

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 - EL
Division/Services professionnels en informatique -
division EL
4C2, Place du Portage
Gatineau
Québec
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet IT SERVICES SUPPLY CHAIN PROJECT	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 47060-136911/A	Amendment No. - N° modif. 005
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 47060-136911	Date 2013-02-13
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$EL-615-25342	
File No. - N° de dossier 615el.47060-136911	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2013-02-25	Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT
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: Ghaddab Nabil	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 615el
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (819) 956-5419 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX (819) 956-5925
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction: See herein	

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

This solicitation amendment is raised to answer questions received from Bidders and to amend the Solicitation.

QUESTION 16

In reference to M1 and M2.

Will CBSA consider TBIPS as one contract to allow fair competition amongst Tier 2 bidders. In support of this approach please see the question, which was submitted to PWGSC in reference to a similar large RFP issued for Shared Services Canada, which required bidders to meet very similar levels of resourcing, in which PWGSC agreed that TBIPS would be considered as 1 contract.

'Question and Response related to Shared Services Canada Tier 2 RFP for Multiple Streams and categories of personnel issued under TBIPS Tier 2.

When PWGSC exercised procurement reform and TBIPS was put in place it was standard practice for government departments to issue RFPs' for individual resource even though those resources were part of a large project team and a single vendor might have multiple resources on that team. Departments were discouraged from issuing TA based contracts under TBIPS. It is only within the past 2 years that PWGSC has allowed departments to start to issue contracts that are TA based under TBIPS again.

By limiting bidders from demonstrating the necessary days of experience per category in more than 5 contracts, it effectively excludes all but very large integrators from bidding and discriminates against bidders who focus on the Federal Government as a client.

Many companies who have many resources deployed and could easily meet the number of days required in experience will be excluded from bidding as a result of this.

We respectfully request that you either allow vendors to consider TBIPS Vehicle as one contract or alternately increase or remove entirely the maximum number of contracts to allow for greater competition.

Answer: Shared Services Canada will consider TBIPS Vehicle as one contract. This has been addressed in the issue for Word version requested in Question #3 above.'

16.1 We respectfully request that you either allow vendors to consider TBIPS Vehicle as one contract or;

16.2 Alternately increase or remove entirely the maximum number of contracts to allow for greater competition.

ANSWER 16

16.1 No, the TBIPS vehicle will not be considered as one Contract.

16.2 No, Canada has reviewed the request and the RFP will remain unchanged.

QUESTION 17

In regards to following part of the criteria M1:

Invoices (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1M;

Could you please clarify if all invoices need to be provided or only samples would be sufficient?

ANSWER 17

See RFP Amendment 005 below:

Canada has decided to modify M1 for all streams as follows:

RFP AMENDMENT # 05:

At M1 of all streams of Attachment B – Bid Evaluation Criteria

DELETE: M1 in its entirety; and

INSERT: M1 as follows:

1.0 CORPORATE MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS**BIDDER'S RESPONSE**

ITEM #	MANDATORY REQUIREMENT	DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE (BIDDERS TO INSERT DATA)
--------	-----------------------	--

M1	<p>The Bidder must have been awarded at least five Informatics Professional Services* contracts, of which three were for a Government Client**. Each of these contracts must have a minimum contract value of \$1,000,000.00 and have been awarded within the past seven years.</p> <p>The Bidder must submit for each contract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Invoices*** (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00; Or A letter from it's client (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1,000,000.00; and 2. the name, telephone number and, if available, e-mail address of a contact person at the customer who received each invoice submitted under (1) above, so that Canada may verify any information provided by the Bidder. <p>The following definitions apply to the evaluation of bids:</p> <p>*Informatics Professional Services are professional services provided by the Bidder in support of an information technology or information management project or contract.</p> <p>**Government Client is a client within a federal, provincial, territorial or municipal government.</p> <p>***IMPORTANT NOTE – The invoices can either be submitted on paper, CD or DVD. If the invoices are submitted on a CD or a DVD, such information must be provided in a PDF file format. Bidder must note that it is their responsibility to ensure that the provided PDF format under CD or DVD works.</p>	
----	--	--

QUESTION 18

- 18.1 When PWGSC exercised procurement reform and TBIPS was put in place it was standard practice for government departments to issue RFPs' for individual resource even though

those resources were part of a large project team and a single vendor might have multiple resources on that team. Departments were discouraged from issuing TA based contracts under TBIPS. It is only within the past 2 years that PWGSC has allowed departments to start to issue contracts that are TA based under TBIPS again. By limiting bidders from demonstrating the necessary days of experience per category in more than 5 contracts, it effectively excludes all but very large integrators from bidding and discriminates against bidders who focus on the Federal Government as a client. Many companies who have many resources deployed and could easily meet the number of days required in experience will be excluded from bidding as a result of this.

We respectfully request that you either allow vendors to consider TBIPS Vehicle as one contract or alternately consider all TBIPS contracts within a Federal Government Department/Agency as one contract to allow for greater competition.

- 18.2 With regard to (M2 and R1) in all streams the requirement for having the maximum of 5 contracts to meet multiple categories/billable days, over the same 36-month period, within the last 5 years is restrictive. For example in Stream 1 in order to get full points you need to have placed FTE equivalents of 24 Architects, 12 Systems Analysts, 16.8 Web Architects, 7.1 Business Architects, 7.1 IM Architects, 7.1 Technology Architects, 12 Enterprise Architects and 4.8 Technical Writers (based on 220/year) totaling 90.9 FTE on only 5 contracts within the same 36 month period in last 5 years.

We respectfully request that you remove the limitation of “within the same 36 month period” and have no time restriction within the 5 year period or alternatively have the 36 month period specific to the reference (meaning that each of the 5 references can utilize any 36 month period, within last 5 years, Reference #1 Sept 2008 to Sept 2011, Reference #2 December 2009 to December 2012).

ANSWER 18

18.1 No, the TBIPS vehicle will not be considered as one Contract. Canada has reviewed the request and the RFP will remain unchanged.

18.2 For clarity purposes, the Bidder must have demonstrated contract experience in supplying all of the resource categories, for the required Minimum Billable Days per category.

The services provided must have been provided under a maximum of five contracts. It is not necessary for each contract to demonstrate all categories of personnel.

The experience must occur within the past five years prior to the solicitation's closing date. The number of Billable Days demonstrated must be proven over no greater than 36 months, but such 36 months need not be consecutive. The experience may occur at any time during the five-year

period, so long as the total number of Billable Days when added together meets the Minimum Billable Days requirement.

As such, M2 is amended as follows:

RFP AMENDMENT # 06:

At M2 of all streams of Attachment B – Bid Evaluation Criteria

DELETE:

The Bidder must have demonstrated contract experience in supplying all of the following resource categories, for the required Minimum Billable Days per category, over the same 36-month period within the past five years. The services provided must have been provided under a maximum of five contracts.

INSERT:

The Bidder must have demonstrated contract experience in supplying all of the following resource categories, for the required Minimum Billable Days per category, over a total period of 36-month within the past five years. The services provided must have been provided under a maximum of five contracts.

QUESTION 19

Within the solicitation the Crown has indicated that Tier 2 SA holders may NOT create a Joint Venture in order to compete for the available contracts solicited. The RFP also requires demonstration of an extensive set of corporate requirements. Corporate requirements and extensive corporate capabilities were the basis of the Tiers in the original solicitation for the TBIPS SA itself. This RFP requires bidders to demonstrate compliance with an additional, and extensive set of corporate capabilities.

Industry members currently holding TBIPS SA's at the Tier 2 level have already demonstrated extensive corporate capability in order to receive a Supply Arrangement.

If in fact, CBSA does not see Tier 2 SA Holders as being of sufficient capability, as this RFP implies, then CBSA might consider development of a contracting vehicle outside of the TBIPS SA. Or, CBSA should, respectfully, permit current SA holders to JV with industry members who do not currently hold Supply Arrangements under the TBIPS vehicle. The latter would permit demonstration of corporate capability beyond which is already required by the Tier 2 SA.

CBSA, as this RFP implies, does not see sufficient corporate capability within the current thresholds set in the Tier 2 SA and will NOT permit the creation of any new Joint Venture in order to develop a proposal. This would seemingly indicate a desire to limit the number of

proposals received, to only the largest of corporations and would, without question, limit the competitive pricing that the Crown should be seeking.

Could the Crown kindly confirm that any Joint Venture bid will be accepted provided that at least one member of any Joint Venture bid already hold a TBIPS SA under Tier 2, or conversely, cancel this solicitation and create a standalone RFP.

ANSWER 19

No, furthermore Bidders are to refer to article "f" of clause 1.2 - Summary of part 1 of the Solicitation.

QUESTION 20

Given the implied complexity involved in responding to this RFP we would respectfully request a 3-week extension to the closing date such that the solicitation closes no earlier than 4-March-2013.

ANSWER 20

Canada has reviewed the request and the RFP will remain unchanged.

QUESTION 21

Will CBSA/PWGSC provide the RFP in Doc format so that suppliers may complete the Evaluation Criteria? If not the whole RFP, could you provide the Evaluation Criteria in DOC format?

ANSWER 21

As per the Notice of Proposed Procurement, the RFP is available in a PDF format only.

QUESTION 22

Could the Crown please provide vendors with a datafillable version of this solicitation document (i.e. Microsoft Word and/or Microsoft Excel as applicable).

ANSWER 22

As per the Notice of Proposed Procurement, the RFP is available in a PDF format only.

QUESTION 23

We are a small to medium sized firm who currently provide consulting services to CBSA and US Customs and Border Protection. Due to the Beyond the Border and Perimeter Security aspect of this RFP, we believe we are a best fit to provide services to CBSA under 2-3 streams of the proposed Supply Arrangement -yet do not hold a Tier 2 TBIPS SA.

- 23.1 As we are unable to bid as a prime vendor based on the current Tier 2 TBIPS requirement, are we allowed to partner with another firm who is a Tier 2 TBIPS holder as a joint venture?
- 23.2 If not, are we allowed to team with a firm who would be represented as the prime contractor (with our company as a sub-contractor) and would they be allowed to use our project credentials to help qualify the bid?
- 23.3 If not, and it is determined we cannot bid, will we be required to use the regular TBIPS SA and other contracting arrangements for contracting to CBSA?

ANSWER 23

- 23.1 No, furthermore Bidders are to refer to article "f" of clause 1.2 – Summary of Part 1 of the Solicitation.
- 23.2 No, further more Bidders are to refer to article "e" of clause 3.1 – Bid preparation instruction of Part 3 of the Solicitation
- 23.3 The establishment of these contracts will not preclude CBSA from using other contracting vehicles, such as TBIPS, to fulfill needs that are not met by the requirement.

QUESTION 24

For all streams, with regards to Bid Evaluation Criteria M2 and R1, can the Crown please confirm that the same contiguous 36-month period can vary per the up-to 5 contracts presented by Bidders?

ANSWER 24

Bidders are to refer to the answer provided under 18.2 of this solicitation amendment.

QUESTION 25

- 25.1 Page 24, Stream 6 Infrastructure, 4th box under "Resource Category" please confirm that "... (Virtualization)..." should read "... (Terminal Services)".
- 25.2 Please confirm Appendix A of Attachment B, specifically Stream 6 - Infrastructure (on page 24) is missing the following categories:
- Tester - Level 2
 - Tester - Level 3
 - Application/Software Architect - Level 3

ANSWER 25

- 25.1 Canada confirms that 'Virtualization' should read 'Terminal Services'. See modification below.
- 25.2 Canada has reviewed the request and the RFP was amended as follows:

RFP AMENDMENT # 07:

At Appendix A of Attachment B of the Solicitation

DELETE: the table provided under Stream 6 – Infrastructure; and

INSERT: the following table:

RESOURCE CATEGORY	NUMBER OF BILLABLE DAYS					
	Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____	Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____	Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____	Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____	Cross Reference to Contract Reference # _____	Total
IM Architect (Level 3)						
Database Administrator (Level 3)						
Database Modeler/IM Modeler (Level 3)						

Technology Architect (Terminal Services) (Level 2)						
Technology Architect (Integrator) (Level 3)						
Technology Architect (Engineering) (Level 2)						
Technology Architect (Engineering) (Level 3)						
Tester (Level 2)						
Tester (Level 3)						
Application Software Architect (Level 3)						

QUESTION 26

26.1 Recently numerous TBIPS of this size and nature have been asking for contracts that “must have be awarded within the past 10 years”, instead of 5 years, so we would like the Crown to change the mandatory and rated for this requirement.

26.2 We request that you either allow vendors to consider other Government Wide Supply Vehicles, such as TBIPS or THS as one contract, similar to the SSC TBIPS Sol # 2B0KB-131858/A response to Question #4 or alternately increase or remove entirely the maximum number of contracts to allow for greater competition.

When PWGSC exercised procurement reform and TBIPS was put in place it was standard practice for government departments to issue RFPs' for individual resource even though those resources were part of a large project team and a single vendor might have multiple resources on that team. Departments were discouraged from issuing TA based contracts under TBIPS. It is only within the past 2 years that PWGSC has allowed departments to start to issue contracts that are TA based under TBIPS again.

26.3 In regards to M1 (1,2), could you please confirm that the provision of copies of invoices with the level of detail requested from potential suppliers, does not contravene any provisions of the Privacy Act or Financial Administration Act.

ANSWER 26

26.1 No

26.2 No

26.3 Bidders are to refer to the answer provided under question 17.

QUESTION 27

27.1 Within the corporate mandatory requirement section, all streams seemingly have the same threshold with respect to contract value (*M1, at least 5 contracts, 3 coming from the public sector, and each bearing a minimum value of \$1M and awarded within the past 5 years*). Each stream, under M2, also require vastly differing minimum billable day requirements which, additionally, range from as few as three(3) to as many as ten(10) categories. Contract values should differ immensely in value given the vast differences requested in billable days as demonstrated throughout these corporate mandatory requirements. In order to demonstrate a more sensible threshold, could the Crown respectfully remove the \$1M threshold from M1 in its entirety and throughout all streams? If industry is able to demonstrate the billable days desired, then certainly the Crown should be willing to accept capability from Industry. By way of example, if any Industry member specialised in Project Management and held contracts demonstrating 534 billable days at less than \$1M, the Crown would deem them non-compliant. This threshold would harm the Crown fiscally. Please confirm that this \$1M threshold will be removed in its entirety from this solicitation.

27.2 Referencing M2, the billable days, alluded to in the question above, could the Crown kindly shed light on how these thresholds were derived? These figures seem fairly specific.

ANSWER 27

27.1 No, the \$1M threshold will not be removed in its entirety from this solicitation.

27.2 The billable days were based on projected usage.

QUESTION 28

In reference to Bid Evaluation Criteria for all streams;

When PWGSC exercised procurement reform and TBIPS was put in place it was standard practice for government departments to issue RFPs' for individual resource even though those

resources were part of a large project team and a single vendor might have multiple resources on that team. Departments were discouraged from issuing TA based contracts under TBIPS. It is only within the past 2 years that PWGSC has allowed departments to start to issue contracts that are TA based under TBIPS again.

By limiting bidders from demonstrating the necessary days of experience per category in more than 5 contracts, it effectively excludes all but very large integrators from bidding and discriminates against bidders who focus on the Federal Government as a client.

Many companies who have many resources deployed and could easily meet the number of days required in experience will be excluded from bidding as a result of this.

1. We respectfully request that you either allow vendors to consider TBIPS Vehicle as one contract or;
2. alternately increase or remove entirely the maximum number of contracts to allow for greater competition.

ANSWER 28

1. No, the TBIPS vehicle will not be considered as one Contract.
2. No, Canada has reviewed the request and the RFP will remain unchanged.

QUESTION 29

29.1 In regards to Corporate Technical Mandatory Evaluation Criteria M.1, Stream 3. Would the Crown consider the following changes to the M1? We strongly believe the current requirement as it is stated excludes many small to medium size companies from bidding since it creates a very narrow window to substantiate technical compliance.

M.1 Current Requirement:

The Bidder must have been awarded at least five Informatics Professional Services* contracts, of which three were for a Government Client**. Each of these contracts must have a minimum contract value of \$1M and have been awarded within the past five years.

M.1 Proposed Requirement:

The Bidder must have been awarded at least five Informatics Professional Services* contracts, of which three were for a Government Client**. Each of these contracts must have a minimum contract value of \$1M and must have been completed in the last five (5) years (as of bid closing date) or has been ongoing for a minimum of six months (as of bid closing date).

29.2 regards to Corporate Technical Mandatory Evaluation Criteria M.1 (1), Stream 3. Would the Crown consider reducing the “billed amount” to \$500,000.00 since contracts of \$1M that have been awarded cannot be used as reference unless the contract has been fully exercised and closed. This greatly limits small and medium firms ability to bid on this RFP.

M.1 (1) Current Requirement:

(1) invoices (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$1M; and

M.1 (1) Proposed Requirement:

(1) invoices (referencing a contract serial number or other unique contract identifier) that shows that the Bidder has provided and invoiced a customer (with whom the Bidder deals at arm's length) for such services in the amount of \$500,000.00

ANSWER 29

29.1 No, Bidders are to refer to the answer provided under question 17.

29.2 No, Bidders are to refer to the answer provided under question 17.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED