



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -
TPSGC

11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier

Place du Portage, Phase III

Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2

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

Business Management and Consulting Services Division
/ Division des services de gestion des affaires et de
consultation

Terrasses de la Chaudière 5th Floor

Terrasses de la Chaudière 5e étage

10 Wellington Street

10, rue Wellington

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet Assessing Security Threats to GoC Assessing Security Threats to Government of Canada Personnel	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 08893-200492/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 20200492	Date 2021-12-10
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$ZG-420-40122	
File No. - N° de dossier 420zg.08893-200492	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM Eastern Standard Time EST on - le 2021-12-13 Heure Normale de l'Est HNE	
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: Higgins(420zg), Conner	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 420zg
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (873) 354-7158 ()	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

Solicitation Amendment # 003 is raised to:

1. Respond to the following questions from the industry:

The Contract is amended as follows:

- 1.

Question	Answer
Question 1: Table 1, Question 2 states "Is there the capability to support some of or all of the geographical locations listed in the SOW, and if so can your company provide reports on specific individuals or companies in that location?" What does the last part of that question mean ... "can your company provide reports on specific individuals or companies in that location"?	Response 1 (EN): Potential bidders will not only need to provide threat assessment but also due diligence reports as mentioned in the SOW Section 4. "Request Type 3" which states "The contractor must produce reports on a governmental or non-governmental organization, commercial entity, individual or an identified combination thereof to support due diligence" *Please mention to whomever asked the question that this question was since amended to "can your company provide reports on specific individuals or organizations in that location"? Réponse 1 (FR): Les soumissionnaires potentiels devront non seulement fournir une évaluation des menaces, mais aussi des rapports de diligence raisonnable, comme mentionné dans l'énoncé des travaux, section 4. "Type de demande 3" qui stipule "Le contractant doit produire des rapports sur une organisation gouvernementale ou non gouvernementale, une entité commerciale, un particulier ou une combinaison de ceux-ci afin d'appuyer un processus de diligence raisonnable". *Veuillez mentionner à la personne qui a posé la question que cette question a depuis été modifiée en " peut-il fournir des rapports sur des personnes ou des organisations précises à ces endroits? " ?
Question 2: Under M3: Volume of Report Experience it says, ... with the remaining certified by the bidder. Please define 'certified'.	Response 2 (EN): M3 requires that the client who received the service acknowledge receipt of 20 of the 50 assessments (redactions accepted); the bidder must attest in good faith to the other 30. Submitting the full information required for M3 will be taken as certification by the bidder for the remaining 30 assessments. Réponse 2 (FR): O3 exige que le client qui a reçu le service en reconnaisse la réception de 20 des 50 évaluations (expurgations acceptées) ; le soumissionnaire doit attester de bonne foi des

	<p>30 autres. La soumission de l'ensemble des informations requises pour O3 sera considérée comme une certification par le soumissionnaire pour les 30 autres évaluations.</p>
<p>Question 3: Table 1, Question 1 states "What types of Threat Analysis and Assessments is provided by the respondent?" What is GAC's definition of Threat Analysis versus Threat Assessments?</p>	<p>Response 3 (EN): GAC lists threat analysis and assessment as two separate entities in the RFI (Table 1, Q1) not to restrict potential bidders from listing the services that they provide. GAC does not profoundly differentiate between the two terms since both analysis and assessment should be concurrent in all excellent threat products. Analysis is objectively synthesizing reporting and thinking, drawing from multiple sources, to corroborate information and identify patterns and trends. Assessment is client focused, and is the strategic evaluation of threat analysis (e.g., to draw conclusions, evaluate the relative improvement or worsening of conditions). Analysis is seen as providing the 'who', 'what', 'where', 'when' and 'why', and assessments turn analysis into the "so what" and "how does it impact me".</p> <p>Réponse 3 (FR): AMC liste l'analyse et l'évaluation des menaces comme deux entités distinctes dans la DDR (Tableau 1, Q1) pour ne pas restreindre les soumissionnaires potentiels à énumérer les services qu'ils fournissent. AMC ne fait pas de distinction profonde entre les deux termes puisque l'analyse et l'évaluation devraient être simultanées dans tous les excellents produits de menace. L'analyse consiste à synthétiser objectivement les rapports et les réflexions, en utilisant multiples sources, pour corroborer l'information et identifier des modes et des tendances. L'évaluation est axée sur le client et constitue l'évaluation stratégique de l'analyse de la menace (par exemple, pour tirer des conclusions, évaluer l'amélioration ou la détérioration relative des conditions). L'analyse est considérée comme fournissant le "qui", le "quoi", le "où", le "quand" et le "pourquoi", tandis que les évaluations transforment l'analyse "comment cela m'affecte-t-il". .</p>

<p>Question 4: The request for client names and contracts for similar assignments is problematic especially if the clients are high profile individuals, or government agencies that prefer to keep their threat assessments, threat analysis and travel threat reporting confidential. There is no question that foreign government clients and IGO clients will not allow their name in a RFI document, or allow copies of contract signature pages, or a discussion of the services provided.</p> <p>Is there a work around for this requirement?</p> <p>It also asks for contract or projects where 'threat analysis' and 'threat assessments' are the main scope. There are very few contracts where 'threat analysis' and 'threat assessments' are the main scope. Threat assessments and analysis might be part of an Executive Protection Contract, or Corporate Security Contract, or Travel Risk Contract, but not a main scope. And the contracts where 'threat analysis' and 'threat assessments' are main scope are typically government and could not be shared.</p>	<p>Response 4 (EN): GAC recognizes that some products may need to be minimally redacted in order to preserve confidentiality. However, bidders are required to provide adequate evidence of their threat analysis and assessment record of accomplishment in order to be evaluated against the SOW.</p> <p>Réponse 4 (FR): AMC reconnaît que certains produits peuvent devoir être expurgés de façon minimale afin de préserver la confidentialité. Toutefois, les soumissionnaires sont tenus de fournir des preuves suffisantes de leurs réalisations en matière d'analyse et d'évaluation des menaces afin d'être évalués par rapport à l'EDT.</p>
<p>Question 5 (M3): M3 again asks for the name of the client and this would be a breach of any confidentiality agreement with a client, and as well, most clients would not want their name listed, or the regions that they are conducting intelligence analysis listed, or a copy of the agreement signature page provided, especially if the client is a government agency, or high profile individual.</p> <p>Question 6 (PR8): In this section the RFI requests 2 actual client approved and certified reports for each region. Once again this would be a breach of any confidentiality agreement with a client, and as well, most clients would not want their name listed, or the regions that they are conducting intelligence analysis listed, or a copy of the agreement signature page provided, or their confidential report provided to another entity, especially if the client is a government agency, or high profile individual.</p> <p>Is there a work around like a redacted report with the client's name removed, or some other work around?</p>	<p>Response 5/6 (EN): Regarding questions 4, 5 and 6: GAC is comfortable with the bidders using redactions to ensure they do not breach any pre-established confidentiality agreements. The bidder can choose what they deem acceptable in terms of quantity of redactions. However, GAC would still need to know the client general details (was the client a private entity, NGO, government, etc.) and redactions which impact our ability to assess the bidder's capabilities will obviously impact our assessment of their bid.</p> <p>Réponse 5/6 (FR): Concernant les questions 4, 5 et 6 : AMC est à l'aise avec le fait que les soumissionnaires utilisent des expurgations pour s'assurer qu'ils ne violent pas les ententes de confidentialité préétablies. Le soumissionnaire peut choisir ce qu'il juge acceptable en termes de quantité de rédactions. Cependant, AMC aura toujours besoin de connaître les détails généraux du client (s'agit-il d'une entité privée, d'une ONG, d'un gouvernement, etc.) et les rédactions qui ont un impact sur la manière dont nous pouvons évaluer les capacités du soumissionnaire auront évidemment un impact sur l'évaluation de son offre.</p>

Contract Number
08893-200492/001/XL

Amendment Number
003

Buyer ID
420zg

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME