



NESS Fact Sheet

The Network Equipment Support Services (NESS) is a Departmental Individual Standing Offer (DISO), managed by PWGSC, for the provision of networking equipment. See **Appendix A** for a list of Classes and Categories. The NESS DISO will be in effect on November 1st, 2006 to October 31st, 2008 with an additional two two-option years.

Ordering Process

Effective November 1st, 2006 to November 19th, 2006, all requests for networking equipment contained in the NESS Standing Offer will be placed through the [Regional Account Manager](#) or [Client Relationship Manager](#) (CRM) in the NCA.

Effective November 20th, 2006, all requests for networking equipment contained in the NESS Standing Offer will be placed through the [Invoicing Support Information System \(ISIS\)](#). ISIS is a user-driven Web-based application, providing the GoC with easy access to a list of NESS Offerors, Original Equipment Manufacturer product sets, and volume-discounted prices. Additional information on ISIS can be found on the ITS@PWGSC Web site at: <http://publiserice.pwgsc.gc.ca/its/text/ps/isissif-e.html>. In order to create an ISIS account and process requests, clients may contact their ISIS Client Support Representative at: <http://publiserice.pwgsc.gc.ca/its/text/ps/isissifclient-e.html>.

Call up thresholds

From **\$0.01 to \$25,000** including GST, the IT Services Branch (ITSB) of PWGSC will issue all call-ups.

From **\$25,000.01 to \$100,000** including GST, a no substitution justification will be required. See **Appendix B** for justification requirements.

For orders **in excess of \$100,000** including GST, a request for volume discount (RVD) will be issued to all NESS Offerors within a particular Category. The Offerors in the Category may propose an equivalent OEM product set in response to the RVD. If the requested OEM product set is deemed by the Department to be the only product set supporting a required feature, meeting the operational requirements, a technical justification will be required in order to validate against an equivalent bid of another OEM product set. See **Appendix C** for justification requirements. **Appendix D** highlights the RVD or Equivalent process.



Appendix A

NESS Classes and Categories

Class 1 - LAN switches
Category 1.1 - L2 LAN switches
8 Offerors -> Cisco; D-Link; Enterasys; Foundry; HP; Netgear; Nortel; Scalar/Extreme
3 Aboriginal Set-Asides -> Advanced Chippewa (Nortel); Dalian (Allied Telesis; HP Procurve); Nisha (3Com; D-Link)
Category 1.2 - L2-3 LAN switches
6 Offerors -> Cisco; Enterasys; Foundry; HP; Nortel; Scalar/Extreme
3 Aboriginal Set-Asides -> Transpolar (Cisco); Advanced Chippewa (Nortel); Dalian (Allied Telesis; HP Procurve)
Class 2 - Routers
Category 2.1 - Branch Routers
2 Offerors -> Cisco; Stoneworks/Juniper
2 Aboriginal Set-Asides -> Transpolar (Cisco); Dalian (Juniper)
Category 2.2 - Enterprise Router
2 Offerors -> Cisco; Stoneworks/Juniper
2 Aboriginal Set-Asides -> Transpolar (Cisco); Dalian (Juniper)
Class 3 - Layer 4-7 Devices
Category 3.1 - Layer 4-7 Application switch
6 Offerors -> Cisco; Foundry; Netgear; Nortel; Radware; Scalar/F5
3 Aboriginal Set-Asides -> Advanced Chippewa (Nortel); Dalian (Radware); Foxwise (Foundry)
Category 3.2 - WAN Acceleration Appliance
3 Offerors -> Riverbed; Scalar/F5; Stoneworks/Juniper
1 Aboriginal Set-Asides -> Dalian (Juniper)
Class 4 - Firewalls
Category 4.1 - Firewall appliances
6 Offerors -> Allstream/Juniper; Cisco; Conexsys/Nokia; Fortinet; Nortel; Secure Computing
4 Aboriginal Set-Asides -> Transpolar (Cisco); Advanced Chippewa (Nortel); Dalian (Juniper); IPSS (Secure Computing; Symantec)
Class 5 - Intrusion Detection Systems



Category 5.1 - Remote Response NIDS (Network Intrusion Detection Systems)

5 Offerors -> 3Com; Allstream/McAfee; Cisco; Nortel; Stoneworks/Juniper

5 Aboriginal Set-Asides -> Transpolar (Cisco); Advanced Chippewa (Nortel); Dalian (McAfee); Nisha (3Com); IPSS (Symantec)

Class 6 - VPN Appliances

Category 6.1 - Small Remote Site VPN Appliance

3 Offerors -> Cisco; Fortinet; Nortel

3 Aboriginal Set-Asides -> Transpolar (Cisco); Advanced Chippewa (Nortel); Dalian (Allied Telesis)

Category 6.2 - Remote Access Node/Branch-to-Branch Terminator

3 Offerors -> Cisco; Fortinet; Nortel

2 Aboriginal Set-Asides -> Transpolar (Cisco); Advanced Chippewa (Nortel)

Category 6.3 - SSL VPN Appliance

4 Offerors -> Cisco; Nortel; Scalar/F5; Secure Computing

3 Aboriginal Set-Asides -> Transpolar (Cisco); Advanced Chippewa (Nortel); IPSS (Secure Computing)

Category 6.4 - SSL Proxy

2 Offerors -> Radware; Secure Computing

2 Aboriginal Set-Asides -> Dalian (Radware); IPSS (Secure Computing; Microdasys)

Class 7 - Optical Networking Devices

Category 7.1 - WDM Optical Networking Device

2 Offerors -> Cisco; Nortel

2 Aboriginal Set-Asides -> Transpolar (Cisco); Advanced Chippewa (Nortel)

Category 7.2 - SONET Optical Device

2 Offerors -> Cisco; Nortel

2 Aboriginal Set-Asides -> Transpolar (Cisco); Advanced Chippewa (Nortel)

Class 8 - Multi Class Equipment

Category 8.1 - Unified Threat Management (UTM) appliances

2 Offerors -> Cisco; Fortinet

1 Aboriginal Set-Asides -> Transpolar (Cisco)



Appendix B

NESS – No Substitution Justification

According to procurement regulations¹, this purchase exceeds the sole-source threshold of \$25,000, including GST, and requires a No Substitution Justification. Please confirm which statement(s) best justifies your request.

Justification Statements
<p>1. Given that the original equipment was acquired through the competitive process under contract number(s):</p> <p>_____</p> <p>with a current installation base (not including training costs) valued at:</p> <p>\$ _____</p> <p>Additional deliveries that are intended either as replacement parts or enhancements to existing equipment or installations, or as the extension of existing equipment or installations, a change of OEM would compel the entity to procure equipment or services not meeting requirements of interchangeability with already existing equipment.</p>
<p>2. Change of OEM would compel the entity to procure equipment or services not meeting the warranty requirements of already existing equipment including software purchased under contract number(s)</p> <p># _____</p> <p>Date of purchase: yyyy/mm/dd</p> <p>_____/_____/_____</p>

Client Disclaimer statement:

I hereby certify that the information selected and agreed to in this justification is accurate. The Department, Agency, or Crown Corporation will be held accountable for any litigation costs or damages awarded based on inaccurate or incomplete information provided to PWGSC and resulting in a challenge to the procurement before the Canadian International Trade Tribunal or a court of competent jurisdiction.

¹<http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/inait-aci.nsf/en/il00031e.html#index>
<http://www.pwgsc.gc.ca/acquisitions/text/sm/chapter05-e.html>
http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pubs_pol/dcgpubs/contracting/contractingpol_2_e.asp#bid

Field Code Changed



Appendix D

RVD or Equivalent Process

Definitions:

PWGSC: Acquisitions Branch and/or the IT Services Branch

Crown or Canada: PWGSC and/or the respective Department

1. **PWGSC** receives a request with a justification for equipment that requires a RVD of the requested product set or an equivalent product set bid submission.
 2. **PWGSC** issues the RVD to Offerors qualified in the Category.
 3. **PWGSC** evaluates RVD responses for financial compliance to the DISO pricing.
 4. If an Offeror submits equipment that differs from the manufacturer's make and model requested, and is the lowest bid, then they must:
 - a. Demonstrate product is equivalent in form, fit, function and quality;
 - b. Demonstrate product is fully compatible with, interchangeable with and seamlessly interoperates with the network equipment identified in the RVD
 - c. Provide complete specifications and descriptive technical documentation for each equivalent item proposed.
 - d. Substantiate compliance by demonstrating it meets all mandatory performance criteria specified in the RVD
 - e. Clearly identify those areas in the specifications and descriptive technical documentation that demonstrate the equivalence of the proposed item.
 5. The **Crown** reviews equivalent bid from a technical perspective.
 6. If the equivalent bids are not compliant, then the **PWGSC** awards the RVD to the Offeror originally requested.
-
7. **PWGSC** may request a sample of the item for demonstration to validate the product compliance.
 8. An excerpt of the NESS DISO (Section 49 or Section 52 of Aboriginal Set-Aside) describing the process is detailed as follows:
 - I. In the event that a demonstration is requested by **Canada** to verify product functionality and compatibility, written notification by the **PWGSC** Contracting Authority will be provided to the Offeror. The product(s) to be delivered for the demonstration must be provided by the Offeror no later than three (3) working days from the date of notification. Failure to meet this date will result in elimination of the product without further consideration. There will be no time period extensions or Administrative Faults given for late delivery of products.
 - II. The products supplied for the demonstration must be identical to the Offeror's products listed on the DISO.
 - III. The products provided are required for a period of up to sixty (60) calendar days. Offeror(s) may be requested in writing to extend this period.
 - IV. Any required testing will be carried-out by an industry recognized independent third party testing firm selected by the Crown. The Offeror must be fully available to answer questions and provide further information as required. All costs associated with this testing, except for Canada's monitoring and site costs, shall be at the expense of the Offeror. A formal methodology and test plan will be provided in advance of any testing.
 - V. The Offeror's technical staff may be requested to install and demonstrate the products prior to the testing by the Identified User Technical Authority but the Offeror will not be permitted to be present during testing unless requested otherwise.



- VI. Any proposed product that is found to be non-compliant in that it fails to meet the Technical Specifications will result in the elimination of the associated proposed product(s) without further consideration.
- VII. In the event that any product(s) delivered to the demonstration site is not configured as specified in the written demonstration invitation letter issued by the PWGSC Contracting Officer, the Offeror will be required to rectify the discrepancy within 24 hours of written notification. The resulting fault will be deemed as an Administrative Fault. A maximum of one Administrative Fault per product will be allowed.
- VIII. If the product(s), or its replacement, exhibits another Administrative Fault, or if the Offeror fails to meet the 24-hour deadline, the product shall be eliminated from further consideration.
- IX. In the event that the product does not function in accordance with the Technical Requirements or fails to execute the demonstration test suite completely and accurately, the Offeror will be required to repair the product within 48 hours of notification. The resulting fault will be deemed a Technical Fault. A maximum of two (2) Technical Faults will be allowed. Failure by the Offeror to repair the product within 48 hours of notification of a Technical Fault shall result in the product being declared non-compliant. These Technical Faults apply to all parts of the demonstration.
- X. If the product, or its replacement, exhibits a third Technical Fault, the product shall be declared non-compliant.
- XI. Notification of a Technical or Administrative Fault will be made to the Offeror's designated representative via telephone and a written confirmation sent via e-mail. The 48-hour clock will start from the time of the sender's e-mail confirmation of receipt.
- XII. At the request of the Offeror(s), the Technical Authority will demonstrate to the Offeror any fault found during the evaluation.
- XIII. Canada is not obligated to test any or all products or options proposed.
- XIV. The Offeror acknowledges there are inherent complexities with the interoperability of operating systems/environments, networks and hardware. These complexities are further aggravated by rapid changes in technology, which in turn may give rise to unforeseeable complications at the time of demonstration. In such a case, Canada may request that all Offerors, in one or more Categories, upgrade, enhance or otherwise modify the demonstration product(s) beyond that of the requested demonstration configuration (e.g. more ports, different network interface card, different NOS configuration, etc.). Offerors will be notified of the requirement to upgrade the demonstration product(s) in writing and provided with forty-eight (48) hours to comply. In the event that an Offeror's product is physically unable to accommodate the requested change (e.g. it is physically unable to support the increased amount of ports, etc.) as supported by the Offeror's published documentation, and the Offeror advises Canada in writing no later than twenty-four (24) hours prior to the deadline for complying with the requested change, then the request will be withdrawn for all bidders in the applicable Category.
- XV. In the event the Offeror refuses to comply with the request to upgrade the demonstration configuration for one or more product(s), as detailed in Article b.14 (above), for other than the reason identified in Article b.14, the affected product(s) will not receive further consideration.
- XVI. Any product found to contain a virus would be eliminated from the demonstration without further consideration.
- XVII. Any product that has already been proposed as an equivalent, tested and found to be non-compliant, will not be tested again unless the Offeror can demonstrate in writing that the product has been upgraded to render it equivalent. However, no equivalent product will be re-tested within six months of its initial test.