS must have the functionality to create, modify and deactivate user accounts. These accounts are to be created and assigned access rights and privileges by select Users with applicable rights". It is our understanding per the RFP that the preferred user accounts repository is an LDAP repository.

(a) Can you confirm if the GC will provide a corporate LDAP repository as the user accounts repository for authentication and authorization?

(b) If so, will there be a single LDAP (or a single federated LDAP) for all GC institutions (265)?

Answer 24:

(a) Yes the GC can provide a corporate LDAP repository as the user account repository for authentication and authorization.

(b) Many large and medium institutions have a single federated LDAP managed through Shared Services Canada but a majority of institutions manage their own repositories.

Question 25: In reference to: Mandatory requirement: M45

The mandatory requirement states that "The RPSS must support controlled access (2 form user authentication)".

(a) If the bidder proposed solution can interact with this type of controlled access method, could you confirm that the GC will provide the 2 form user authentication platform?

(b) If so, provide detailed information on the technology used for the 2 form user authentication and the available integration methods that would be available?

Answer 25:

Same as Q23.

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation 24062-180627/A	Amd. No – N° de la modif. 005	Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur 138XL
Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client 24062-180627	File No. – N° du dossier	CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

Question 26: In reference to: Mandatory requirement: M49

The mandatory requirement states that "The RPSS must have the functionality to intake and capture all request related information with the flexibility to add, edit or remove request related fields as needed."

(a) Can you clarify which intake/capture channel(s) should be considered here: AORS, email, fax, courrier, paper, others (please specify)?

(b) Can you also clarify what is the data reference model and define which fields would be considered "Required" vs "Optional" in that model, hence not available to delete from an ATIP request?

Answer 26:

- (a) In order to process requests, institutions require *requester* and *request related* information. This basic information may vary from one institution to the other, thus the proposed solution must enable the institution to add, edit or remove data elements in order to capture this information regardless of the channel.
- (b) Based on the request form templates provided within the RFP (APPENDIX C TO ANNEX G – REQUEST FORMS), the required information shown would be considered "Required" hence not available to delete. However, rated requirement R37 seeks for the RPSS to have the functionality to manage information by sorting what is required and what is optional when capturing information within the RPSS.

Question 27: In reference to: Mandatory requirement: M51

The mandatory requirement states that "The RPSS must have the functionality to auto-generate new requests using information from an existing request." Can you clarify which fields (mandatory, optional or others) of the ATIP request data reference model should be minimally transferred into a new auto-generated request from an existing one?

Answer 27:

The RPSS would require the user to create a new request by transferring the "Requester" information as well as the details of the request. It is then up to the institution to modify the new request in accordance with what is needed.

Question 28: In reference to:

- Mandatory requirement: M57
- Rated requirements: R53, R86, R87, R88, R89
- ANNEX D - DEFINITIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS

In the references mandatory and rated requirements, you refers to the term "**sever**", mostly in "search & **sever**". For each of the referenced requirements, can you clarify how this term is defined contextually, by providing a clear and detailed definition and description, as not found in "ANNEX D - DEFINITIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS"?

Answer 28:

In the context of the RFP, the term "sever" applies to digital records and means the process of removing content and adding exemptions and / or exclusions to a record.

Question 29: In reference to:

- Mandatory requirement: M61
- ANNEX A – Section 1.0, Overview

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation 24062-180627/A	Amd. No – N° de la modif. 005	Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur 138XL
Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client 24062-180627	File No. – N° du dossier	CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

(a) Should we understand by this requirement that a department running a solution from Contractor #1 would be asked to collaborate with **a totally different solution** from Contractor #2, in the "up to 2 contracts per Tier of functionality (Tier I and Tier II)" statement found in Section 1.0?

(b) If so, please provide detailed clarifications on how what is the expectations of this collaboration process?

(c) How easy would that be possible to have **up to four** (2 per Tiers) totally different solutions and facilitate collaboration in an enterprise context across all the GC institutions?

Answer 29:

If Institution A is licensed with a RPSS from Contractor #1 and Institution B is licensed with a RPSS from Contractor #2 then both RPSSs should have the functionality to export software consultation packages from their software that can then be put in a shared repository where both institutions can review the documents. Upon the completion of the revision the consulted documents can then be re-imported into the RPSS.

Question 30: In reference to: Mandatory requirement: M63

This mandatory requirements ask that "The RPSS must have Optical Character Recognition(OCR) functionality for quick and reliable searches within the digital records ..".

(a) Can you confirm you are here referring to the non-textual GC records captured and stored within the ATIP RPSS solution to support the ATIP request and produced the ATIP answer package?

(b) If not, please provide clarify around this requirements?

Answer 30:

When importing digital records into the RPSS the proposed solution must be able to perform the OCR functionality in order for the users to locate information contained within the records.

Question 31: In reference to: Mandatory requirement: M71

Can you provide detailed clarity on the term "merge codes" used in this requirements, as not found in "ANNEX D - DEFINITIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS"?

Answer 31:

The term is defined within the requirement. "Merge codes" are also referenced as **bookmarks**. These are merge fields that you insert into your templates in locations where you want information from your software database to appear. A "Merge field" is a field you can put in a letter template, an email template, custom link, or formula to incorporate values from a record. For example, you can place a **merge field** in an email template so that the greeting includes the recipient's name rather than a generic "Hello!"

Question 32: In reference to: Rated requirement: R24

This rated requirement states a rating scale of either 20, 14 or 0 points, but the maximum points is identified as 10 points. Can you clarify or correct the rating scale inconsistency or the maximum points to be allowed?

Answer 32:

The ratings should read Outstanding = 10 pts, Satisfactory = 7 pts, Unsatisfactory = 0 and Max Points remains at 10.

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation 24062-180627/A	Amd. No – N° de la modif. 005	Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur 138XL
Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client 24062-180627	File No. – N° du dossier	CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

Question 33: In reference to: Rated requirement: R25

This rated requirement states a rating scale of either 10, 7 or 0 points, but the maximum points is identified as 20 points. Can you clarify or correct the rating scale inconsistency or the maximum points to be allowed?

Answer 33:

The ratings should read Outstanding = 20 pts, Satisfactory = 14 pts, Unsatisfactory = 0 and Max Points remains at 20

Question 34: In reference to: Rated requirement: R26

This rated requirement states a rating scale of either 10, 14 or 0 points, but the maximum points is identified as 10 points. Can you clarify or correct the rating scale inconsistency or the maximum points to be allowed?

Answer 34:

The vendor meant to reference R56 and not R26. The ratings should read Outstanding = 10 pts, Satisfactory = 7 pts, Unsatisfactory = 0 and Max Points remains at 10.

Question 35: In reference to: Rated requirement: R5

This rated requirement states that "The RPSS should have the functionality to assign sequential request numbers based on a configurable file numbering scheme with alpha-numeral values that can support 15 digit numbers (e.g. examples; A-2019-0000001, AI-2019-0000001)"

(a) Can you clarify if the file numbering scheme be exactly 15 characters or up to 15 characters, as the first sample provided is only 14 characters?

(b) Can we assume an institution or department using the ATIP RPSS will use **only a single** file numbering scheme, or could a single institution use multiple schemes?

Answer 35:

(a) The file numbering scheme should be up to 15 characters

(b) Institutions will only be using single file numbering scheme. Institutions will be identifying the requests types based on the numbering scheme, for example an informal access request would be numbered AI-2020-0000001, and a formal access request would be numbered A-2020-0000001.

Question 36: In reference to: Rated requirement: R16

Can you clarify if you request the proposed solution needs to support any additional 3rd party imaging technology than the one(s) within the supplier's proposal?

Answer 36:

In order to meet this requirement, the proposed solution will incorporate scanning capabilities that will allow the user to scan directly into the redacting component of the proposed RPSS. If the supplier's proposal includes imaging capabilities, then this requirement will be met.

Question 37: In reference to: Rated requirement: R38

Could you provide the specific fields, supporting tailored lists of selections values, would need to comply to this rated requirement?

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation 24062-180627/A	Amd. No – N° de la modif. 005	Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur 138XL
Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client 24062-180627	File No. – N° du dossier	CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

Answer 37:

The GC has no lists of fields to provide in reference to this requirement. What it seeks is for the RPSS to have the functionality to configure lists of selections tailored for a group of Users or Business Units (BU).

Question 38: In reference to: Rated requirement: R65

This rated requirement states that "The RPSS should have the functionality to create new Complaints based on information received in Extensible Markup Language (.XML)". Can you provide definition, and samples, of XML-specific format(s) to be supported by this requirement?

Answer 38:

Extensible Markup Language is a markup language that defines a set of rules for encoding documents in a format that is both human-readable and machine-readable. For now Complaints are forwarded to institutions by either the Office of the Privacy Commissioner or the Office of the Information Commissioner by email. The intention is for these offices to be able to transfer Complaints via XML such that the RPSS can integrate these for processing. The GC does not have any sample nor XML-specific formats to provide.

Question 39: In reference to: Rated requirement: R76

This rated requirement states that "The RPSS should have the functionality to query other GC records/collections management tools to retrieve (order) the request related records". Can you provide a detailed list of those other targeted GC records/collections management tools, including detailed integration's specifications and methods for each of them?

Answer 39:

Section 11, Optional Requirements indicates examples of tools which the RPSS should integrate with. Tools such as GCDocs and Sharepoint. Each institution may call upon the Contractor through a Professional Services TA to request the RPSS integration with their respective repositories in order to retrieve documents.

Question 40: In reference to: Rated requirement: R77

This rated requirement states that "The RPSS should have the ability to migrate information from the various ATIP software currently being used by GC institutions to the RPSS. Data migration from legacy ATIP systems must include both database content and File System based content". We would assume here that the detailed analysis phase was previously completed when looking at migrating multiple ATIP systems/tools into target system(s) supported by this RFP.

(a) Can you provide a list of all existing ATIP systems/tools, including a detailed definition of those systems, from reference data schemas to integration's specifications and methods?

(b) Can you also shared the detailed target reference data models, for each entities supported by the target solution to be implemented?

Answer 40:

This requirement applies to a Contractor that has already deployed earlier versions of their product. The GC does not expect Contractor #1 to migrate data from a product delivered by a different vendor. This is why it is a rated requirement.

Question 41: In reference to: Rated requirement: R85

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation 24062-180627/A	Amd. No – N° de la modif. 005	Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur 138XL
Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client 24062-180627	File No. – N° du dossier	CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

In order for the Contractor to evaluate efforts and deployment scope, can you provide an idea of number of different GC forms to be scanned and supported by this rated requirement?

Answer 41:

APPENDIX C TO ANNEX G – REQUEST FORMS illustrates 2 examples of standard forms that could be scanned and data transferred into the RPSS.

Question 42: In reference to:

- Rated requirement: R68
- Mandatory requirements: M32, R39, R54, M6, M18, M27, M7, M26, M30, M66, R87, M9, M72, M28, M39, ...

In order to ensure that specific field's value entrie(s) are not deleted when they are referenced elsewhere in other functions, can you clarify if any type of data integrity validation should be considered and delivered related to the different "Delete" processes reference above, like:

- Activities/Actions, Activities/Action Groups
- Request types
- Contacts
- Correction Types
- Countries / Provinces / States / Territories/ Regions
- Currencies
- Fee Types
- Methods of Payment
- Complaint Findings
- Holidays
- Keywords
- Methods of Access
- Methods of Delivery
- Complaint Reasons
- Complaint Results
- Requester Sources
- Business Units/ Business Types
- Translation Types
- ... or any others fields with similar requirements in the RFP

If so, please specify every integrity validations to comply to for each of those fields?

Answer 42:

The proposed solution must allow for the definition of values defined in the listed fields/tables. The defined values must be retained as long as it is in use. The system should allow for the deletion of unused values.

Question 43: In reference to:

- Solicitation Amendment 001 – updated Section 6.1 "Server"
- ANNEX A – Section 6.1 "Server"

In comparison with the original table 6.1, we noticed:

(a) that 2 lines were added under section "4. Exchange Server:", hence:

- Oracle Database 11g version 11.2 and higher; or
- PostgreSQL v10 and higher.

Solicitation No. – N° de l'invitation 24062-180627/A	Amd. No – N° de la modif. 005	Buyer ID – Id de l'acheteur 138XL
Client Ref. No. – N° de réf. De client 24062-180627	File No. – N° du dossier	CCC No./ N° CCC – FMS No/ N° VME

Should those additions not be under section "3. Relational Database Management System (RDBMS)" instead?

(b) that there is a dual reference to Microsoft Exchange, under section "4. Exchange Server" (as being Microsoft Exchange Server 2013 or higher" and under section "9. Electronic Mail" (as being Microsoft Exchange 2016 or above with Outlook 2013 or above". Can you clarify this inconsistency and specify which specific version of Microsoft Exchange should be considered for integration of the proposed RPSS?

Answer 43:

- (a) The vendor is correct. The RFP will be amended accordingly
- (b) The requirement for point 9 of section 6.1 should read:

Electronic Mail: • Microsoft Exchange 2013 or above with Outlook 2013 or above; and

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.