

**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 0A1 / Noyau 0A1

Gatineau

Québec

**K1A 0S5**

**Bid Fax: (819) 997-9776**

## SOLICITATION AMENDMENT

## MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire, les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

## Comments - Commentaires

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS A SECURITY  
REQUIREMENT (See original solicitation  
document.)

**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

11 Laurier St. / 11, rue Laurier

3C2, Place du Portage

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S

K111 055

<b>Title - Sujet</b> CIC IM/IT/PM TBIPS OMNIBUS		
<b>Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation</b> B8289-100575/B		<b>Amendment No. - N° modif.</b> 006
<b>Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client</b> B8289-100575		<b>Date</b> 2012-03-21
<b>GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG</b> PW-\$\$ZM-380-23739		
<b>File No. - N° de dossier</b> 380zm.B8289-100575	<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> <b>on - le 2012-04-10</b>		<b>Time Zone</b> <b>Fuseau horaire</b> Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
<b>F.O.B. - F.A.B.</b>		
<b>Plant-Usine:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Destination:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other-Autre:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à:</b> Cook, Gail		<b>Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur</b> 380zm
<b>Telephone No. - N° de téléphone</b> (819) 956-2591 ( )		<b>FAX No. - N° de FAX</b> (819) 956-1207
<b>Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction:</b> <b>Destination - des biens, services et construction:</b>  CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION CANADA		

**Instructions: See Herein**

**Instructions: Voir aux présentes**

<b>Delivery Required - Livraison exigée</b>	<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>

## AMENDMENT NO. 006

This amendment is raised to revise the RFP and answer Bidders' questions.

### **RFP REVISIONS:**

**1. At Appendix 1 to Annex A-G1, Stream G1 - Architecture and Integration, Resource Evaluation Criteria, A.3 ERP Programmer Analyst, Level 3 (Core) (Page 49):**

Delete: R4 Experience in programming languages (e.g., Java/.Net, ABAP, ASP 3.0, Visual Basic 6, Cold Fusion Perl, Basic, C, C+, C++, C-sharp, SQL, COBOL, e-Script), middleware (e.g., Jaguar, Tomcat, Tuxedo, MSMQ, Oracle Portal, Citrix, MQ Series, Adobe, SSA-Name-III) and BMC Remedy.

Insert: R4 Experience in programming languages (e.g., Java/.Net, ABAP, ASP 3.0, Visual Basic 6, Cold Fusion Perl, Basic, C, C+, C++, C-sharp, SQL, COBOL, e-Script), middleware (e.g., Jaguar, Tomcat, Tuxedo, MSMQ, Oracle Portal, Citrix, MQ Series, Adobe, and SSA-Name-III).

**2. At Appendix 1 to Annex A-G2, Stream G2 - Application Development, Resource Evaluation Criteria, A.6 Programmer/Software Developer, Level 2 (Core) (Page 72):**

Delete: R3 Experience in designing detailed programs, flow charts, and diagrams indicating mathematical computation and sequence of machine operations necessary to copy and process data and print the results.

Insert: R3 Experience in designing detailed programs, flow charts, use cases, class diagrams, sequence diagrams and activity diagrams using industry standard modelling language such as UML.

**3. At Appendix 1 to Annex A-G2, Stream G2 - Application Development, Resource Evaluation Criteria, A.6 Programmer/Software Developer, Level 3 (Core) (Page 73):**

Delete: R3 Experience leading the design of detailed programs, flow charts, and diagrams indicating mathematical computation and sequence of machine operations necessary to copy and process data and print the results.

Insert: R3 Experience leading the design of detailed programs, flow charts, use cases, class diagrams, sequence diagrams and activity diagrams using industry standard modelling language such as UML.

**4. At Annex D-G1, Stream G1 - Architecture and Integration, Bid Evaluation Criteria, 2. Resources, 2.4 A.3 ERP Programmer Analyst, Level 3 (Core), (Page 141):**

Delete: R4 Experience in programming languages (e.g., Java/.Net, ABAP, ASP 3.0, Visual Basic 6, Cold Fusion Perl, Basic, C, C+, C++, C-sharp, SQL, COBOL, e-Script), middleware (e.g., Jaguar, Tomcat, Tuxedo, MSMQ, Oracle Portal, Citrix, MQ Series, Adobe, SSA-Name-III) and BMC Remedy.

---

Insert: R4 Experience in programming languages (e.g., Java/.Net, ABAP, ASP 3.0, Visual Basic 6, Cold Fusion Perl, Basic, C, C+, C++, C-sharp, SQL, COBOL, e-Script), middleware (e.g., Jaguar, Tomcat, Tuxedo, MSMQ, Oracle Portal, Citrix, MQ Series, Adobe, and SSA-Name-III).

**5. At Annex D-G2, Stream G2 - Application Development, Bid Evaluation Criteria, 2. Resources, 2.1 A.6 Programmer/Software Developer, Level 2 (Core) (Page 148):**

Delete: R3 Experience in designing detailed programs, flow charts, and diagrams indicating mathematical computation and sequence of machine operations necessary to copy and process data and print the results.

Insert: R3 Experience in designing detailed programs, flow charts, use cases, class diagrams, sequence diagrams and activity diagrams using industry standard modelling language such as UML.

**6. At Annex D-G2, Stream G2 - Application Development, Bid Evaluation Criteria, 2. Resources, 2.2 A.6 Programmer/Software Developer, Level 3 (Core) (Page 149):**

Delete: R3 Experience leading the design of detailed programs, flow charts, and diagrams indicating mathematical computation and sequence of machine operations necessary to copy and process data and print the results.

Insert: R3 Experience leading the design of detailed programs, flow charts, use cases, class diagrams, sequence diagrams and activity diagrams using industry standard modelling language such as UML.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:**

Q49. Clarification regarding the following requirements of CIC's TBIPS OMNIBUS RFP, Stream G2, Application Development, Programmer/ Software Developer, Level 2 is requested:

- (a) R3. Experience in designing detailed programs, flow charts, and diagrams indicating mathematical computation and sequence of machine operations necessary to copy and process data and print the results.

What is meant by mathematical computation and sequence of machine operations in this requirement? Would you have an example to illustrate the requirement?

- (b) R4. Experience developing code with programming languages (e.g., Java/.Net, ABAP, ASP 3.0, Visual Basic 6, Cold Fusion Perl, Basic, C, C+, C++, C-sharp, SQL, COBOL, e-Script) and middleware (e.g., Jaguar, Tomcat, Tuxedo, MSMQ, Oracle Portal, Citrix, MQ Series, Adobe, SSA-Name-III).

Does middleware in this requirement refer to specific third party middleware components?

- A49. (a) R3 Requirement is reworded as follows: Experience in designing detailed programs, flow charts, use cases, class diagrams, sequence diagrams, and activity diagrams using industry standard modelling language such as UML.
- (b) The programs and middleware examples listed are not mandatory nor are they all-inclusive.

Q50. In reference to Rated Requirement R4 for the ERP Programmer Analyst in Stream G1, the requirement reads as follows; R4 - Experience in/with programming languages (e.g., Java/.Net, ABAP, ASP3.0, Visual Basic 6, Cold Fusion Perl, Basic, C, C+, C++, C-sharp, SQL, COBOL, e-Script) and middleware (e.g., Jaguar, Tomcat, Tuxedo, MSMQ, Oracle Portal, Citrix, MQ Series, Adobe, SSA-Name-III) and BMC Remedy.

Can the Crown please confirm if the proposed candidate must have experience with all 3 elements, those being programming language, middleware and BMC Remedy; or can the cumulative experience within a combination of these areas be acceptable. In the examples below, can you please confirm which scenario(s) are acceptable.

Ex: Programming/Middleware/BMC Remedy  
 Programming/Middleware  
 Programming/BMC Remedy  
 Middleware/BMC Remedy  
 Programming

A50. "BMC Remedy" has been removed from R4 of A.3 ERP Programmer Analyst, Level 3 under G1 Stream. The programming language examples listed are not mandatory nor are they all-inclusive. Therefore, cumulative experience within a combination of areas is acceptable.

- 
- Q51. In regards to A.8 System Analyst (L2 & L3 Core) in Stream G2 and I.11 Technology Architect (L2 Core) in Stream G1 examples of programming and middle tier platforms are given. Can the Crown please confirm if these are just examples and therefore will the Crown accept other programming languages such as BASH, KSH, html, Kixtart, and batch file programming, as well as other middle tiers such as IIS and Citrix Metaframe?
- A51. The programming language examples listed are not mandatory nor are they all-inclusive. Therefore, other applicable programming languages and/or middleware are acceptable.
- Q52. When responding to the resource evaluation grids in Annex D, will it be acceptable to provide numbered references to résumé contents within the column titled "Cross Reference to Résumé (page, para)" - e.g. bullet x within project y?
- A52. See A31. of Solicitation Amendment No. 005.
- Q53. Can one resource be bid by more than one company in the same stream and same category?
- A53. Yes.
- Q54. Can the same resource be bid by two different companies in a different category?
- A54. Yes.
- Q55. Can the same resource be bid in a different category in the same stream?
- A55. No.
- Q56. Can the same resource be bid in a different category in a different stream?
- A56. Yes.
- Q57. Is a reference for each project required regarding a resource's resume. For example if a resource has 7 projects that justify their seven years of experience do we need a reference for all seven projects? Normally we would provide two references per resource for two different but relevant projects, is that satisfactory?
- A57. A resource reference is not required for all projects.
- Q58. Would CIC consider accepting a reference for a Project Management Support Service contract that is a) with the Canadian federal government, and b) within the NCR as meeting the requirements of for both M1 and M2 in Annex D - Stream G4 and Stream G3 given the project meets all of the requirements identified in both M1 and M2?
- A58. No.

Q59. Pages 48 and 49 of this RFP define the mandatory and rated requirements for ERP Programmer Analyst, Levels 2 and 3. The same requirements are repeated in the grids on pages 140 and 141 but R1, R2 and R3 for Level 2 and Level 3 seem to be reversed.

A59. See RFP Revisions Item 10. and Item 11. of Solicitation Amd. No. 004.

Q60. Can you confirm that R1 on page 140 which reads "Experience developing low-level detailed requirements, programming, and systems development of ERP Systems" should be "Experience leading the development of low-level detailed requirements, programming, and systems development of ERP Systems"?

A60. R1 for the A.3 ERP Programmer Analyst, Level 2 (Core) on page 140 which reads "Experience developing low-level detailed requirements, programming, and systems development of ERP Systems." is correct.

Q61. Can you also confirm that R2 on page 140 which reads "Experience leading the translation of ERP business requirements into systems design and specifications" should it be "Experience in translating ERP business requirements into systems design and specifications"?

A61. Confirmed. See RFP Revisions Item 10. of Solicitation Amd. No. 004.

Q62. Can you also confirm that R3 on page 140 which reads "Experience leading ERP system testing and implementation" should in fact be "Experience in ERP system testing and implementation".

A62. Confirmed. See RFP Revisions Item 10. of Solicitation Amd. No. 004.

Q63. We would also like to confirm that R1 on page 141 should be "Experience developing low-level detailed requirements, programming, and systems development of ERP Systems", R2 on page 202 should be "Experience leading the translation of ERP business requirements into systems design and specifications" and that R3 on Page 141 should be "Experience leading ERP system testing and implementation".

A63. R1 for the A.3 ERP Programmer Analyst, Level 3 (Core) on page 141 which reads "Experience leading the development of low-level detailed requirements, programming, and systems development of ERP Systems." is correct.

R2 for the A.3 ERP Programmer Analyst, Level 3 (Core) on page 141 has been revised. See RFP Revisions Item 11. of Solicitation Amd. No. 004.

R3 for the A.3 ERP Programmer Analyst, Level 3 (Core) on page 141 has been revised. See RFP Revisions Item 11. of Solicitation Amd. No. 004.

- 
- Q64. Page 141 – ERP Programmer Analyst (Level 3) – Rated Requirement 4 states: Experience in programming languages (e.g., Java/.Net, ABAP, ASP 3.0, Visual Basic 6, Cold Fusion Perl, Basic, C, C+, C++, C-sharp, SQL, COBOL, e-Script), middleware (e.g., Jaguar, Tomcat, Tuxedo, MSMQ, Oracle Portal, Citrix, MQ Series, Adobe, SSA-Name-III) and BMC Remedy.
- (a) Are resources required to have experience in all three elements (programming languages, middleware and BMC Remedy) in order to score points?
  - (b) Would a combination of 2 elements (programming languages and middleware) also score points?
  - (c) Would any other software application be accepted other than BMC Remedy?
- A64. The programming language examples listed are not mandatory nor are they all-inclusive. Therefore, cumulative experience within a combination of areas is acceptable. R4 will be reworded to remove reference to “BMC Remedy”).
- Q65. Please note that the changes outlined in Amendment #4 are significant and affect the vast majority of the positions in the solicitation, which even includes the addition and exclusion of roles. As a result of these significant changes many of the resources previously identified are no longer compliant and therefore we will be required to recruit additional resources to fill these roles. In light of these changes, we respectfully ask that the Crown to further extend the closing date of the solicitation to April 23<sup>rd</sup> 2012 at the earliest. In essence the changes outlined in Amendment #4 will cause many firms to have to re-start the response process, including which Stream they are capable to respond to. This essentially brings many firms back to day 1 of the process.
- A65. Although there are numerous revisions, overall they are not considered significant to the extent of having to re-start the response process. Therefore, an extension to April 23, 2012 is not being considered, however the closing date has been extended to April 10, 2012.
- Q66. Under RFP Page 9, it states that “Multiple bids from the same Bidder for a Stream are not permitted in response to this bid solicitation and that each Bidder must submit only a single bid for each Stream...” Please advise on the following:
- If Company A and B are on the bidders list as separate companies and have no affiliation with each other, are they both able to submit individual bids as well as work together as subcontractors on each other's bids if they disclose this information in their respective bids (i.e. Company A submits a bid and Company B is identified as a subcontractor and vice versa)? In this instance, would it be okay for Company A and Company B to discuss rates if it is disclosed? What information would need to be disclosed?
- A66. Please refer to the link to the Competition Bureau's website at:
- [http://www.competitionbureau.gc.ca/eic/site/cb-bc.nsf/eng/h\\_00110.html](http://www.competitionbureau.gc.ca/eic/site/cb-bc.nsf/eng/h_00110.html)
- If you do intend to discuss pricing then you will need to tell PWGSC explicitly that you have done so on or before the time you submit your bid.

- Q67. Based on the response provided for Q&A12 of Solicitation Amd. No. 003, would the Crown please confirm that the example detailed below would be compliant.

Example: in response to M1 for Stream G1: Project reference #1 makes reference to A.1 Application/Software Architect Level 2 and ERP Programmer Analyst Level 3. Project reference #2 makes reference to Technology Architect Level 2 and Enterprise Architect Level 3.

- A67. The example would be compliant.

- Q68. Please confirm Bidders may propose the same resource in multiple streams as each stream will be evaluated separately.

- A68. Confirmed.

- Q69. Reference: Item 4.4 Basis of Selection, page 15 of 164, sub-item (b)

Portion of item reads:

A technically responsive bid is one that meets all mandatory technical criteria identified in this solicitation and obtains the required minimum of 70 percent overall of the points for the Bidder and for each of the proposed resources for the technical evaluation criteria which are subject to point rating.

The two lowest-priced technically responsive bids will be ranked from lowest to highest cost.

This establishes that the winning bids will be based on lowest-cost compliance. The majority of roles defined in the work streams are all Level 2 and Level 3 resources, and most would be considered knowledge-based resources who provide value-added experience. The selection of lowest-cost compliant suppliers will achieve the opposite of the implied desire, which is presumably to secure a consistently reliable source of resources that will provide high levels of service for reasonable rates. Lowest cost is suitable for acquiring commodities that meet a fixed set of performance criteria, not for acquiring knowledge-based services. Lowest-cost compliant also encourages to the extreme the practice of "tanking" rates in order to secure business that is essentially based totally on cost, and then trying to figure out whether it can be serviced afterwards. There are many examples of supply arrangements where lowest-cost compliance of knowledge-based resources was used as the basis for selection that would in retrospect be considered to have failed to support the achievement of business goals. The belief that financial price substantiation is sufficient to safeguard against this is proven invalid by the failure of these supply arrangements and by the fact that almost every respondent can produce at least one resource they have placed that satisfies a low price, but rarely is it a practice and more than likely it was an outright exception. There are on the other hand examples of supply arrangements using recently developed financial evaluation methods that prevent tanking of rates, but still ensure that CIC would receive cost-competitive rates. PWGSC's recent RFP for Professional Advisory Services – solicitation # EP549-120248/A – is an example of a financial evaluation method that still ensures cost-competitiveness while making the practice of "tanking" punitive points-wise to the respondent. Accordingly, we request that CIC consider altering the financial evaluation by means of one/more of the following:

- Adapt the pricing model to be consistent with solicitation EP549-120248/A, and make the technical component be evaluated on the basis of full scores, so that the two respondents with the highest overall scores are selected.



- If no change to lowest-cost compliant approach, then adjust financial price justification so that the respondent must provide four (4) examples of each role that ends up being subject to financial price justification
- Adapt the price model so that the score is based on the highest score achieved from the combination of technical score and price as opposed to lowest-cost compliant. The scores must be evaluated regardless in order to determine if they meet the minimum point threshold.
- Adapt the price model so that the score is based on cost-per point.

A69. The Basis of Selection methodology will remain unchanged.

Q70. The CIC IM/IT/PM Omnibus TBIPS requirement is intended to be the primary contracting vehicle for CIC and will constitute a major success factor for CIC's ability to meet their obligations. The resulting Task Authorizations' tight turnaround time and variety of categories are also significant. It is clear that CIC recognizes this in its Corporate Rated Criteria which are based on two key criteria: Contract Management Plan and Client Manager. And yet the evaluation methodology of lowest priced technically compliant is out of line with CIC's intent of contracting with suppliers with proven ability to deliver on these types of contracts. We ask that CIC revise the evaluation methodology to one that better recognizes the importance of the corporate capabilities within the Bidder Rated Requirements-through a 70% technical, 30% financial evaluation.

Should CIC settle with a lower caliber company, the fulfillment results will be unsatisfactory to the Crown. It is possible for a Bidder to score 6/10 on each component of R1, Contract Management Plan and 30/30 on R2, Client Manager and still be compliant and therefore a potential winner. We maintain that CIC requires suppliers with contract management plans that is better than 6/10 to properly fulfill.

A70. The Basis of Selection methodology will remain unchanged.

Q71. In reference to Amendment 4, Answer 18 "A different title is acceptable, as long as it is clearly demonstrated that the position clearly aligns with category description in the SOW". By "clearly demonstrating", will the Crown accept a simply checklist of the applicable responsibilities? As well, will the Crown accept 50% or more of the responsibilities per core resource category? For example: Application/Software Architect Level 2 and 3 lists a. to k. (11 responsibilities). Is it acceptable to the Crown that a Bidder check off 6 to 11 responsibilities that are applicable to the contract used for M1?

A71. The SOW provides a non -inclusive list of category responsibilities. Rather than checking off experience in a minimum percentage of category responsibilities, it is expected that Bidders will demonstrate that a resource has experience in performing the broad scope of category responsibilities.

- Q72. "In Stream G4 – Project Management, several of the Core Roles have rated criteria which score candidates suitability with respect to the number of projects for which they have a particular skill set. For example: Project Manager – L3

RATED REQUIREMENTS					
	Description	Years Experience	# Projects	Point Rating	Cross Reference to Résumé (page, para)
R1	Experience in the initiation of a project (e.g., development of Business Objectives, Scope, Charter).		1 project	2	
			2 projects	4	
			3 projects	6	
			4 projects	8	
			5+ projects	10	

Can the client please confirm that in order to score maximum points (10), the candidate must have experience on "five or more" projects OR must the candidate have experience on "more than five" (i.e. 6 or more projects) to achieve maximum points?

- A72. Confirmed, the candidate must have five or more projects to achieve maximum points.

- Q73. Although there is no specific requirement for the resources within G1 Stream to have ABAP programming experience, in order to meet the Corporate requirement, the required reference MUST have provided resources in all of the Core categories. Therefore the reference must include providing ERP Programmer Analyst resources within an Architecture and Integration reference.

Given that this is an Architecture and Integration stream and our understanding is that the term "architecture" has been adopted to describe the activity of designing any kind of system and "Integration" the engineering practices and procedures for assembling large and complicated systems from less-complicated units, especially subsystems, we question why any of the ERP categories would reside within this stream.

We recommend one of the following

- Move all ERP categories from G1 Stream to one of the specialized Streams
- Do not include any of the ERP categories as Core categories

Failing to do one of the above is eliminating any company who specializes in Architecture and Integration resources from bidding and therefore minimizing competition.

- A73. There will be no change in the G1 categories.

- Q74. In Stream S1 it is clear the ERP is for PeopleSoft Development, in Stream S2 it is clear the ERP is for SAP development and Stream S3 it is clear the ERP is for SAS development, can you please clarify what type of ERP you are referring to in G1?

- A74. Unlike the Specialist (S) Streams, the General (G) Streams are not limited to a specific ERP.

- 
- Q75. Page 11 – Customer Reference Contact Information (iv) – Please confirm this section only applies to the Bidder's corporate requirements (mandatory and rated) and not to the proposed resources. As per section 4.2 (e) the Contracting Authority reserves the right to request references from a Bidder to conduct a reference check to verify the accuracy of the information provided.
- A75. Bidders must provide references in accordance with Annex D, Bid Evaluation Criteria.
- Q86. For each Stream's Basis of Payment tables we wanted to confirm that Bidders are to provide ceiling per diem rates as per the page 163, 2.0 The Contractor's TA Quotation, sub-article 2.1). There are no wordings within each of the basis of payment sections (or tables) that indicate rates requested are ceiling per diem rates and yet under the Tasking Procedure, it is apparent that the Crown is requesting ceiling rates.
- A76. As stated in section 4.3 (a), the Bidder must provide firm, all-inclusive per diem rates for each Resource Category identified in Annex B. The Basis of Payment tables refer to the Bidder's Supply Arrangement ceiling rates and that the proposed firm per diem rates must not exceed the SA ceiling rates. Appendix A to Annex A, Tasking Procedure, sub-article 2.1 refers to the Basis of Payment which details the firm per diem rates for any resulting contract.
- Bidders are to provide firm, all-inclusive per diem rates, not ceiling rates for the basis of payment.
- Q77. Multiple bids (page 9 of 164). We wanted to confirm that if a company is a qualified TBIPS Tier 2 supplier and is also part of a joint venture that is a recognized TBIPS Tier 2 supplier, article 3.1 (c) of Part 3 – Bid Preparation Instructions prohibits the company from submitting two bids (one on its own and one via the joint venture).
- A77. Confirmed.
- Q78. Rated Criteria R4 for the System Analyst Level 2 and Level 3 ask for experience in programming languages and middleware. Would experience with J2EE or IBM WebSphere qualify as middleware experience?
- A78. Yes.
- Q79. On page 15, the Crown states that *"If more than one Bidder is ranked first because of identical lowest priced technically responsive bids, then the Bidder with the higher technical score will become the top-ranked Bidder."*
- The Bidder Rated Criteria is based on two criteria: the contract management plan and the client manager experience. It is possible that multiple bidders may get identical total scores on both R1 and R2. Further, it is possible that multiple bidders may score identically on the resource rated requirements for the same stream. In the case of identical lowest priced technically compliant proposals, how does the Crown determine contract award in the event that two or more Bidder have identical technical scores on both the corporate and resource rated criteria?
- A79. Please refer to the Supply Manual, Section 5.65 Identical Low Bids - Best Value.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

B8289-100575/B

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

006

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

380zm

Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client

B8289-100575

File No. - N° du dossier

380zmB8289-100575

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

---

Q80. We are aware that a resource cannot be submitted under multiple resource categories under the one stream. Is it acceptable to submit a resource in one resource category under multiple streams?

A80. Confirmed.

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

**NOTE: A BID ALREADY SUBMITTED MAY BE AMENDED PRIOR TO THE CLOSING DATE. AMENDING CORRESPONDENCE SHALL ADDRESS THE SOLICITATION NUMBER AND THE CLOSING DATE AND SHALL BE ADDRESSED TO:**

**BID RECEIVING  
PUBLIC WORKS AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES CANADA  
PLACE DU PORTAGE, PHASE III  
MAIN LOBBY, ROOM 0A1  
11 LAURIER STREET  
GATINEAU, QUEBEC K1A 0S5**