

Request for Quotes (RFQ)

RQ220-2017-01 For Risk, Privacy and Security Consulting Services

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Please see the answers below regarding any questions raised in relation to this RFQ.

1. Question:

Can CPAC please clarify what privacy legislation it is subject to?

Answer:

The Partnership does not fall under any specific federal or provincial privacy legislation. The Partnership adopts the Canadian Standards Association (CSA) model for privacy that in broad terms reflects the 10 common principals of privacy found in most legislative standards.

2. Question:

Clarification to the ‘Scope of Services’ section in the RFQ, point number 1, where it reads “Asset with reviews of the policies, standards, procedures and tools included in the Partnership’s Privacy and Security Framework as required.”

Answer:

Point number 1 should read “Assist with reviews of the policies, standards, procedures and tools included in the Partnership’s Privacy and Security Framework as required.”

3. Question:

The following two questions will help inform our approach to sub-contracting for the engagement and the extent to which we focus on our core services.

- a. Will you accept proposals responding to some, but not all, of the services described in the Scope of Services on page 4 of the RFQ?
- b. Of the nine services listed on page 4, can you identify a subset for which you would expect the contractor to expend the most effort over the course of the contract?

Answer:

- a) Preference will be given to Proponents that can provide all the services listed.
- b) 2,3, 7 & 8 will expend the most effort over the Term.

4. Question:

MERX shows this as an electronic bidding RFQ, but the RFQ document states that paper copies of proposals are required. Will electronic bids via MERX be accepted?

Answer:

No. Electronic submissions will not be accepted through MERX. Please follow the submission instructions noted in the RFP. Five (5) hard copies are required.

5. Questions:

RE: Appendix C, Areas of Responsibility Table, the first column of the table requests a “Level of Experience”. What is CPAC expecting in terms of a response from vendors? A ranking of 1 to 5, a Low, Medium High? Can you please clarify?

Answer:

Number of Years’ Experience.

6. Question:

What is the legal status of the CPAC? (E.g. an incorporated not-for-profit organization?)

Answer:

Not-for-Profit organization

7. Question:

We have reviewed the CPAC website <http://www.partnershipagaincancer.ca/>, the Privacy and Security Framework Overview, including the Framework Figure (Exhibit A to the RFQ). In addition, we have accessed the Canadian Partnership for Tomorrow Project (CPTP) Portal, including the CPTP Access Policies and Procedures. The publicly available information does not appear to describe CPAC’s information holdings in a manner relevant for a privacy/security analysis. We would appreciate it if you could respond to the following question on this topic:

Can you please confirm CPAC’s information holdings?

- a) Does the organization have custody or control over personal health information (i.e. identifying or identifiable information related to patients)?
- b) Does CPAC have custody or control over de-identified patient personal health information?

Answer:

- a) No
- b) Yes

8. Question

Was an external Certification Authority employed for CPAC’s certification and accreditation or did CPAC self-certify?

Answer:
Self-certified.

9. Question:

Does CPAC operate its own datacentre facilities? If so, will CPAC be hosting and managing its 'hybrid cloud network architecture' in its datacentre facilities or will external vendors' facilities be used?

Answer:
The Partnership's datacenter is located at Cogeco Peer1. It's managed by its IT support vendor.

10. Question:

Who would have drafted the data sharing agreements to be reviewed? Would the successful Proponent be required to draft and negotiate data sharing agreements?

Answer:

The Partnership's data sharing agreement template was drafted by its legal counsel. The successful Proponent would review and advise on data sharing agreements, as directed by the Partnership.

11. Question:

Which auditing standards does CPAC employ (e.g. CSAE 3416, PCI DSS etc.)

Answer:

To develop the IM/IT Risk Based Audit Plan, the Partnership leveraged the Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) Global Technology Audit Guide (GTAG), developing the IT Audit Plan, as a framework.

12. Question:

Stage 1 refers to the compliance of a Proponent with all of the **mandatory requirements**. Where are the mandatory requirements set out in the RFQ document?

Answer:

Refer to page 8, Bid Content.

13. Question:

The RFQ Document states that: “Stage II **may** consist of scoring by the Partnership of each qualified Proponent on the basis of the rating criteria”. If Stage II does not consist of scoring by the Partnership of each qualified Proponent on the basis of the rating criteria, how will qualified Proponents be scored?

Answer:

Each submission will be scored in accordance with the rating criteria noted in the RFQ.

14. Question:

The RFQ Document provides: Upon completion of Stage II for all Proponents, the scoring of the pricing submitted. The evaluation of price **may** be undertaken after the evaluation of mandatory requirements (Stage 1) and any rated requirements (Stage II) has been completed.” Can you please clarify the meaning of the word “may”?

Answer:

The RFQ process, was not completed using a two envelope evaluation process, thus the pricing will be included in the submission and will be visible to all evaluators before the evaluation meeting. As such, the rating of the price may be completed before the rated requirements (Stage II). Pricing will only be evaluated for proponents that are qualified through the mandatory requirements (stage 1)

15. Question:

Does the CPAC have any criteria for the determination of “Level of Experience?”

Answer:

Refer to the response from Question #5. Proponents are asked to identify the “years of experience for each area of responsibility.

16. Question:

Several of the Areas of Responsibility are repeated. Can we assume that there are nine (9) of these as listed on p. 4 Scope of Services?

Answer:

Yes.

17. Question:

Appendix C – Would you provide details as to the meaning of “blended rate for professional fees”?

Answer:

The Partnership has requested an hourly rate for each area of responsibility. However, for most projects the suggested resources have different levels and skills, with different internal costs and hourly rates for their time. Rather than bill each of these resources individually at their respective rates, a blended rate is created which is the average hourly rate for that pool of resources – the blended rate. The blended rate will be used in this RFQ for comparison purposes. The hourly rates will be used within the contract.

18. Question:

Appendix C – Do you want our blended rate shown just before the table in Appendix C?

Answer:

Yes.

19. Question:

Will you please define what is meant by IT maturity and certification assessments (p. 4)? Are there specific maturity scales/frameworks you currently use to assess IT maturity? What types of certifications are under consideration?

Answer:

The certification was a self-certification, there is no requirement for an industry specific certification. The control framework used for the maturity assessment is based on ISO/IEC 27001/27002:2013 controls with maturity target levels based on a measurement against the Process Capability Model from CobIT5 (ISO/IEC 15504).

20. Question:

Under “assumptions and constraints”, it states that the successful Proponent will be awarded a contract with a maximum ceiling amount for the initial three years and that proponents should submit a “blended rate of the professional fees, as well as the hourly rate”. Will you please explain how this ceiling amount is determined? For example, are you looking for a maximum amount based on the blended rate?

Answer:

The Partnership has budgeted a specific amount for the 3 year period. This amount will be used as the maximum ceiling amount.

21. Question:

Under Scope of Services, what kind of activities would be involved in the task “assist with reviews...”? (i.e. conduct a review of referenced documentation and make recommendations, draft revised documentation where gaps are identified, QA CPAC’s own review process, and/or also provide some sort of knowledge transformation and training.) Please clarify the desired level of assistance.

Answer:

Review existing documentation and provide recommend changes/updates.

22. Question:

Are there any constraints on the number of proposed team members or the years of experience for each team member?

Answer:

No.