



**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**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL  
DEMANDE DE PROPOSITION**

**Proposal To: Public Works and Government  
Services Canada**

We hereby offer to sell to Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada, in accordance with the terms and conditions set out herein, referred to herein or attached hereto, the goods, services, and construction listed herein and on any attached sheets at the price(s) set out therefor.

**Proposition aux: Travaux Publics et Services  
Gouvernementaux Canada**

Nous offrons par la présente de vendre à Sa Majesté la Reine du chef du Canada, aux conditions énoncées ou incluses par référence dans la présente et aux annexes ci-jointes, les biens, services et construction énumérés ici sur toute feuille ci-annexée, au(x) prix indiqué(s).

**Comments - Commentaires**

<b>Title - Sujet</b> SBIPS TGMS	
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> 2K001-239347/A	<b>Date</b> 2022-11-02
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> 19347	
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b>	
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 384zm.2K001-239347	<b>CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME</b>
<b>Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin</b> <b>at - à 02:00 PM</b> Eastern Standard Time EST <b>on - le 2022-12-09</b> Heure Normale du l'Est HNE	
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b> <b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Beaudoin, Michael	<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 384zm
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (613) 859-0841 ( )	<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> ( ) -
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>  Specified Herein Précisé dans les présentes	

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

**Vendor/Firm Name and Address**

**Raison sociale et adresse du**

**fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur**

**Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution**

Informatics Professional Services Division / Division des services professionnels en informatique

Les Terrasses de la Chaudière

10, rue Wellington, 4ième

étage/Floor

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b> See Herein – Voir ci-inclus	<b>Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée</b>
<b>Vendor/Firm Name and Address</b> <b>Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur</b>	
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> <b>Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur</b>	
<b>Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm</b> <b>(type or print)</b> <b>Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/</b> <b>de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

**SOLICITATION AMENDMENT 004**

**This amendment is raised to:**

- 1) **Modify the Evaluation Criteria**
- 2) **Include questions and answers raised by the Industry.**

- 
- 
- 1) **At Page 428, Solution Proposal Rated Criteria**

**Delete R-1.7 in it's Entirety And Replace with the Following:**

<b>R-1.7</b>	<b><u>Project Security – Security Policy</u></b> The Bidder should demonstrate their proposed Security Architecture, which includes:  1. The requirement that only resources who have the security clearance to perform a task are authorized to access protected information, assets or site(s). 2. The requirement to ensure that the security policy is applied throughout the entire Bidder’s Team including all subcontractors. 3. The use of encryption at rest and in transit for all data. 4. The proposed security layers to segregate data, applications, and access in accordance with the SoW Appendix H section 1. Security/Privacy Requirements  <b>The security policy of subcontracted organizations will not be accepted for evaluation purposes in response to this criterion.</b>	Points will be awarded in the following manner:  <b>10 pts</b> = Response has addressed all requirements in points 1 through 4 and has tailored its response to the TGMS Project  <b>8 pts</b> = Response has addressed the requirements of points 1 through 4, but has not tailored its response to the TGMS Project  <b>4 pts</b> = Response partially addresses 3 of the 4 points  <b>0 pts</b> = Response addresses fewer than 3 of the points	
--------------	--	--	--

---

---

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

**Question 24**

On Page 419 for M3 – Software Publisher(s) Authorizations, required the proponent to demonstrate compliance by completing either the “Software Publisher Certification Form” or the Software Publisher Authorization Form”. As these forms were not included in the subsequent RFP in Appendix A or B as previously listed. The proponent is asking either that Canada provide a copy of the corresponding forms in order to meet this mandatory requirement, or that this requirement be stricken from the list of mandatories.

**Answer:** Canada has reviewed your question, please refer to the response to Question 13

**Question 25**

R1.7 scoring on Page 423 shows that R1.7 Project Security – Security Policy is worth 10 points, but the grading scale shown on Page 428 only shows a scale with a maximum of 5pts.

Can Canada please clarify the scoring method for R1.7 to show how proponents can maximize the score in this section, or if points need to be revised to suit the scale already given?

**Answer:** Canada has reviewed your request and is making changes to the Technical Evaluation Criteria in order to clarify.

**Question 26**

On page 14 of the RFP, Section I: Technical Bid 3.2.iv Previous Similar Projects states that “A project will be considered "similar" to the Work to be performed under any resulting contract if the project was for the performance of work that closely matches the descriptions of the Resource Categories identified in Annex A” and “For work experience to be considered by Canada, the technical bid must not simply indicate the title of the individual's position, but must demonstrate that the resource has the required work experience by explaining the responsibilities and work performed by the individual while in that position. Only listing experience without providing any supporting data to describe responsibilities, duties and relevance to the requirement, or reusing the same wording as the qualification requirements, will not be considered "demonstrated" for the purposes of the assessment. The Contractor should provide complete details as to where, when, month and year, and how, through which activities/responsibilities, the stated qualifications/experience were obtained. In situations in which a proposed resource worked at the same time on more than one project, the duration of any overlapping time period will be counted only once toward any requirements that relate to the individual's length of experience.”

Since no technical resources are proposed or evaluated as part of the technical evaluation will Canada amend this section to remove these two requirements for Previous similar projects?

**Answer:** Canada has reviewed your request but has decided to maintain the current wording. This requirement remains unchanged.

**Question 27**

In Annex A – Statement of work, Appendix J: TGMS Conceptual Application Architecture, on page 364 lists, the GMS application component provides TGMS users with the functionality to “ manage the governance and approval processes for the Funding Structure & Opportunities Management processes, including online requests for approval and electronic signature-enabled approvals. “ Is there a preferred electronic signature partner that the solution must integrate with? (DocuSign, Adobe etc) related to this requirement?

**Answer:** Canada has reviewed your question, and we have not established a preferred electronic signature partner.

### Question 28

In Annex A – Statement of work, Appendix J: TGMS Conceptual Application Architecture, on page 374 lists that “In the course of conducting TGMS-related business processes, documents from specific business transactions are forwarded to the DRMS (using the Integration Platform), which:

- provides online accessibility and comprehensive search facilities, using audit trails and **policy-based security** to reduce risk; “

And also on page 374,

The DRMS interacts with the other TGMS application components through the Integration Platform:

- new documents, received or created by TGMS business processes, are forwarded to the DRMS from other TGMS application components using the Integration Platform. The DRMS categorizes, indexes and stores new documents based on their accompanying metadata, and applies the **appropriate document management rules**;

For implementing 'policy based security and 'appropriate document management rules', should the solution replicate D365 security roles/privileges to SharePoint online or the SharePoint security model will be managed separately (outside of D365)“?

**Answer:** Thank you for your question. Canada does not have a requirement for the management of security roles/privileges to be separate between SharePoint Online and D365 in the implementation of TGMS.

### Question 29

In Attachment 4.2 Pricing Schedule (p. 438), "Table 1 Licensed Software" asks Bidders to provide firm prices for “perpetual” enterprise licenses. Given that Bidders are expected to provide access to Software as a Service (SaaS) solutions that are billed on a recurring rather than a perpetual basis, and that Bidders are to provide costs for three separate years, can the Crown confirm its definition of “perpetual”? Alternatively, could the Crown either remove the word “Perpetual” from this Table or broaden Enterprise License Cost to include “Annual” licensing?

**Answer:** Canada has reviewed your question. While Canada understands that some vendors bill using an annual licensing model, others charge a flat fee for perpetual access to their SaaS solution. As described within Attachment 4.2 Pricing Schedule, Canada expects vendors to provide their pricing for perpetual access (subscription without an expiration date) to their SaaS solution. As a result, no changes will be brought to Table 1. For further clarification of “perpetual license”, please refer to the RFP, Section 7.4(b) subpoint (ii) (Page 31).

### Question 30

In Attachment 4.2 Pricing Schedule (p. 438), "Table 1 Licensed Software" solely includes enterprise license costs for the initial three-year contract period and no such costs for the two additional option years. In contrast, "Table 2 Annual Maintenance and Software Support" includes only annual maintenance and software support fees for the two option years – and no such fees for the initial contract term. Can the Crown confirm that the intent of Table 2 is to represent the extension of “Table 1 costs” for the two optional years?

**Answer:** Canada has reviewed your question. Canada can confirm that Table 2 DOES NOT represent an extension of Table 1 costs for the two option years. Bug fixes and maintenance for the base SaaS software is expected to be covered by the license costs in Table 1 for the contract period. However, the maintenance and software support cost referenced in Table 2 would cover support beyond that period for service to modify and continuously update the software licensed through Table 1 to reflect additional features in the bidder's offering, eliminate errors, malfunctions, to improve work efficiency and better

system performance, should Canada choose to exercise the option year (s). For further clarification of maintenance and support services for licensed software, please refer to the RFP, Section 7.4(b) subpoint (iii) (Page 31).

**ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME**