

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

**Revision to a Request for Supply
Arrangement - Révision à une demande
pour un arrangement en matière
d'approvisionnement**

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

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Electronic Information Technology Professional Srv
Div/Div des srv professionnels en technologie de
l'information électronique

11 Laurier St. / 11 rue Laurier

Portage III 0A1 - 1

Gatineau

Québec

K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet TBIPS		
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation EN578-055605/E		Date 2013-02-20
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client EN578-055605		Amendment No. - N° modif. 007
File No. - N° de dossier 003ei.EN578-055605	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME	
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EI-003-25338		
Date of Original Request for Supply Arrangement Date de demande pour un arrangement en matière d'app. originale		2013-01-18
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-03-15		Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Benoit(003ei), Real		Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 003ei
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 934-4667 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-7827	
Delivery Required - Livraison exigée		
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:		
Security - Sécurité This revision does not change the security requirements of the solicitation. Cette révision ne change pas les besoins en matière de sécurité de l'invitation.		

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Acknowledgement copy required Accusé de réception requis	Yes - Oui <input type="checkbox"/>	No - Non <input type="checkbox"/>
The Offeror hereby acknowledges this revision to its Offer. Le proposant constate, par la présente, cette révision à son offre.		
Signature	Date	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of offeror. (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du proposant. (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)		
For the Minister - Pour le Ministre		

Solicitation Amendment #7

This Solicitation Amendment is raised to make the following:

- A: Modification #7**
 - A-1: Modification #8 (in the french version only)**
 - B: Clarification #10**
 - C: Questions and Answers**
-

The deadline to submit questions is March 1, 2013.

A:
Modification #7
Delete the closing date: March 4, 2013

Insert the new closing date: March 15, 2013

A-1:
Modification #8
(resulting contract clauses for the SA and SO in french)

B: Clarification #10

Current TBIPS Holders are being requested to enter the following certifications through the Data Collection Component (DCC): FCP EE, Former Public Servant, Work Force Reduction Program, Aboriginal Business Certification, Code of Conduct, Security.

PWGSC recognizes that current TBIPS Holders have already provided these certifications through the previous bid solicitation or SA/SO amendment. As the DCC is a new tool, bidders are asked to input their information. Although this information is not mandatory, it is required for the system to work properly.

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
EN578-055605/E
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
EN578-055605

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
007
File No. - N° du dossier
003eiEN578-055605

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur
003ei
CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

C: Questions and answers

Q 78:

1. We currently hold two Tier 1 TBIPS SO's and SA's. One directly, one under a CJV.

My questions is, can we partner with another firm to be part of a Tier 2 JV?

Is the limit of (2 TBIPS per Tier) or in total regardless of Tiers?

2. We are working on a TBIPS refresh, however we are also working on adding a couple of new STREAMS and multiple CATEGORIES.

Getting together all the information for references to substantiate is very time consuming.

We respectfully request an extension of two weeks.

A 78

- 1) The limit is two bids regardless of Tiers.
- 2) Please see Modification #7 of this solicitation amendment.

Q 79:

1. Would the following be considered compliant in response to the required table for M4?

Contract/Project Title	Contract/Project Number	Start Date	End Date	Amount Billed (Informatics Professional Services)	Description of the Services Performed	The Bidder warrants that the total amount to the subsidiary does not exceed 50% of the TCVB. Indicate "Confirmed"
Client X – Information Management & Information Technology Professional Services		2010-04-01	Present	\$5, 250, 000.00	A. Provide Description of the contract/project and purpose/SOW B. List categories of personnel supported/required within contract/project; C. List categories of personnel that vendor has placed resources against, including count within each. Example: We have placed 14 ProgrammerAnalysts, 3 Testers and 23 Systems Analysts throughout the duration of this contract in support of our client;	Confirmed
Client Y – Project Management & Business Support Services		2011-11-01	Present	\$7, 430, 000.00	A. Provide Description of the contract/project and purpose/SOW	Confirmed

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation

EN578-055605/E

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.

007

Buyer ID - Id de l'acheteur

003ei

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

EN578-055605

File No. - N° du dossier

003eiEN578-055605

CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No/ N° VME

					<p>B. List categories of personnel supported/required within contract/project;</p> <p>C. List categories of personnel that vendor has placed resources against, including count within each Example: We have placed 19 Project Managers and 30 Business Analysts throughout the duration of this contract in support of our client;</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

2. Would we then need to also provide in our physical response all of the invoices relevant to the total claimed for (Amount Billed) against each of the projects outlined in the table above or would providing the completed table as above suffice? As per the way the instructions for responding to M4 are laid out presently, do sole bidders only need to provide the table above and are bidders in JV required to provide the table and invoices (see wording differences in the instructions for how to respond to M4 specifically between M4.1 and then M4.2/M4.3). One part of the instructions (M4.1 for sole bidders) seems to only seek submission of the table above while the other two parts of the instructions specific to JV and parent/subsidiary arrangements (M4.2 and M4.3) seem to seek completion of the table and additional submission of invoices in support of what is being claimed in the response table.

A 79:

- 1) Yes. Please note that all information provided is subject to verification.
- 2) Bidders are not required to submit invoices with the bid submission. However, for verification purposes Canada may request the bidder to provide invoices that contain the minimum information required to meet M.4.

Q 80:

We are a current TBIPS Tier 1 and 2 SA and SO holder. In one category - I.5 IM Architect - we have been unable to bid some SA RFPs as we had not been financially compliant, although we were technically compliant.

- 1) As it seems there will not be rates attributed to the “new” TBIPS SAs, please confirm that we would now be eligible to bid opportunities calling for this category?
- 2) And as of when would we be eligible to bid a I.5 category resource?

A 80:

- 1) If you are technically compliant for I.5, then you will be eligible to bid on opportunities calling for that category.

2) Once the evaluations are completed and the new SA's and SO's have been awarded.

Q 81:

Regarding requirement for Code of Conduct Certifications - Consent to a Criminal Record Verification

DCC /Certifications / Code of Conduct says “a properly completed and signed form Consent to a Criminal Record Verification (PWGSC-TPSGC 229) included in Attachment 2 to Part 5, for each individual named in the aforementioned list” is to be submitted with the bid

Bid Package PART5 – Certifications / (iv) – Code of Conduct / Para. 4 says

Canada may, at any time, request that a Bidder provide completed and Signed Consent Forms (Consent to a Criminal Record Verification form – PWGSC – TPSGC 229) for and or all individuals aforementioned within the time specified ...”

Question :Are PWGSC – TPSGC 229 forms to be submitted with the hard copy bid?

A 81:

No

Q 82:

Another question is this: In the prior refresh, we qualified for Standing Offer status only but this year, we are applying for SA Tier 1.

1. a) Will all of the categories that were deemed to be Technically Compliant, be entitled to be eligible for Grandfathering or

b) do you require us to indicate this is a new application and submit client references for every category that we are applying for, since the proposed level <from SO level to SA Tier 1> may potentially be modified.

2. a) Finally, following the refresh, if we develop the expertise in our company in a new stream or category while working with a client, can we revise our TBIPS application to include this new information without waiting for the next refresh?

b) If so, how long do you anticipate your department approval based on this new information requiring? Will there be no more annual refreshes as in the past?

A 82:

1.a) Yes.

1.b) No. Please refer to Solicitation Amendment #4, A18, 1.

2 a) No

2 b) The target to complete the evaluations and award the new SA's and SO's is the Summer of 2013. Please refer to Amendment #4, Modification #2.

Q 83:

We would like to ask the following question in response to Solicitation EN578-055605/E, TBIPS:

In the DCC of the supplier's module of the CPSS, there is a section entitled "Regional Information" where bidders need to select which regions/metropolitan areas for which they would like to offer/provide services.

We are an existing TBIPS SO and SA holder and already have regions for which we have qualified. We are interested in having the same regions for the TBIPS refresh.

Please confirm whether we can simply choose these same regions in the DCC or if we need to also choose the metropolitan areas in these regions.

For example, if we have qualified for the Atlantic region, can we simply choose the Atlantic region or would we also have to choose the metropolitan areas of Halifax and Moncton?

A 83:

The metropolitan areas and the regions are independent from one another. In your example, if you wish to offer services in the Atlantic Region including the metropolitan areas of Halifax and Moncton, then you must select all of them in the DCC (ie: the Atlantic Region, the Halifax metropolitan area, and the Moncton metropolitan area). A bidder who indicates in the DCC that they want to provide services to the Atlantic Region but does not select Halifax or Moncton, will not appear on any search result lists where the client department runs the search under the metropolitan area.

Q 84:

We are an existing TBIPS holder and will not be changing the Technical Offer which is already on file from the previous TBIPS Solicitation. As such, we understand that Column C in the Submission Grid in Part 3 (Bid Preparation Instructions), Item 1.4 (Submission Grid) on page 15 of 108, applies to us.

We are, however, somewhat confused as to the information which we need to complete online through the DCC of the Supplier's Module of the CPSS.

Question #1:

A) Please confirm that although all of the sections listed in the Submission Grid appear in the DCC, the only sections which we would need to complete through the DCC are as follows:

- **Region & Metropolitan Area selection**
- **Mandatory M.5 (Identification of Categories)**
- **Financial Offer (for the RFSO only)**
- **Bidder's Statement**
- **Grandfather Certification.**

B) Should we by accident complete some sections other than those five sections listed in Question 1A) above, would our bid be considered non-responsive?

Question #2:

The Grandfather Certification does not seem to contain any references to the following: FCP EE Certification, Work Force Reduction Program Certification, Former Public Servant Certification, Aboriginal Business Certification, and Code of Conduct Certification.

Please confirm whether these five certifications are implied in the Grandfather Certification, whereby with signing and submitting the Grandfather Certification, we will be submitting these certifications as well, or whether we need to complete these certifications in the DCC.

A 84:

- 1.a) Yes, that is correct.
- 1.b) Any information provided in a bid may be used for evaluation purposes.
2. Please refer to Clarification #10 of this Solicitation Amendment.

Q 85:

In the CPSS module, I selected Tier 2, and I didn't see the Total Cumulative Value Billed SA Tier 2 option in the mandatory criteria menu. I thought that I had to demonstrate a

billing threshold of 12 million dollars for the last three years. Is it normal that I don't have the Tier 2 option?

A 85:

Yes. Please refer to Attachment C of the solicitation, M.4, 1.

Q 86:

We have the following question regarding the subject RFSA:

Question 1) Can you please clarify if a company is allowed to submit bids in solo and as part of 2 different joint venture arrangements as long as the company is only part of 2 bids in each stream?

For example, Company A currently holds a TBIPS SA as itself "Company A" and as "Company A and B in joint venture" under streams 1, 3, 4 and 5. Company A is currently qualified under the Cyber Protection Supply Arrangement as itself "Company A" and as "Company A and C in joint venture" and wishes to bid on the TBIPS Stream 6 both as itself "Company A" and as "Company A and C in joint venture". Our understanding is that a company can only hold 2 supply arrangements under TBIPS for a given stream. In this case, Company A would hold 2 SAs only (as itself and in joint venture with company B) for each of stream 1, 3, 4 and 5; and would hold 2 SAs only (as itself and in joint venture with company C) for stream 6. Please confirm if our understanding is correct. If not, can you please provide further clarification on number of bids allowed by one company?

Question 2) Our company is also considering bidding as part of a joint venture on the Aboriginal set aside. Can you please advise if this is permitted?

A 86:

1) No. One company can hold a maximum of two supply arrangements. Company "A" can submit one bid on its own, and one bid with either Company "B" or Company "C".

2) Yes

Q 87:

I have additional questions regarding the TBIPS refresh:

1. In the DCC, in the Streams/Categories Substantiation Forms, there is a box at the bottom for "Subsidiary of JV Member". Please confirm that the "Name of Resource:" field is optional. It seems unnecessary considering it is not a required element for non-subsidiary, non-JV member projects.

a) If it is a required field, what are we supposed to enter therein? If multiple resources were provided for that category, do we enter them all in here?

2. With regards to TCVB, do we enter the “Start Date” for the contract, or the “Start Date” for when we counted invoices as billed revenue. For example, if a project started in January 2008, but we are only counting revenue starting March 2010 in accordance with the RFP, which date would we enter into the table? Similarly, for projects that aren't complete, do we enter “on-going” in the end date or do we enter February 28th as the last date invoices were counted.

3. Does the “Main Contact” in CPSS, i.e. the person who will submit the electronic portion of the bid, need to be the same person as who will sign the hard copy certifications?

4. Regarding M.1, Financial Certification: Where this is signed by the bidder's authorized representative, and that representative is not the CEO or CFO, do we still provide the CEO or CFO contact information in the form, or do we provide the information for the person who signed?

5. Could you please elaborate on “Email for Search Results” and “Email for Credentials” on the Regional Contact form? What is the purpose of each? How will each be used?

6. Do new suppliers simply ignore and leave the Grandfather Certification form blank in the DCC?

7. The Code of Conduct Certification indicates that we are to provide a list of all Directors of the organization, along with signed and completed Consent to Criminal Record verification form for each with the bid. This is not reflected in the submission grid on page 15 of the RFSA/RFSO. Could you please:

a. Confirm that you would in fact like this to be completed and included as part of our submissions;

b. If yes to (a), could you add a data entry element to the DCC on the Code of Conduct page to enter the names of the directors, and distribute a copy of the required form?

A 87:

1) Yes this field is optional.

2) The start and end date represent the range of time in which the invoices were submitted to the client (invoice date).

3) No

4) Yes. The CEO or CFO's information is required as indicated in the DCC.

5) The email address that is provided in the "Email for Search Results" field is the email address that is displayed in the CPSS search result list. It is specific to a region or metropolitan area. This email address will be used by client departments to send their RFP or ACF forms.

Regional and metropolitan area contacts being assigned in the DCC will only receive their credentials once they have been awarded an SO or SA.

The email address that is provided in the "Email for Credentials" field is the email address that CPSS will use to send the contacts their credentials (i.e. userid and password)

6) That is correct.

7 a) No

7 b) N/A

Q 88

Answer to Q31 in amendment 4 is not the same as the statement in the RFP M.4.

Answer to Q31 states, The eligible period to meet M4 is based on 36 months prior to the date of bid submission (currently from March 2010 to February 2013). But the original RFP states the eligibility period as "Within the last three years immediately prior to the date of bid submission." This means, eligible period should be from March 5th 2010 to March 4th 2013. Please clarify.

A 88:

The revised eligible period is from March 4, 2010 to March 15, 2013. Please refer to Modification #7 in the Solicitation Amendment #7.

Q 89

I noticed that the newly created stream #6 Cyber Protection Services, includes 3 categories that were previously contained in, and moved from stream #3

(I.12, I.13, I.15). The document that was sent out to previous / existing TBIPS suppliers by IMOS in January (.pdf), has 2 of these categories (C5 & C16) now located in stream #6 and listed as "Technically Compliant". This seems to indicate that if C5 & C16 had been previously successfully substantiated in an earlier refresh and deemed technically compliant (as mine was), then I would be able to automatically offer these C5 & C16 in the newly created stream #6 without having to provide a substantiation (reference) for C5 & C16, or any other category in the stream.

1) Essentially what I'm asking is: right now, moving forward, if I provide no substantiation (references) for any category in stream #6, am I still awarded C5 & C16 by default?

2) If this is correct, then should there not be a drop down box option that reads “Currently Substantiated” for stream #6?

A 89:

1) No. You must meet the minimum number of substantiated categories to qualify for this stream. You already have two, therefore you need four more to qualify for Tier 1 or 7 more to qualify for Tier 2.

2) From the “Stream and Category Selection” page of the DCC, select the Stream as “Currently Offered”. From there, identify C.5 and C.16 as “currently substantiated” categories. Then identify the other categories that you wish to substantiated as “newly substantiated.”

Q 90

I have a few questions regarding the TBIPS Renewal process -

I understand that there are Streams, Categories within streams, and Substantiated and Unsubstantiated Categories. And Tiers.

Questions:

1) Does this mean that to substantiate a category, I only need to provide one (1) reference for that category?

2) To qualify for a particular stream within a tier, I need to have substantiated a minimum number of categories with that stream?

3) Can I use the same reference to substantiate multiple categories within a stream, and the same reference to substantiate references across multiple streams? If so, I assume they'll be treated as separate evaluation exercises?

4) I don't understand what this means: "the unsubstantiated Categories submitted through this bid process can only be awarded against Categories substantiated through this bid process"

A 90:

1) Correct

2) Correct

3) Yes you can use the same Reference for multiple category.

4) Newly unsubstantiated categories can only be awarded against newly substantiated categories from this bid solicitation. Unsubstantiated categories cannot be awarded using Categories that received a positive reference from a previous bid solicitation.

Q 91

This question is in regard to substantiation of previous client contracts in order to qualify for a particular category. In a previous refresh, our firm had provided names and related contact information from previous government clients. For whatever reasons, some of these

individuals were unable to verify the substantiation(s), despite the fact that their names as well as details of the work provided could be found on the contract that we had with this client.

I do understand how this can happen as it's quite possible that a particular government client contact could be used by dozens of companies seeking a substantiations for TBIPS as well as other tenders (ex. THS, SBIPS). This would mean that PWGSC could be sending one individual contact, a significant number of emails seeking verification related to several different contracts. IT Managers and contracting personnel are amongst the busiest and hardest working people in the Public service and therefore don't always respond to all their emails / phone messages. Given the nature of their jobs, these IT Managers and contracting officials might not likely have the time to be going through many of their records and documents to determine whether someone has worked in their department as far back as three years ago.

Additionally, with the recent layoffs in the public service, many of these officials may no longer be employed with the government, and thus could be unavailable to substantiate a reference. These individuals may in certain cases, be the only people who are able to accurately substantiate a reference.

It has been suggested that a bidder should verify beforehand (by first checking with a reference) whether or not that individual is willing or able to act as a reference and to find an alternate reference in instances where an individual named may not be able or might not be willing to verify a contract. However, bidders are not in a position, nor would it be accurate to give alternate names of people who are not directly related to a contract. Consistent with TBIPS rules, a bidder has an obligation to provide you with the most accurate contact information.

In our previous refresh, the substantiating names given by our company were the names of either the contracting or technical authority associated with the assignment. These names are featured on either the actual contract or related contractual documents. If those individuals cannot or will not confirm, or refuse to participate then there is little the bidder can do. Government procurement officials in various government departments have mentioned to me in the past that a contract is the most reliable and accurate means of proving that a company has previous experience providing professional services to a government department. The best, indeed the only true and valid substantiation, is the name of the government representative listed on the contract. It seems perhaps unfair that a bidder may possibly be overlooked, for providing you with the most accurate information possible, irrespective of what a reference might say when contacted.

I do respect that PWGSC has made significant progress in streamlining this TBIPS renewal process. However, there is a lot of emphasis put on the contact and perhaps not enough emphasis on providing a more accurate substantiation. In fairness to busy government procurement and IT officials who might have other priorities, and in fairness to companies who have legitimate previous work experience with a client which might not be easily substantiated, I request that in situations where a contact provided was unable, unwilling or unavailable to substantiate a reference, a company be given an opportunity to provide a copy of a contract to PWGSC in order to properly substantiate that reference.

A 91:

This request is denied.

Q 92

In Section 2 (Certifications Precedent to Issuance of a Standing Offer or Supply Arrangement), item (iv) (Code of Conduct Certification), point 4, states that Canada may, at any time, request that a Bidder provide properly completed and Signed Consent Forms for any or all individuals identified as being on the Board of Directors of the organization bidding on TBIPS. In CPSS, under the Code of Conduct Certification section, the statements require that “the following must be submitted with the bid” on the bid closing date.

These 2 requirements are in conflict – Canada may request the Bidder to provide the Consent forms (in the RFSA document), and must be submitted with the bid (in CPSS).

1 a) Clarification is sought regarding what is required to be submitted at the bid closing date. Must bidders submitted signed Consent forms from all identifies Board of Director members at bid closing date?

1 b) In some cases, Board of Director members may not be Canadian citizens, may not reside in Canada, may include numerous members (10 or more), and may have extensive commitments and responsibilities associated with managing a large multi-national organizations and extensive budgets. The time required to process the Consent form within the organization and submit the signed form with the bid may be impossible to achieve. Will the requirement to submit the “properly completed and signed Consent” form with the proposal submission on the closing date be removed to allow more time for this to be accomplished?

A 92:

1 a) No

1 b) N/A