Systems Delivery and Project Portfolio Management (SDPPM)

EFCD

ATTACHMENT 2 TO APPENDIX J: TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION SUBMISSION TABLES

Last Updated Date: 2020-07-02
Status: Final

Version: 1.2
RDIMS Document No.: 45537v1B

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 General

1. This Attachment 2 to Appendix J describes the format of the submission tables that are expected to be used when responding to the technical details of this EFCD RFSO. The Offeror's submission tables will be critical for the effective evaluation of the Offeror's proposal; therefore, it is recommended that the Offeror ensure their proposal clearly articulates how their solution satisfies the requirement to achieve the best possible score.

1.2 Proposal Format

1. The Offeror should provide a Table of Contents listing all of the documents and material included in each section of the proposal, as well as all material(s) specified as Proposal submission requirements or provided as reference materials in the Proposal.

2. The Offeror's Technical Proposal should be provided using the following format:

   a. Section 1: Executive Summary and Corporate Profile – This section must include a signed copy of page "1" of this RFSO. This section may also contain an executive format and/or letter of transmittal at the Offeror's discretion. This should include, at a minimum, the Name and Telephone Number of a single person that may be contacted by Canada concerning any issues relating to the RFSO and this may also include a brief corporate profile of the Offeror and its major subcontractors;

   b. Section 2: Project Management Requirements;

   c. Section 3: Functional Requirements;

   d. Section 4: Technical Requirements;

   e. Section 5: Implementation Requirements;

   f. Section 6: Benchmark Requirements; and

   g. Section 7: Attachments – This section may include technical brochures, Corporate References, Proposed Personnel's References, Contract Deliverable Requirements List, Plans and any other bid submission deliverable not otherwise specified.

1.3 Response to Requirements

1. The Offeror is to provide a Technical Proposal that responds to the Mandatory and Rated requirements in the RFSO and its accompanying documents in the format set out in the Submission and Evaluation Tables indicated herein. The Offerors must complete the Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM) which is a key element of evaluating the Offeror's proposal as well as the method that will be allow the Offeror's compliance to the COTS requirement to be assessed. Refer to Appendix K for additional information concerning the RTM. It should be noted that the Offeror may expand the submission tables to accommodate its response. Additionally, the Offerors must complete the Rated criteria submission tables to allow the BET to effectively evaluate and determine a Rated score for the Offeror's proposal. The Offeror's Rated criteria response can be duplicated in the RTM or the RTM can have a reference to the Rated criteria submission tables. It is the Offeror's responsibility to ensure the information provided allows for the most effective and efficient assessments of the Offeror's submission.

   a. Mandatory Requirements:

      i. Offeror's must sign the Requirements Declaration, at the start of Appendix K (RTM), indicating their compliance to all Mandatory requirements; otherwise the bid will be considered non-compliant,

      ii. Mandatory requirements will be evaluated in Stage 1 – Confirmation of Compliance to Mandatory Requirements of the Evaluation Process; Stage 2 - Assessment of COTS compliancy; and verified, as required, in Stage 3 – EFCD Benchmark Testing,

      iii. Offerors are to respond to each Mandatory requirement by completing the RTM for each section detailed in the SOR, its annexes and the compliancy documents unless specifically noted, and

      iv. Offerors that fail to meet the Mandatory requirements will be disqualified;

   b. Rated Requirements:

      i. Rated requirements will be evaluated in Stage 2 – Evaluation of Rated Requirements of the Evaluation Process and verified, as required, in Stage 3 – EFCD Benchmark Testing,

      ii. Offerors are to respond to each Rated requirement by completing the Submission and Evaluation Response Tables, included herein, and

      iii. The rating tables contain a compilation of information extracted from the SOR and its annexes, as well as other documents and additional information required from Offerors to identify the Offeror's ability to support the requirements of this RFSO;

c. The Rated requirements include the following:

i. Project Management,

ii. Functional Requirements,

iii. Technical Requirements,

iv. Implementation Requirements, and

v. Benchmark Testing Requirements.

1.4 Completing the Submission and Evaluation Tables

1. Offerors are to complete the rated submission tables.
2. Offerors are to respond to each Rated item(s) using the format of the tables herein.
3. Offerors should note that their response to each Rated requirement will be evaluated using the rating scales included in Appendix J and the criteria contained on the same row in Column “Evaluation Criteria”.

1.5 Submission Evaluation Tables

1. The following identifies the tables to be used for the Offeror’s proposal response. The accompanying text describes the instructions that the Offeror should follow to ensure the RCMP/PSPC can effectively and efficiently evaluate the submitted bid.
2. There are separate instructions and tables for mandatory and rated criteria.

1.6 Mandatory Requirements Evaluation Table

1. Table 1-1 provides an example of the format of the Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM) that will be provided by the RCMP in Appendix K.
2. This RTM will include all requirements (i.e. Mandatory (M), Rated (R), Information (I)) from the SOR and its accompanying documents.

3. The Offeror must confirm their compliance/non-compliance to all Mandatory requirements at the paragraph level using the column “Compliant Y/N”.

4. The “COTS Y/N” column must indicate whether this requirement is satisfied by the Offeror’s COTS product. The requirements identified in the RFSO Rated evaluation tables will be used to determine the COTS percentage of the Offeror’s solution.

5. The Offeror’s Response column should be used to describe how the Offeror’s solution supports each requirement. If additional information is required to show how the Offeror fully supports the requirement, the Offeror can use the Offeror’s Referenced Info column to identify specific sections of the additional documentation where more information is available concerning the requirement.

6. Annex A to Appendix A – Current Architecture can be accepted as one Mandatory requirement to indicate that the Offeror’s solution operates within the current architecture.

7. Annex F to Appendix A – Livescan Interface Specification can be accepted as one Mandatory requirement to indicate that the Offeror’s solution will operate with the interface specifications in Annex F.

8. The compliancy documents listed in the SOR Section 1.6.1 do not have to be included in the Mandatory requirements evaluation table. Mandatory compliance to SOR Section 1.6.1 paragraph 1, will inherently identify compliance with the content of all the listed compliancy documents that form an integral part of this SOR.

1.7 Rated Requirements Evaluation Tables

1. The Rated requirements evaluation tables describe the Rated requirements that will be evaluated and if appropriate, provide a reference to specific sections and/or paragraphs that will be used to evaluate the rated criteria.

2. All columns, for each row, in the tables are filled with information that will be used to evaluate the Offeror’s response. The filled fields include:

   a. Rated criteria number which will be used a reference, as required;

   b. Requirement being evaluated;

   c. Evaluation Criteria which describes the criteria that will be used to determine how many of the maximum points that will be awarded for the specific requirement;

   d. Rating Scale as described in Appendix J;

e. Offeror's Response;

f. Offeror's Reference Information;

g. Maximum Points Available, which indicates the maximum points that could be awarded for the requirement;

h. Score, which identifies the score achieved for the requirement based on the evaluation; and

i. Additional fields that will be added, for use by the BET, such as Evaluator Comments as part of the evaluation process.

3. The Offeror's Response column should be used to describe the how the Offeror's solution supports each requirement. If additional information is required to show how the Offeror fully supports the requirement, the Offeror can use the Offeror's Referenced Info column to identify specific sections of the additional documentation where more information is available concerning the requirement.

4. Annex E to Appendix A – Government Furnished Equipment is for evaluation purposes to determine how much and how well the Offeror's solution supports re-using the GFE. This evaluation will be part of Stage 2 – Evaluation of Rated Requirements of the Evaluation Process, verified, as required, in Stage 3 – EFCD Benchmark Testing, and confirmed in Stage 5 – Offeror Conditional Selection.

5. As part of the Rated requirements evaluation, the Offeror's EFCD(s) will be assessed against the SOR Section 1.6.2 Reference Documents to determine how well these preferred requirements are satisfied.

Table 1-1: Requirements – Mandatory

Submission and Evaluation Table

Section Number	Section Name / Evaluation Subject	Submission Requirements	Mandatory / Rated / Information	Compliant Y/N	COTS Y/N	Offeror's Response	Offeror Referenced Info
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H

Table 1-2: Requirements – Rated

Submission and Evaluation Table

NO.	REQUIREMENT	Evaluation Criteria	RATING SCALE	Offeror's Response	Offeror's Reference Info	MAX POINTS AVAILABLE
R1	For each Referenced Project, Offerors should provide: • Name of the referenced client organization with project title; • Name, title, email, telephone number and fax number of one (1) senior client reference for each of the project(s); • A brief description of the project's major milestones, objectives, outcomes and narrative which demonstrates the similarity of scope, value, nature, complexity and relevance of the project(s) to the RCMP's EFCD RFSO; • The number of EFCDs included in the project; • Size of team provided by the Offeror, and contribution of the resources provided; • Project duration, including start and finish dates by month and year; • Current project status, e.g. completed, cancelled, in progress; and • Other information, which the Offeror	Project references will be assessed in accordance with the general evaluation guidelines Table B Rating Scale up to the maximum percentage of the total points based on the project references relevance to the RCMP's EFCD RFSO: All 5 project references will be evaluated based on SOR section 5.1 para 4 and the requirement stated herein. Up to 100% points will be awarded based on how well the requirement is satisfied. Projects identified that have over 100 users/devices involved in fingerprint processing, with a contract length of over 3 years, that includes at least 25 EFCDs and meets the following size, scope, and complexity would be ideal (e.g. a federal, province or foreign country system such as an AFIS, AFIS workstations plus EFCDs or a large number of EFCDs only) references: • Livescan data, ten print image (NPS-NIST Type 4 and Type 14 records), and facial	Table B Rating Scale			250

	deems appropriate, with a clear indication as to its pertinence.	image capture capability; • Livescan Identification Flats (NPS-NIST Type 14 records) capture capability; • Cardscan data, ten print image (NPS-NIST Type 4 and Type 14 records) from fingerprint cards, facial image capture from photograph, biometric consent image capture from consent form capability; • A widely distributed (geographic) Criminal or Refugee, and Civil tenprint capture user base. This entails several locations in widely dispersed areas that have a variety of communication bandwidth capabilities. Having only two (2) projects will be regarded as having considerable deficiency at best since it reflects the Offeror has limited experience to support a requirement as large as this RFSO.				
R2	The Offeror should provide the following plans in its proposal: • Systems Engineering Management Plan; • Quality Assurance Plan; • Requirements Management Plan; • Configuration Management Plan; • Risk Management Plan; • Problem Resolution Plan; • Document Management; and • Sub-Contractor Management Plan.	As a minimum, the Offeror is to address the requirements listed for each plan. Each plan will be rated in accordance with the general evaluation guidelines Table B Rating Scale. The Offeror's score will be calculated by determining the average rating factor for all plans and applying it against the maximum points available. The plans should clearly demonstrate that the Offeror has a thorough understanding of what is required to satisfy the requirements of this RFSO and the resulting NMSO with specific explanation on how the Offeror's previous experience is reflected in their plans.	Table B Rating Scale			50

	Systems Engineering Management Plan • Approach, tools, and standards to be used in performing the System Design, Business Process Engineering, Application, Software Design and Development to support the EFCD RFSO requirements; • Approach to configuring the COTS product to obtain the maximum benefits; • Approach, tools and standards for incorporating changes to business rules as the project proceeds; • The deliverables and objectives expected from the System Engineering (SE) process that ensures all the requirements in the EFCD RFSO are satisfied; • A description of the configurable and non-configurable parameters that shall be used; • An identification of other SE standards that shall be followed; and • A description of how the EFCD SE efforts (e.g. requirements analysis, system design, custom software development, testing, training, data conversion and implementation) will support the EFCD satisfying the RFSO requirements.					

	Quality Assurance Plan • Develop, recommend, document, implement, and maintain a policy and the necessary processes to ensure quality deliverables. • Establish, document and communicate the standards and assurance procedures for deliverables. • Liaise with project personnel to ensure that quality assurance standards and procedures established for the project conform to RCMP/GC+B6/CPMG standards. • Establish metrics for measuring quality and performance. • Monitor deliverables to verify that quality standards are being met, dealing with variances internally first, and then raising concerns to RCMP if problems are encountered. • Quality reviews.					
	Requirements Management Plan • Complete the Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM) that initially reflects the Offeror's compliancy to the requirements, and then used to manage all functional and technical requirements throughout the System Development Life Cycle (SDLC) of the project, using the contractual requirements as the starting point. • The RTM shall track each requirement throughout the NMSO, capturing key status information as well as any significant business or technical decisions related to each requirement. • The RTM shall be updated and provided to the RCMP on a regular basis, at key milestones throughout the NMSO.					

	• An RCMP document management tool (e.g. RDIMS or replacement) will be used to manage the RTM. • Note: the RTM is also a critical deliverable that must be included in the Offeror's proposal response.					

	Configuration Management Plan • Manage the contractual baselines as well as design baselines established throughout the NMSO. • Use a Configuration Management tool to record initial versions and manage changes to Designs; Workflows; Procedures; Documentation; Hardware; COTS software; Custom-developed software modules; Conversion software; Physical data base design; Application code; All supporting tools, etc. Problem Resolution Plan • This must be the Offeror's internal plan coordinated/integrated with RCMP's Work Item (i.e. incident management) tool. Risk Management Plan • Review existing project schedules and EFCD development/implementation areas to determine key areas for potential bottlenecks, risks and/or failure points. • RCMP will maintain a risk matrix, mapping key events to their areas of impact, with input from the Offeror to validate and quantify risk events in terms of time delay, likelihood of occurrence, mitigation plans, and/or other negative effects.					

	Document Management Plan • Procedures for the management of project documents, including e-mail policies and procedures for managing e-mail documents are in place. Any EFCD/RTID/RCMP-related documents must be securely exchanged and it is the Offeror's responsibility to provide an approved document exchange mechanism if off-site (i.e. non-RCMP site) resources require access to EFCD/RTID/RCMP related documents. All EFCD/RTID/RCMP related documents are at least Protected A. • The Offeror's Document Management Plan should demonstrate how documents developed/modified by off-site resources will be securely managed, published and maintained. Sub-Contractor Management Plan • Agreements, procedures and policies under which Sub Contractors work on the Offeror proposed solution. • Controls that ensure Sub Contractors are aware of and adhere to all relevant work and contract terms, conditions and requirements. • Describe how the Offeror shall maintain full responsibility for all work assigned as a part of the contract resulting from this RFSO.					
R3	The Offeror should have all the corporate and management infrastructure and staff to support providing NMSO devices in a timely manner to RCMP/GC/CPMGs departments. The tools and processes must be identified in the response to this RFSO and described to a level of detail that clearly identifies an effective, efficient and proven method to	Points awarded based on what percentage of the requirement is satisfied in terms of the corporate and management infrastructure and experience of the staff providing the required devices for similarly sized projects. SOR Sections 1.7.1.1 (9), 1.7.1.3 (2), 5.1 (4, 8), 5.3.1 (2), 5.3.4 (3,6);	Table B Rating Scale			100

	manage the NMSO specific software/configurations constituting the Offeror's proposed solution.					
R4	The Offeror should identify an executive sponsor with overall responsibility for meeting the terms and conditions of this Contract. The executive sponsor should have ultimate resolution and approval authority, for the Offeror, concerning the Contract resulting from this SOR. The executive sponsor is expected to directly resolve any issues relating to this Contract on behalf of the Offeror. The organizational structure should depict the ultimate authority of the executive sponsor. If the executive sponsor is not the ultimate authority, then the executive level that represents the ultimate authority must be identified as well as the types of decisions that are expected to be directed to the ultimate authority. SOR Section 5.3.2 (1).	General Evaluation Guidelines Table A Rating Scale. Score based on whether this feature is evident or not.	Table A Rating Scale			10
R5	The Project Manager should have experience above the minimum listed below: - A minimum of five (5) years experience within the last eight (8) years that includes full time experience as a Project Manager; - Demonstrated relevant biometric experience involving Livescan and Cardscan in support of the capture of NIST Type 4, Type 10, Type 14 and Type 15 records in a similar role with similar duties as those proposed.	Evaluating based on relevant project experience involving EFCD and fingerprint processing with Livescans and Cardscans above the minimum requirements. SOR Sections 5.2.1	Table B Rating Scale			20

R6	The Systems Engineer should have experience above the minimum: -A minimum of five (5) years experience within the last eight (8) years as a lead engineer that includes System Engineering experience; - Demonstrated relevant biometric experience involving Livescan and Cardscan in support of the capture of NIST Type 4, Type 10, Type 14 and Type 15 records in a similar role with similar duties as those proposed.	Evaluating based on relevant project experience involving EFCD and fingerprint processing with Livescans and Cardscans above the minimum requirements. SOR Sections 5.2.1	Table B Rating Scale			40
R7	The Software Engineer should have experience above the minimum: -A minimum of five (5) years experience within the last eight (8) years as a engineer that includes System Engineering experience; - Demonstrated relevant biometric experience involving Livescan and Cardscan in support of the capture of NIST Type 4, Type 10, Type 14 and Type 15 records in a similar role with similar duties as those proposed.	Evaluating based on relevant project experience involving EFCD and fingerprint processing with Livescans and Cardscans above the minimum requirements. SOR Sections 5.2.1	Table B Rating Scale			40

R8	The Software Developer and his/her backup should have experience above the minimum: - A minimum of three (3) years experience within the last five (5) years software development experience with the Offeror's EFCDs; - Demonstrated relevant biometric experience involving Livescan and Cardscan in support of the capture of NIST Type 4, Type 10, Type 14 and Type 15 records in a similar role with similar duties as those proposed.	Evaluating based on relevant project experience involving EFCD and fingerprint processing with Livescans and Cardscans above the minimum requirements. SOR Sections 5.2.1	Table B Rating Scale			60
R9	The Tester and his/her backup should have experience above the minimum: - A minimum of two (2) years experience within the last five (5) years quality assurance and testing experience; - Demonstrated relevant biometric experience involving Livescan and Cardscan in support of the capture of NIST Type 4, Type 10, Type 14 and Type 15 records in a similar role with similar duties as those proposed.	Evaluating based on relevant project experience involving EFCD and fingerprint processing with Livescans and Cardscans above the minimum requirements. SOR Sections 5.2.1	Table B Rating Scale			30
R10	The Technical writer should have experience above the minimum: - A minimum of three (3) years experience within the last five (5) years as a technical writer with EFCD related documentation. - Demonstrated relevant biometric experience involving Livescan and Cardscan	Evaluating based on relevant project experience involving EFCD and fingerprint processing with Livescans and Cardscans above the minimum requirements. SOR Sections 5.2.1	Table B Rating Scale			10

	in support of the capture of NIST Type 4, Type 10, Type 14 and Type 15 records in a similar role with similar duties as those proposed.					
R11	The Technician should have experience above the minimum: - A minimum of two (2) years experience within the last five (5) years as a technical writer with EFCD related documentation. - Demonstrated relevant biometric experience involving Livescan and Cardscan in support of the capture of NIST Type 4, Type 10, Type 14 and Type 15 records in a similar role with similar duties as those proposed.	Evaluating based on relevant project experience involving EFCD and fingerprint processing with Livescans and Cardscans above the minimum requirements. SOR Sections 5.2.1	Table B Rating Scale			20
R12	The training plan should clearly explain how the Offeror's training approach will result in effective and efficient training for the users including any printed material, videos, and online training aides that will be provided.	Evaluating based the clear articulation of the plan, the approach based on past experience with lessons learned from the previous experience, the time allocated based on the complexity of each area of training required.	Table B Rating Scale			20
R13	The Offeror should provide all details of the training techniques that will be used to conduct OLU, OLA and IT Support training at a training session for each device. SOR 3.2.5 (6)	Evaluating based on a well defined approach and previous execution of training for any applicable client for the OLU, OLA, SMTP-SPOI and IT Support training sessions that focus on functionality incorporated into the Livescan, Cardscan and SMTP-SPOI Server software.	Table B Rating Scale			40

R14	The Offeror should describe their corporate infrastructure that will enabled them to provide their Delivery, Installation, and Integration Plan by describing: a. how they will ship, upon receiving a call up, the device hardware, software, and documentation; b. a complete description on how change orders will be processed, approved, and implemented; c. the facility and layout requirements for the use of the devices including at least the space, power, lighting requirements and integration into the RCMP/GC/CPMGs architecture; d. the configuration process that allows the device to be setup with the Types Of Transactions (TOTs) and configuration required for the Agency procuring the devices; and e. the NMSO reporting process that ensures the NMSO reporting requirements stated throughout this SOR and its accompanying documents are satisfied. SOR 5.3.4 (4)	Evaluating based on the corporate infrastructure, shipping, processes, device availability, facilities and NMSO reporting that clearly demonstrates the Offeror's ability to satisfy the requirements stated throughout this SOR and its accompanying documents. Specific demonstrated experience using the corporate infrastructure to successfully deliver, install and integrate the solution is ideal.	Table B Rating Scale			100
R15	The Offeror should describe the setup and installation process for the EFCDs. This description should include a clear indication whether the Offeror is required to complete the installation and configuration or if the Agency's IT support staff can follow an installation guide to complete the setup of the EFCD. This is for smaller sites that will follow the installation guide (i.e. no SCCM or other reason).	Evaluation will be based on an assessment of the EFCD installation guide provided with the bid. The installation guide submitted must be a production ready and previously used in a Production environment. Points will be awarded based on the clarity, size and number of steps required to complete the EFCD installation process. The most preferred installation guide is an automated process with very few steps required by the IT Support staff. Large installation guides (i.e. more than 15	Rating Scale B			80

		pages) with a lot of steps (i.e. more than 50) and limited automation would have considerable deficiencies. EFCDs that can only be installed and configured by the Offeror would be considered not acceptable.				
R16	It is preferred that the implementation to support the functional changes necessary to satisfy the mandatory requirements, and the rated requirements that the Offeror committed to completing (and received rated criteria point for) are completed as soon as possible. The completion date is determined by acceptance of the changes by RCMP to allow the re-certification/approval process to start. That is, the RCMP must accept the changes before the formal re-certification/approval process will start. This strategy must be included with the Offeror's proposal which will be considered part of the evaluation assessing the feasibility of the strategy. This strategy should identify, the implementation time, risks and risk mitigation plan. The evaluation will include the feasibility of the Offeror's proposed schedule. SOR Section 1.7.1.2 (4), 4.2 (8,9), 6.2 (2).	Points awarded according to the following: Delivery within 3 months of contract award: (100%); Delivery within 4 months of contract award: (70%); Delivery within 5 months of contract award: (50%.); Delivery after 6 months of contract award will be considered non-compliant. The Offeror's provided plan/schedule showing the key steps, how easily the EFCD can be modified to support the required changes, milestones and delivery of the approved solution will be used to assess the effectiveness of the completion of the required updates within the time frame identified by the Offeror.	Specific Rating in Criteria			140

R17	The proposed System to the greatest extent possible should satisfy the EFCD solution requirements through the COTS product. An Offeror that can deliver more of the Entire EFCD solution via a COTS solution will score higher on the evaluation. Where configuration or customization is required the Offeror should provide a description of what this entails in the Offeror Response column. Any paragraphs, within a section included in the evaluation criteria, that are marked with an (I) for information will not be included in the percentage calculation. Offeror documentation and response to RTM will be used to assess this criteria.	Score based on the actual percentage of requirements that Offeror identifies in its proposal as being in its COTS EFCD product at bid closing date. This will be evaluated based on the percentage of the following requirements identified by section and paragraph number in parenthesis: Excluding information items, all requirements in SOR Sections: 1.3 (9 thru 12); 1.9 (3 thru 14); 3.2.1 (4, 5, 6); 3.3.7 (1); 3.3.8 (1, 2); as well as all requirements in Annex B Sections: 2.2 thru 2.6 (software supports each type of EFCD); 3.2 (1, 3, 4); 3.3 thru 3.7 (each (M) requirement will be used); 3.11 thru 3.12 (each (M) requirement will be used); 3.13 thru 3.15 (only EFCD (M) requirements will be considered) 3.17; 4.1.1 (1 thru 5); 4.2; 4.3, and 5.1 (1 thru 9, 11 thru 14); 5.1.2; 5.2 as well as all requirements in Annex D Sections: 2 (1,2,3,4,5,6,); 3 (1,5,6,10,15,16,17,20,21); 4.3 (3,4,5); 4.4.1 (2,4,7); 4.4.2 (2,4,7). The Offeror should identify in the RTM whether the requirement is satisfied by the COTS application.	Specific Rating in Criteria			200
R18	The Offeror's Livescan and Cardscan software should be identical, except for variances to accommodate using a scanner block for the Livescan versus a flatbed scanner for a Cardscan and variances for supporting a camera. SOR Section 3.2.1 (6). It is preferred that the EFCD be designed such that the same source code is used to support both the Livescan and Cardscan. That is, the same EFCD executable is provided to the client and it is the	General Evaluation Guidelines Table B Rating Scale. Maximum points will be awarded for a design that uses the same source code to support both the Livescan and Cardscan with the same EFCD executable used to configure/install and processes and/or configurable parameters that determine whether the software operates as a Livescan or Cardscan.	Table B Rating Scale			200

	configuration/installation process and/or configurable parameters that determine whether the software operates as a Livescan or Cardscan.					
R19	The Offeror should describe in detail its proposed strategy for implementing NMSO specific functionality as the EFCD COTS baseline evolves over the life of the contract, addressing the extent to which it will include custom features into its COTS product and to what extent that the Offeror's strategy will minimize disruption in terms of availability if Canada chooses to implement an upgrade. The EFCD COTS that is part of single solution for the Offeror that ensures corrections to defects are included for all clients as part of the Offeror's core COTS product and therefore provided to the RCMP/GC/CPMG as part of any new build is the most desirable solution.	General Evaluation Guidelines Table B Rating Scale. This includes the requirements stated herein and the rated requirements in Annex B 3.2 (6).	Table B Rating Scale			50

R20	The EFCD should follow the guidelines in the Best Practices for the Implementation of Civil Efficiencies of Fingerprint Capture Device Workflows and Best Practices for the Capture of Charge Information In Support Of NPS-NIST-ICD V1.7.8 v1.6.	General Evaluation Guidelines Table B Rating Scale. Score based on the actual percentage of Best Practices requirements that will be supported by the Offeror's solution. Refer to Annex B 1.1 (3) and Best Practices documents.	Table B Rating Scale			200
R21	All non Windows servers should be described in detail to the allow the GC to determine the effectiveness of the solution to satisfy the requirement to maintain the servers with the latest updates for the OS; and the latest Anti-Virus (AV) DAT files and AV policies; as well as the support procedures for updates that are not automated. It is preferred that only Windows servers are used that can participate in automatic OS and anti-virus updates. SOR 3.2 (15)	Score will be based on the effectiveness of the solution to automatically update the OS and anti-virus. Non-automated updates will receive zero (0) points. Using only Windows servers that can participate in automatic OS and anti-virus updates will receive full points.	Table B Rating Scale			30
R22	The RCMP/GC/CPMGs department may also request that the Offeror provide support and maintenance related to GFE including coordinating replacement parts/upgrades from the hardware / operating system through a Task Authorization or through an adjusted support and maintenance plan. SOR 3.2 (19)	Points will be awarded based on whether the Offeror agrees to provide support and maintenance related to GFE including coordinating replacement parts/upgrades from the hardware / software / operating system.	Table A Rating Scale			100

R23	The EFCD solution should make use of configurable parameters as much as possible to provide flexibility to best satisfy the requirements. The Offeror's EFCD solution should provide maximum flexibility with configurable parameters. These application configuration changes should not include modifying existing or adding new, programming code, or changing the application architecture or data structure. Annex B Section 6 and through the SOR and its accompanying documents where configurable parameter is identified.	Points will be awarded based on the overall design of the EFCD and its ability to use configurable parameters. A design that is built on configurable parameters with at least 25 configurable parameters will achieve 50% of the points. The remaining 50% of the points will be based on whether the specific configurable parameters identified in Annex B Section 6.1.1 (1,a,b,c,d,f,m,n,q); 6.1.2 (1a); 6.1.3 (1, a,b,c,e,f,g); 6.1.4 (1,a,d,e,f,g,h); 6.1.5 (1,a,b,c) 6.1.6 (1,ai,aii,aiii,b,c) are satisfied by the COTS product at the time of bid submission. Only half points will be awarded for configurable parameters that should be modifiable by the OLA; however, they can only be modified by the Offeror. The Offeror should identify in the RTM whether the configurable parameter already exist and if it is modifiable by the OLA.	Table B Rating Scale			100
R24	The EFCD User Management capability should have a user-friendly interface and support the NIST Role-Based Access Control (RBAC) Standard as stated in Annex B. The Offeror should describe how an OLA would ADD, MODIFY or DELETE a name on both the Livescan and Cardscan.	General Evaluation Guidelines Table B Rating Scale. 50% of the score will be based on how well the Offeror's solution satisfies the requirements in Annex B 5.1.1 (2 and 3). 50% of the score will be based on how easy and user friendly the OLA can complete the user management based on the basic ADD, MODIFY or DELETE functions.	Table B Rating Scale			50

R25	If the manual update process for the Charge Table is used, it should be as automated as possible to minimize the number of steps and/or key strokes / mouse clicks required by the IT staff. The ideal solution is to use the same or similar installation files used for the automated updated through SCCM. SOR 1.10 (10)	Points will be awarded based on how close the solution is to the ideal and how effectively the Offeror's EFCD supports the following: The charge table update process should be robust and easy to use based on the how effectively the EFCD's charge table processing supports the requirements stated in the Best Practices For The Capture Of Charge Information In Support Of NPS-NIST 1.7.8 v1.6, SOR 1.10 (10) and Annex B Section 3.12 (2, 4, 5, 6,14).	Table B Rating Scale			50
R26	Any future devices, not currently market available (e.g., remote handheld fingerprint scanner), that are applicable for RCMP certification or could be certified, should be identified. SOR Section 3.2.6 (4).	General Evaluation Guidelines Table B Rating Scale. Score will be based on the products applicable to the RCMP/GC/CPMG. There must be a clear description of how the solution is applicable to RCMP/GC/CPMG operations based on the content of this solicitation.	Table B Rating Scale			30
R27	The Offeror should explain their migration strategy for reusing GFE in the most efficient and effective manner. SOR Section 3.1 (3); Annex B Section 1.2 (5). The Offeror must specifically identify GFE that their software cannot operate on in a manner that satisfies the EFCD requirements as stated throughout the RFSO. It is expected that all keyboards and mice will be supported. The Offeror must specifically identify if there are specific keyboards or mice that cannot be supported with their solution.	General Evaluation Guidelines Table B Rating Scale. Score will be based on the ability of the Offeror’s solution to effectively and efficiently reuse GFE and how much the GFE can be reused. The Offeror should complete the GFE tables included herein. Refer to Annex E for details if required. The score weighting is: Scanner Blocks – 20% of points (reusing all Crossmatch scanners = 15%, reusing Cogent 2.5%, Reusing Morpho 2.5%). Kiosks chassis/cabinet – 20% of points Cameras – 10% of points FlatBed Scanners – 10% of points Printers – 15% of points	Table B Rating Scale			300

		Workstations – 12% of points SPOI-SMTP Servers – 3% of points Touch Screen Monitors – 5% of points Combination Readers – 5% of points				
R28	The Offeror should describe how the option to select Type 4 with or without Type-15 records would be presented to the OLU.	Points will be awarded based on how easy/user friendly the solution is. A simple approach to allow the OLU to choose whether to capture palm images. An Offeror that allows an OLU to select palm capture after the tenprint enrollment or skip palm enrollment at any point during the palm capture will be viewed as added value.	Table B Rating Scale			10
R29	The Offeror Should describe how the Livescan option to select Type 4 or Type 14 (Identification Flats) records would be presented to the OLU within the Miscellaneous Applicant Civil Ret N (MAP) workflow.	Points will be awarded based on how easy/user friendly the solution is. A simple approach to allow the OLU to choose whether to capture either record type and how the business rules will be incorporated to ensure the correct record type is selected based on application type is preferred.	Table B Rating Scale			20
R30	The Offeror should describe how their application will display details to the OLU of any missing mandatory fields or data format errors.	This will be evaluated based on high visibility of mandatory fields and fields that become conditionally mandatory along with how data input error dialog boxes will be presented. High visibility can be through the use of coloured fields or other means.	Table B Rating Scale			20

R31	The Offeror should describe the design of their EFCD helpful instructions and how easily it can be adapted to support the Helpful Tips requirements in the RFSO.	Points will be awarded based on how closely the Offeror's EFCD matches the RFSO requirements and how easy the Offeror's solution can be adapted to support the RFSO requirements (primarily described in Annex D).	Table B Rating Scale			40
R32	The Offeror should describe its Case management system. The Case Manager should have automated controls to prevent an OLA from deleting an active transaction in a proper state. The Offeror should describe the business rules applied to the delete transaction. Annex B Section 3.9.2 (9, 20).	Points will be awarded based on whether this option does/will exist and the effectiveness of the method that prevents deleting active transaction.	Table B Rating Scale			20
R33	The Offeror should describe the design and functionality of their facial image capture, storage, retrieval and export system.	Points will be awarded based on how easy/user friendly the solution is. A solution built into the EFCD is preferred.	Table B Rating Scale			40

R34	The Offeror should describe the intuitiveness of their EFCD to meet a 15-minute enrolment time per person such as: -Use of a graphical user interface - Highly visible mandatory data fields, e.g. color - Logically ordered data entry fields that trigger conditionally mandatory fields later in the data entry process -Conditionally mandatory fields that become mandatory triggered by completion of other fields - Intuitive screen navigation through the use of tabs for data capture and fingerprint image capture - Presentation of mandatory fields based on agency profile, e.g. Third Party Waiver Exempt - Ease of navigation to correct and edit previously captured data or fingerprint images - Fingerprint enrollment in real-time, i.e. auto-capture feature/auto advance vs. manual initiation of movement to next image	Evaluation will be based on overall simplicity of screens and fingerprint capture, Mandatory field enforcement and ease of enrollment process.	Table B Rating Scale			50
R35	The Offeror should describe how their Livescan prompts the OLU to move to the next finger image capture after successful completion of an enrolment using an auto-capture/auto-advance feature.	The following points scale will be used: 1. Auto capture/Auto Advance function, with foot peddle as a backup to force the capture of poor prints - 100%. 2. Foot peddle - 40%. 3. Hand operated is of least value - 0%. 4. If Auto capture/Auto advance is available a description should be provided on enabling and disabling this functionality and whether an OLA can set the timing of the advance to the next finger - 10% bonus points.	Table B Rating Scale			100

R36	The Offeror should describe the Livescan process for sequence checks performed on each captured fingerprint image as it is captured and the ease with which sequence errors are corrected, including display messages that clearly articulate the issue.	Points will be awarded based on how easy/user friendly the solution is. The sequence checks should be assessed and displayed to the OLU in realtime immediately following the image scan where a sequence check can be applied. Display messages and the sequence error correction should be easy (i.e. one step) and clear to the OLU. Screen shots would be extremely beneficial to understand how well this requirement is satisfied and would assist with any narrative description.	Table B Rating Scale			20
R37	The Offeror should describe their image quality metric used in image quality assessment and if not the NIST Fingerprint Image Quality (NFIQ) assessment tool then how their image quality thresholds are mapped to the NFIQ thresholds.	Full points will be awarded for using the NIST NFIQ assessment; otherwise, points will be awarded based on closely the Offeror's solution maps to the NFIQ thresholds.	Table B Rating Scale			10
R38	The Offeror should describe the Livescan process of identifying missing fingers/images during the capture of Type-4 and Type-14 records and at what stage of the enrollment workflow missing fingers/images are identified.	Points will be awarded based on how intuitive and user friendly the approach is. Identifying missing fingers at the beginning of the enrollment process and then allowing the OLU to correct at each step of the process is preferred.	Table B Rating Scale			15
R39	The Offeror's Livescan should have an effective method to determine the best biometric finger to use and inform the OLU in a user friendly manner.	Points will be awarded based on how effective the method is to determine the biometric that should be used by the OLU. An overall quality assessment method, ideally using NFIQ, to determine the best print to use considering all aspects on the already taken prints as well as comparison against plains and rolled as required is most desirable. A method that always picks the same finger is the least desirable.	Table B Rating Scale			15

R40	The Offeror should describe their palm sequence check process.	Points will be awarded based on how effectively the Offeror's EFCD design performs the palm sequence checking. It is preferred that a comprehensive method is used to compare the lower palm to the upper palm and the upper palm to plains and rolled.	Table B Rating Scale			15
R41	The Offeror should explain all aspects of their EFCD solution that ensures the integrity of the RCMP/GC/CPMG fingerprint and fingerprint related data to justify that the integrity of the data will be maintained. This should include at least the following: (R) a. transaction processing with units of work and phased commits; b. managing concurrent processing; c. error recovery; d. any aspects of the design that ensures data integrity. For example, to ensure no duplicates are recorded for a field, the database field would be defined as unique; and e. any aspects of the design that ensure referential integrity.	Points will be awarded based on how well the requirement is satisfied.	Table B Rating Scale			50
R42	The Offeror's Livescan/Cardscan processing of the Agency's RMS/DMS photos and biographical data should be an efficient, effective and simple to use GUI that seamlessly fits into the associated workflow. SOR Section 3.2.1 (6). Annex B Section 4.1 (2).	Points will be awarded based on how well the requirement is satisfied.	Table B Rating Scale			20
R43	The Offeror should describe whether their facial image capture application software includes an automatic face find and centre feature or overlay which complies with the ISO/IEC 19794-5:2005 format (Information technology - Biometric data interchange	Points will be awarded based on whether the requirement is satisfied.	Table A Rating Scale			30

	formats - Part 5: Face image data). SOR 3.3.8 (4)					
R44	For the purpose of this procurement, context sensitive will be defined as allowing an OLU to minimize the number of key strokes or manually select the desired data input from a pull down list by entering the least number of alpha characters to select the desired input to a field supported by pull down list of selections. For example, if the cursor was at the “Hair Colour” field and the OLU entered the alpha character “B” then the application would populate the field with “BALD”. If the OLU added another alpha character such as “L” to represent “BL” then the application would populate the field with “BLACK”. If the OLU was to add yet a third alpha character such as “O” to represent “BLO” then the application would populate the field with “BLONDE”. Context sensitive functionality should be supported by all fields that have pull down list. A cursor placed on a field with a pull down list should not automatically generate the display of the list. The list should only display if manually initiated. The Offeror should describe how context sensitive fields are supported by pull down lists in their EFCD to support how closely their solution satisfies this requirement. Annex B 5.1 (10).	Points will be awarded based on how well the RFSO requirements are satisfied.	Table B Rating Scale			40
R45	The Offeror should describe how an OLU would initiate a resubmission workflow.	Points will be awarded based on how user friendly and intuitive the solution is.	Table B Rating Scale			20

R46	In the case of a Livescan resubmission transaction, the Offeror should describe how they will incorporate the "Biometric Consent Image Designator" logic in the event the fingerprint images are recaptured or rescanned.	Explanation on when an ERRT is received for a particular FP image quality and whether all FP images must be re-enrolled or just FP images that were rejected and whether a Biometric Consent finger re-enrollment will be necessary. Preference will be to re-enroll at the individual finger image level rather than all FP images.	Table B Rating Scale			20
R47	The Offeror should describe how their Cardscan application will detect and identify finger sequence errors. The Offeror Should describe how their application would identify sequence errors to the OLU and guide the OLU during the manual onscreen re-sequencing of rolled finger impressions.	Sequence error checking should be explained in detail. Points will be awarded based on how user friendly and intuitive the approach to identifying out of sequence fingers scanned from a paper card are and whether the OLU can manually correct sequence errors onscreen.	Table B Rating Scale			15
R48	The Offeror should describe how an OLU would center or adjust the image within the NIST capture box and how the OLU would reduce the size of the NIST capture box.	Points will be awarded based on the effective use of templates, what adjustments can be made to the templates when centering images and the user friendliness of interface.	Table B Rating Scale			15
R49	The Offeror should describe whether their Cardscan application currently conducts an upper/full palm to plains and rolled image sequence check.	Points will be awarded based on effectively the Offeror's Cardscan design performs for palm sequence checking. It is preferred that a comprehensive method is used to compare the lower palm to the upper palm and the upper palm to plains and rolled.	Table B Rating Scale			15
R50	The Offeror should describe how their Cardscan application software will incorporate the biometric consent image scanning, centering and verification processes.	Points will be awarded based on how effective and user friendly the process is.	Table B Rating Scale			15
R51	The Offeror should describe how their Livescan will be configured to allow either a normal workflow or a workflow integrated with a RMS/DMS interface workflow.	Points will be awarded based on how effective and user friendly the process is.	Table B Rating Scale			10

R52	The Offeror should describe the EFCD's magnetic stripe and 2D bar code application functionality: - their methodology and frequency for updating or adding formats as provinces or states update their formats or new provinces or states incorporate this technology into their licenses. - What mechanisms they have in place to obtain the most current versions of driver's license formats from individual Provincial, Territorial or State authorities, -Their methodology for supporting more than one version of a provincial or state format in circulation. - Frequency of anticipated template updates for individual provincial/territorial or state formats or new provinces or states that have moved to incorporating this technology into their licenses. - Whether updates to existing templates or the addition of new provincial or State templates are included as part of an extended maintenance/service plan.	Points will be awarded based on how effective and efficient the application is and how often the magnetic stripe and 2D bar code application functionality is updated.	Table B Rating Scale			15
R53	It is preferred that the EFCD's instructional mode method is controlled through the user management system defining a user with only instructional mode privileges to prevent the user from creating transactions that are submitted to production. Once the user is proficient with the EFCD, the user management system would be used to allow the individual full OLU privileges. Annex B Section 3.5 (5).	Points will be awarded based on whether the feature is available.	Table A Rating Scale			30
R54	The EFCD instructional mode implementation should effectively and efficiently allow the user to learn how to use	Points will be awarded based on how well the solution supports the requirements in Annex B Section 3.5 (17).	Table B Rating Scale			30

	the EFCD.					
R55	The Offeror's EFCD should clearly and distinctly alert the OLU that they are in the Instructional mode Annex B Section 3.5 (18).	Points will be awarded based on how obvious it is to the user that they are in Instructional mode; and the consistency of this alert throughout the full operation of the EFCD. The preferred solution is that the alert is clearly visible to the user and that it remains throughout the full operation of the device.	Table B Rating Scale			15
R56	The EFCD should provide icon(s) in the bottom right portion of the screen to allow the readiness of each component (e.g., scanner, camera) to be checked by the OLU. Annex B Section 3.6 (7).	Points will be awarded based on whether the feature is available and how effectively it provides the OLU with the required information.	Table B Rating Scale			20
R57	The Offeror should provide an explanation and sample of how the Cardscan will populate the criminal, refugee and civil overflow page(s).	Points will be awarded based on how effective and user friendly the capability is.	Table B Rating Scale			15
R58	The Offeror should describe whether their Case Manager SMTP Server has the option to stop, read and print search responses from the RCMP without forwarding to the originating EFCD. The EFCD / SMTP-SPOI Server should have a configurable parameter that the OLA can change to set the wait time, internal when attempting to connect, when the RTID System is not available. The SMTP-SPOI Server should have the capability of auditing specific resources. The SMTP-SPOI Server should conform to specific network architecture constraints.	Points will be awarded based on how effective the following RFSO requirements are satisfied. Annex B Section 3.9.2 (9), 3.11 (5), 3.13 (5), 3.22 (3).	Table B Rating Scale			10
R59	The Offeror should describe their Case Management SMTP-SPOI Server GUI including its transaction search features.	Points will be awarded based on the effectiveness and user friendly capabilities of the GUI and its application search feature. The description should be	Table B Rating Scale			10

		supported by sample screen shots.				
R60	The Offeror should describe how their deletion function number of days parameter is incorporated into their application on the SMTP-SPOI Server.	Points will be awarded based on the OLA being able to change the number of days and how user friendly making the change is.	Table B Rating Scale			15
R61	The Offeror should describe the design of their standalone cabinet in terms of security provided to components and access to components. The ruggedized Livescan protective cabinet should have demonstrated proof that it has successfully operated with a Livescan configuration the same or similar to the Offeror's solution for at least two (2) years of continuous use.	The Kiosk cabinet should be ergonomically designed with cabinet stability and ruggedness along with ease of access to the hardware components. Points will be awarded based on these requirements and the requirements in Annex B Section 2.2.1 (3,6).	Table B Rating Scale			60
R62	The lockable ruggedized travel case should include storage space for a tripod. Annex B Section 2.6 (3).	Points will be awarded based on whether the feature is available.	Table A Rating Scale			15
R63	The Offeror should describe how their portable Livescan, including laptop, scanner block and camera are assembled in an operational environment. Annex B 2.6 (4)	Points will be awarded based on how easily, effectively and efficiently the portable Livescan can be setup and be in an operational mode. The Offeror should provide a complete description of proposed component configuration setup. Can enrollments be initiated without removing the components or must the components be removed from the case and set up.	Table B Rating Scale			20
R64	It is preferred that Offeror has previously had a Portable Livescan certified by the RCMP or at least operational for a client for a period of at least two years. Annex B 2.6 (5)	100% of the points will be awarded if a Portable Livescan has been certified by the RCMP. 50% of the points will be awarded if the Offeror's Portable Livescan has been operational for another client for at least	Specific Rating in Criteria			50

		two years.				
R65	It is preferred that the EFCD support a common email account configuration where multiple EFCDs can read from the same email account allowing all the RMS/DMS transactions to be processed by multiple EFCDs. This configuration requires specific controls implemented to ensure the email is lock by an EFCD and then gets removed when the email account when the transaction has been completed. Annex B 4.1.1 (6).	Points will be awarded based on whether the feature is available.	Table A Rating Scale			80
R66	It is preferred that the Offeror's EFCDs have already been proven to work with ePo and WSUS in an operational environment similar to the RCMP/GC/CPMG. SOR 4.2 (9)	Points will be awarded based on whether the feature is available.	Table A Rating Scale			100
R67	In Transaction manager, it is preferred that the EFCD allow the OLU to select their preferred column order and that this order be retained at each log in.	Points will be awarded based on whether the feature is available.	Table A Rating Scale			20
R68	It is preferred that the mandatory fields highlighted in pale yellow be configurable to allow a different colour as part of the EFCD installation process. Annex D section 3 (14).	Points will be awarded based on whether the feature is available.	Table A Rating Scale			20

R69	It is preferred that the Livescan obtains the make, model and serial number directly from the scanner block to ensure the information is correct	Points will be awarded based on whether the feature is available.	Table A Rating Scale			20
R70	Upon selection of a body location, the dropdown list should only contain the body locations that are displayed on the screen and the body location selected should be highlighted.	Points will be awarded based on how closely this requirement is satisfied.	Table B Rating Scale			10
						3500

1.7.1 SCANNER BLOCKS

Table 1-3: Government Furnished Equipment – Scanner Blocks				
Model	**Finger Print Capture**	**End of Life Date**	**End of Service Date**	**Offeror Reuse (Yes/No)**
Crossmatch 1000PX	TP/IDFlats	2016-12-23	2021-12-23	
Crossmatch 500P	TP/IDFlats	2016-12-23	2021-12-23	
Crossmatch Guardian	IDFlats	2016-12-23	2021-12-23	
Crossmatch 1000	TP/IDFlats	Not Declared	Not Declared	
Cogent CS500E	IDFlats	Not Declared	Not Declared	
Crossmatch Guardian 200 USB	TP/IDFlats	Not Declared	Not Declared	
Morpho TP5300A ED	IDFlats	Not Declared	Not Declared	
Morpho TP5300A HD	TP/IDFlats	Not Declared	Not Declared	

1.7.2 KIOSK CHASSIS

Table 1-4: Government Furnished Equipment – Kiosk Chassis/Cabinet							
Model	**Approx Full Height, Width, Depth**	**Height to bottom of space for scanner block**	**Height to top of space for scanner block**	**Height to level above scanner block for mouse/touch pad**	**Height to camera mount**	**Scanner Block**	**Offeror Reuse (Yes/No)**
Model #1	69”x28”x28”	~33”	~42”	~46”	~64”	Crossmatch 500P	
Model #2	65”x25”x33”	~30”	~42”	~45”	~60”	Morpho TP5300A HD	
Model #3	65”x25”x33”	~30”	~42”	~45”	~60”	Crossmatch 1000P/PX	
Model #4	67”x24”x25”	~33”	~39”	~46”	~65”	Crossmatch 1000P/PX	
Model #5	72”x25”x27”	~32”	~38”	~42”	~70”	Crossmatch 1000P/PX	
Model #6	68”x25”x35”	~34”	~43”	~46”	~64”	Morpho TP5300A HD	

1.7.3 CAMERAS

Table 1-5: Government Furnished Equipment – Cameras				
Model	**Approx Size**	**Approx %**	**End-of Life Date**	**Offeror Reuse (Yes/No)**
Logitech B910 webcamera	7”x5”x3”		Not Declared	
Logitech C910 webcamera	7”x5”x3”		Not Declared	
Logitech C920 webcamera	7”x5”x3”		Not Declared	
Canon EOS rebel XS-SLR	5”x4”x3”		Not Declared	
Canon rebel T3i	5”x4”x3”		Not Declared	
Canon EOS Rebel T5/T6 (DLSR)	5”x4”x3”		Not Declared	
Canon EOS 500D	5”x4”x3”		Not Declared	

1.7.4 FLATBED SCANNERS

Table 1-6: Government Furnished Equipment – Flatbed Scanners				
Model	**Approx Size**	**Approx %**	**End-of Life Date**	**Offeror Reuse (Yes/No)**
Epson 11000xl Flatbed Scanner			Not Declared	
Epson Perfection V800			Not Declared	
Epson 10000xl Flatbed Scanner			Not Declared	

1.7.5 PRINTERS

Table 1-7: Government Furnished Equipment – Printers				
Model	**Approx Size**	**Approx %**	**End-of Life Date**	**Offeror Reuse (Yes/No)**
Lexmark MS810			Not Declared	
Xerox 5500			Not Declared	
Lexmark MS310dn			Not Declared	
Lexmark MS3-12			Not Declared	
Xerox Phaser 3610			Not Declared	
Xerox Phaser 4510			Not Declared	
Xerox Phaser 5550			Not Declared	

1.7.6 WORKSTATIONS

Table 1-8: Government Furnished Equipment – Workstations					
Model	**CPU**	**RAM**	**HD**	**Ports**	**Offeror Reuse (Yes/No)**
HP Compaq 6005 Pro MicroTower Windows 7	AMD A4	4G	2x160GB SATA RAID 1	Ethernet VGA 6xUSB 2.0 4xUSB 3.0 3xIEEE 1394	
HP Compaq 6005 Pro SFF Tower Windows 7	AMD A4	4G	500GB and 160GB SATA RAID 1	Ethernet VGA 6xUSB 2.0 4xUSB 3.0 3xIEEE 1394	
HP Compaq 6305 Pro SFF Tower Windows 7	AMD A4	4G	2x160GB SATA RAID 1	Ethernet VGA 6xUSB 2.0 4xUSB 3.0 3xIEEE 1394	
HP EliteDesk 800 G3 SFF Tower Windows 10	Intel Core i5-6500 3.2 GHz	8G	2x160GB SATA RAID 1	Ethernet VGA 6xUSB 2.0 4xUSB 3.0 3xIEEE 1394	

Table 1-8: Government Furnished Equipment – Workstations					
Model	**CPU**	**RAM**	**HD**	**Ports**	**Offeror Reuse (Yes/No)**
HP Z400 Tower Win 7 Pro 32 bit Tower	Intel Xeon 2.4GHz	4G	2x500GB SATA RAID 1	Ethernet DVI Displayport 16xUSB 2.0 4xUSB 3.0 3xIEEE 1394	
HP Z230 Tower Win 7 Enterprise 64 bit	Intel i5 3.2 GHz	8G	2x500GB SATA RAID 1	Ethernet DVI Displayport 6xUSB 2.0 4xUSB 3.0 3xIEEE 1394	
HP Compaq Pro 6300 Tower Win 7 Pro 64 bit	Intel i7 3.4 GHz	4G	2x500GB SATA RAID 1	Ethernet VGA Displayport 6xUSB 2.0 4xUSB 3.0 3xIEEE 1394	

Table 1-8: Government Furnished Equipment – Workstations					
Model	**CPU**	**RAM**	**HD**	**Ports**	**Offeror Reuse (Yes/No)**
Dell Precision 5810 Tower Win 7 Pro 64 bit	Xeon 2.8GHz	8G	2x500GB SATA RAID 1	Ethernet DVI Displayport 6xUSB 2.0 4xUSB 3.0 3xIEEE 1394	
HP Elite Desktop Windows 7	Intel Core i7 3.2 GHz	8G	1x500GB SATA RAID 1	Ethernet VGA 6xUSB 2.0 4xUSB 3.0 3xIEEE 1394	
HP Laptop Win Pro 10	Intel Core i7 4.0 GHz	8G	1x500GB SATA RAID 1	Ethernet VGA 4xUSB 2.0 3xUSB 3.0	

1.7.7 SPOI-SMTP SERVERS

Table 1-9: Government Furnished Equipment – SMPT-SPOI Servers					
Model	**CPU**	**RAM**	**HD**	**Ports**	**Offeror Reuse (Yes/No)**
IBM 3500 M5 tower Windows 2012 EOL December 2018 EOS December 2023	Intel Xeon processors E5-2600 v3 series	32G	1xTB	Ethernet VGA 6xUSB 2.0 4xUSB 3.0	

1.7.8 TOUCH SCREEN MONITORS

Table 1-10: Government Furnished Equipment – Touch Screen Monitors				
Model	**Approx Size**	**Approx %**	**End-of Life Date**	**Offeror Reuse (Yes/No)**
Various model	19in		Not Declared	

1.7.9 COMBINATION 2D/MAGNETIC STRIPE READER

Table 1-11: Government Furnished Equipment – Combination 2D/Magnetic Stripe Readers				
Model	**Approx Size**	**Approx %**	**End-of Life Date**	**Offeror Reuse (Yes/No)**
Eseek/Token Works (TokenWorks M260 – IDWedgeKB™)			Not Declared	
Gemalto Double-sided ID Card Reader CR5400			Not Declared	