

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

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 0S5

Title - Sujet SENIOR ARCHITECT (LEVEL 3)	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 21120-127132/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 003
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 21120-127132	Date 2013-02-26
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$ZM-379-25430	
File No. - N° de dossier 379zm.21120-127132	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-03-05	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Standard Time EST
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: Croucher, Dennis	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 379zm
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-1195 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-5078
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée
Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)	
Signature	Date

Solicitation Amendment No. 3

Questions and Answers Set No. 3

Question No. 1: RE: Annex D, Evaluation Criteria, Rated Evaluation Criteria – Resources, P.4 Organizational Development Consultant, Level 2, R3 - Experience in the analysis, design, development, implementation, delivery and evaluation of training programs and courses as described in 7.7.02 above. (Note this also applies to the Organizational Development Consultant, Level 2 matrix in Appendix 1 to Annex A).

Could CSC please explain to which paragraph or section in the solicitation document the reference “as described in 7.7.02 above” should be pointing? We cannot find any clause in the solicitation document numbered 7.7.02.

Response No. 1: Please delete both references of “as described in 7.7.02 above” and replace with “as described in R2 above” for this resource category.

Question No. 2: RE: Annex D, Evaluation Criteria, Rated Evaluation Criteria – Resources, P.9 Project Manager, Level 3, R5. Would the CSC please consider removing “C) Making use of Java and related technologies;” from this requirement? As this requirement is an aspect of the Project Lead’s skill set, (i.e. requirement), the Project Manager need not concern themselves with this level of detail in managing the project.

Response No. 2: No.

Question No. 3: RE: Annex D, Evaluation Criteria, Corporate Rated Criteria, R4 With respect to the allocation of points, would CSC please consider the following changes?

- a. Changing the minimum points required from 45 to 30? and,
- b. Removing the requirement that “A minimum of three different federal public service entities must be demonstrated.”?

Each of the other minimum points, (where they apply) on the other rated criteria are set at half of the maximum. Although R1 is an exception to this it is still only at 60%. Setting the minimum

points at 75% of the maximum, (as is the case currently with R4) seems too high in our experience.

If an organization has successfully managed a large team of resources, (i.e. 15 or more), in our experience the application of the processes involved in the effective management of the contractor's employees and sub-contractors are irrelevant of the federal public service entity being serviced.

Response No. 3:

Response No. 3a: Agreed. The minimum required for Corporate Rated Criterion R4 is hereby lowered to 30 points.

Response No. 3b: The requirement will remain. However, to be consistent with the Response to 3a of this question, the requirement is hereby changed to "A minimum of two different federal public service entities must be demonstrated."

Question No. 4: RE: Solicitation Closing Date. Would the CSC please consider extending the solicitation closing date by one week? We understand that a two week extension has already been requested, (Question 4 from Amendment 1). We request the one week extension in trust that in granting the extension the planned timeline for evaluation and the start date of the resources will not be unduly impacted.

Response No. 4: No extension will be made at this time.

Question No. 5: Further to Q&A No. 1, would you mind clarifying the statement "A college diploma will be accepted if it can be demonstrated to be equivalent to either of these." For example, would a 2 or 3 year technical college diploma in a relevant specialized discipline be "equivalent"? Would a university degree with a major or minor in a relevant specialized discipline be equivalent?

Response No. 5: Yes, a 2- or 3-year specialized or concentrated college programme would be considered "equivalent". However, an applied college programme continues to be unacceptable. Yes, both major and minor designations in the specified fields of study are acceptable. Note that contrary to Amendment 1, Response 6, a 3-year university degree (i.e. non-Honours) is also acceptable, assuming a major or minor designation in one or more of the specified fields of study.

Question No. 6: Part 3 of the RFP, more specifically para 3.2, Section I: Technical Bid, item (iv) Customer Reference Contact Information, stipulates that “The Bidder must provide customer references who must each confirm...”

6a. How are we to respond to this requirement? Is it, effectively, Corporate criterion M2? How many customer references are required?

6b. This item (iv) defines CSC’s requirements as being large scale, task driven contracts. It was our interpretation that that definition was to apply to each of the Corporate requirements M1 and R1 through R8. However, Amendment 1, Response 12 seems to allow consecutive small-scale contracts to meet the requirements. This would seem to be contradictory to the intention of item (iv) above; please clarify.

Response No. 6:

Response No. 6a: No, this section is not intended to create an additional Corporate Mandatory criterion. This section is meant to describe the minimum acceptable for any contract referenced within a Bidder’s response to the Corporate criteria. Unless a particular criterion specifies otherwise, every contract referenced by the Bidder must meet the minima found in paragraph 3.2 (iv): \$1 M value, use of TAs, 9 simultaneous resources over 12 months, and Prime Contractor. A modification to these minima appears, for example, in Corporate Mandatory Criterion M1, where the minimum contract value is increased to \$5 M; the remaining 3 minima still apply. Another example is found in Corporate Rated Criterion R4, where the minimum number of resources managed is increased to 15; again, the remaining 3 minima still apply.

Response No. 6b: Yes, the definition provided in item 3.2 (iv) is to apply to each of the Corporate criteria M1 and R1 through R8, unless modified as exemplified in our response to part “a.” of this question. The intent of our response in Amendment 1, Response 12 was to suggest that a series of contracts on a single project, but each worth less than the \$5 M required in M1, may be eligible as an engagement toward some of the Rated criteria, assuming that such contracts individually meet the required minima, as well as the criterion-specific modifications, if any.

Question No. 7: On a significant initiative of this nature one would think CSC would want to ensure that the resources being submitted have a significant relationship with the organization they are being bid by. We would suggest that the bidders be required to provide signed consent forms showing the consultants’ commitment to the bidder organization and the Crown.

Response No. 7: Certifications required are in accordance with the RFP as currently stated.