



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. 006
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 24062-180627	Date 2020-08-12
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. 006	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 006 is raised to answer questions from the Industry.

First, Canada will now provide a response to Question 15 from Solicitation Amendment 005:

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:

Canada (the GC institutions) 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 act in place, all other departmental requirements will be onboarded to any one of the contracts at Canada's discretion and in consideration of Canada's operational requirements.

Next set of new questions:

Question 44: Re: Page 11, Section 1.2.b Will the GC consider subscription based licensed software?

Answer 44:

Canada will not consider subscription-based licenses.

Question 45: Re: Page 19, Section 3.2.a If a Bidder is responding to both tiers, can the Bidder submit one bid and indicate both tiers?

Answer 45:

The requirement is that a Bidder can submit a bid per tier of functionality and that the bid clearly indicates which tier(s) of functionality its bidding on. There are no issues with responding to both tiers in one bid as long as it is clearly indicated in the bid submission and that the pricing for each Tier is also clearly identified

Question 46: As the RFP does not appear to contain any requirements for hosting of the solution, can Canada therefore confirm that there is no requirement to provide costing around hosting at bid response time, and that this will be requested by Canada at a later date, via the Task Authorization process for example, with the winning contractor(s)?

Answer 46:

Hosting of the solution is not a requirement of this RFP.

Question 47: Regarding rated requirement R6, the Satisfactory score shows "5 7 pts". Could Canada please clarify if it should state 5 pts or 7 pts?

Answer 47:

At Annex G, Part 2.1, Table 3:

Delete R6 in its entirety. Replace with the following:

Solicitation No. – N° de l’invitation 24062-180627/A	Amd. No – N° de la modif. 006	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

R6	<p>The RPSS should have screen interfaces and navigation that allows Users to easily navigate through the software pages and data fields with good aesthetic conditions, without incurring screen or field navigation errors.</p> <p>The rating scale (defined in Annex D – Definitions and Interpretations) will be as follows: Outstanding = 10 pts Satisfactory = 7 pts Unsatisfactory = 0</p>	Max Points: 10	
----	--	-------------------	--

Question 48: Regarding rated requirement R24, the Max Points is showing as “10”; however, the rating scale shows 20 pts for Outstanding. Could Canada please clarify the scoring points for R24?

Answer 48:

As per the response provided to Question 32 of Solicitation Amendment 005, the ratings should read Outstanding = 10 pts, Satisfactory = 7 pts, Unsatisfactory = 0 and Max Points remains at 10.

Question 49: Regarding rated requirement R25, the Max Points is showing as “20”; however, the rating scale shows 10 pts for Outstanding. Could Canada please clarify the scoring points for R25?

Answer 49:

As per the response provided to Question 33 of Solicitation Amendment 005, the ratings should read Outstanding = 10 pts, Satisfactory = 7 pts, Unsatisfactory = 0 and Max Points remains at 10. The ratings should read Outstanding = 20 pts, Satisfactory = 14 pts, Unsatisfactory = 0 and Max Points remains at 20.

Question 50: Regarding rated requirement R56, the Max points shows “10”; however, the rating for Satisfactory shows 14 pts. Could Canada please clarify the scoring points for Satisfactory?

Answer 50:

As per the response provided to Question 34 of Solicitation Amendment 005, the ratings should read Outstanding = 10 pts, Satisfactory = 7 pts, Unsatisfactory = 0 and Max Points remains at 10.

Question 51: Regarding rated requirement R80, the Max points shows “10”; however, the Pass score is 5 pts. Could Canada please clarify the scoring points for R80?

Answer 51:

At Annex G, Part 2.2, Table 4:

Delete R80 in its entirety. Replace with the following:

R80	<p>The RPSS should have the functionality to securely transfer data and synchronize information (request tracking data, contact data, response content, redaction processing statistics, etc.) between different security level environments (e.g., from Secret to Protected).</p> <p>The rating scale (defined in Annex D – Definitions and Interpretations) will be as follows:</p>	Max Points: 10	
-----	---	-------------------	--

Solicitation No. – N° de l’invitation 24062-180627/A	Amd. No – N° de la modif. 006	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

	Outstanding = 10 pts Satisfactory = 7 pts Unsatisfactory = 0	
--	--	--

Question 52: Regarding the “Passing Mark” in the table at the end of all the rated requirement titled “Overall Tier II Rated Criteria Score”, the Passing Mark is identified at 60%; however, the score shown in the grey cell is “595/850” which represents 70%. Could Canada please clarify the correct the Passing Mark?

Answer 52:

Delete last table at the end of all the rated requirements titled “Overall Tier II Rated Criteria Score” in its entirety.

Replace with the following:

TOTAL SCORE	Total / 550 Points	
Table 5: Overall Tiers I and II Rated Criteria Score		
	Max Score	Score
Tier I	300	
Tier II	550	
Total	/850	
Passing Mark (60%)	510/850	
Responsive	Yes _____ No _____	

Question 53: We notice at page 84 - *item B) Bid submissions must address which Tier its bid is for, and must address all criteria identified in Annex F with complete supporting detail.* - but the Annex F is a Task Authorization form. Can you clarify if this is just a typo?

Answer 53: Delete reference to “Annex F” and replace with “Annex G”.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME.